

HONORING "SALADO LEGENDS" FOR THEIR THIRD SEASON OF BRINGING THE STORY OF CENTRAL TEXAS PIONEERS TO THE STAGE

**HON. CHET EDWARDS**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 1995*

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today it is with great pride and pleasure that I honor the 1995 presentation of "Salado Legends." This stage drama brings to life the story of central Texas pioneers who braved danger and hardship to carve out a new life.

For the past three summers more than 100 cast and crew have donated their time and talent to bring this production to appreciative audiences. This unique stage production reenacts the experiences of Scottish settlers who arrived in Salado in Bell County in the late 1850's. The audience is treated to a slice of central Texas history through song, dance, and story.

I ask Members to join me in honoring the cast and crew of this stage production for their work preserving a piece of history in my Texas congressional district.

IN TRIBUTE TO EDWARD ROBERTS

**HON. NANCY PELOSI**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 1995*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true American pioneer, a hero to millions, a leader in the truest sense of the word: Edward V. Roberts. Ed Roberts was known and loved by millions throughout the world, for, by the sheer force of his will, intelligence, and genius, he created the independent living movement for people with disabilities.

Born in 1939, Ed was stricken with polio at the age of 14. Left a quadriplegic by the disease, Ed soon found that the world did not recognize that though his body had been ravaged, his mind had not. Confronted with the fact that his high school would not let him graduate because he could not complete mandatory driver's and physical education classes, Ed began his career in tenacious advocacy by convincing his principal to lift that restriction.

In 1962, he became the first severely disabled student to attend the University of California at Berkeley, overcoming opposition to the idea of a student who required a respirator during the day and an iron lung at night. He was physically separated from other students by the school, which housed him at Cowell hospital. Not being content with being a trailblazer for the admission of disabled students, he led a successful fight to allow them to use regular student housing.

After receiving a bachelor's and master's degree in political science, and after teaching at UC-Berkeley for 6 years, Ed left the school to establish the Center for Independent Living. The center's goal was to carry out much of what Ed had spent his life battling alone: helping to find and promote housing, transportation, and assistance for the disabled. His work caught the eye of Governor Jerry Brown, who appointed him the head of the State De-

partment of Rehabilitation. He held the position until 1982. During his tenure, Ed was tireless in promoting the rights of the disabled, and working to ensure that independent living was not merely a goal, but a need for the severely disabled.

In 1984, in recognition of his work, Ed received a \$225,000 MacArthur Foundation "Genius" Award. Using the grant, he, Judy Heumann, and Joan Leon established the World Institute on Disability, which has become the most influential policy and research center on people with disabilities. Indeed, the World Institute and Ed played a key role in helping passage of the landmark Americans with Disabilities Act.

Most recently, Ed and the World Institute have been profiled in a three-part series on people with disabilities and technology called "People in Motion." In addition, Ed has been working on a project to create work stations for people with disabilities that would allow them to own their own small businesses, such as espresso or vending carts. It was my privilege to work with Ed on this project with regard to the San Francisco International Airport.

Unfortunately, the world lost Ed Roberts on March 14, 1995. On Sunday, March 19th, a memorial service was held to honor Ed Roberts at the UC-Berkeley campus. I, along with countless others, was proud to call Ed Roberts my friend. He has been called, with little hyperbole, the "Ghandi of the disability rights movement." Comparisons, however, do not do justice to the spirit, the passion, which filled the soul of Ed Roberts. Perhaps Ed defined it best: after overhearing a doctor telling his mother that it would be better if he died from the polio because he would be left a vegetable, Ed immediately thought of the artichoke, which was prickly on the outside with a tender heart.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Congress, allow me to express our condolences to his son, Lee, his mother, Vona, and brothers Mark and Ron. But, more importantly, we must continue our fight as a Nation for the rights of the disabled. It is only through our actions that we properly pay tribute to Ed Roberts' enduring legacy of good works and his tireless pursuit of justice on behalf of the disabled.

**EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995**

SPEECH OF

**HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 15, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the rescissions contained in H.R. 1158. I oppose this measure for several reasons, primarily because of the detrimental effect it will have on our children.

No one suffers under this bill more than our children. They have been targeted to carry the

bulk of the cuts to pay for the tax cuts for our Nation's most affluent.

We are not cutting bureaucrats. We are denying children who have no control over their circumstances an opportunity to learn in safe, clean schools with a nutritious meal in their stomachs. We are denying children in low income families a warm bed.

This measure will have a negative impact on my home State and my district. For my colleagues, I would like to point out a number of programs vital to the productivity and welfare of Texans which will be slashed or eliminated by this bill.

Under this bill, Texas will lose over \$1 billion in funding. H.R. 1158 reduces the funding Texas would have received under formula allocations by half a million dollars. This measure cuts over \$162 million from housing modernization, operating subsidies, and section 8 vouchers funding for my State. Texas will lose \$20 million from Community Development Block Grants, \$30 million from the low-income home energy assistance program, and over \$170 million in job training and employment services programs. Texas children will lose over \$70 million in school programs.

Two cuts contained in this package will have a disparaging impact on residents of dilapidated, low-income housing. The reduction in payments for the operation of low-income housing projects and the elimination of funding for the Severely Distressed Public Housing Fund will result in a reduction of affordable housing for the residents of my district, where public housing is already at maximum capacity and 5000 families are on a waiting list for affordable housing. This cut will result in a loss of over 200 jobs in a region with unemployment over 9 percent.

The reduction in the payments for the operation of low-income housing projects will fall disproportionately on housing authorities. These housing authorities, which begin their fiscal year July 1 or October 1, could see their funding cut by as much as 50 percent. This reduction will mean a reduction in maintenance, security, and supportive services.

The Severely Distressed Public Housing fund is targeted to help those who live in some of our nation's most dilapidated and crime infested developments. The President had intended this last year of funding to assist communities with the worst public housing. This money is urgently needed. In many instances this money has already been obligated and contracts have been signed. Not funding this program in 1996 is one thing, renegeing on our commitments for 1995 is another. This will result in long and costly litigation over the cancellation of this commitment.

Under this measure, funding for three national parks in Texas will lose funding. The Chamizal National Memorial, Palo Alto National Battlefield, and the San Antonio Missions will lose funding. These parks preserve our unique multicultural heritage. Although, less known than the Yellowstone National Park or the Grand Canyon, they are no less important and serve to commemorate and preserve an unique part of our history, culture, or landscape. Under this proposal, programs to promote this aspect of our heritage will continue to be underfunded and neglected.

I provided the Rules Committee an opportunity to make in order an amendment to

eliminate funding for \$400 million in low-priority highway demonstration projects. My amendment, which would have cut real pork, was not made in order. Instead the Republicans chose to cut funding for programs such as Healthy Start, which is aimed at improving the health of unborn children, and to eliminate over 50,000 pregnant mothers and infants from the WIC program.

Remember this bill only provides an \$11 billion down payment. The Republican tax cuts will cost over \$700 billion. The majority felt compelled to cut programs for children and the elderly first. It scares me, as it should any parent, to consider where they will get the remaining \$690 billion.

Why are we doing this? So that big industry and the rich can be given a tax break that I doubt they want. I can not imagine any businessman that wants to see the next generation of high school graduates turn out to be an illiterate workforce of dropouts. I know I don't and my constituents don't.

I do not support the rescissions contained in this bill and I urge my colleagues to vote against it. I believe that it cuts the wrong programs—programs that hurt children, low-income Americans, and the elderly—for the wrong reasons.

HONORING MOLLY BROWN, 1995  
REFUGEE VOLUNTEER OF THE  
YEAR

**HON. OWEN B. PICKETT**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, March 21, 1995*

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to extend my sincerest congratulations to Ms. Molly P. Brown, a constituent of mine from Virginia Beach, VA, on being awarded the 1995 National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer of the Year Award.

The National Wildlife Refuge Association and the National Audubon Society have jointly established this annual award. Its purpose is to recognize the volunteer who best achieves the goals and objectives of the National Wildlife Refuge System [NWRS], which are superior organizational skills, innovation in handling refuge assignments, effectiveness in dealing with the public, and dependability. Ms. Brown's extensive service and long-standing commitment to the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge located in Virginia Beach, VA, clearly are above and beyond the criteria that merit national recognition.

As an advocate of environmental consciousness, Ms. Brown has appeared regularly before the Virginia Beach City Council and the zoning board to testify on city and State proposals affecting the Refuge. As a member of the Mayor's Growth Management Advisory Committee, Ms. Brown has frequently provided valuable citizen comments and observations on the city's land use, transportation, and infrastructure plans and programs.

Realizing the need to promote an awareness not only of the Refuge's mission but of other conservation activities within the region as well, Ms. Brown worked to establish both the Southeastern Association for Virginia's Environment [SAVE], and the Friends of Back Bay/Save Our Sandbridge organization of which she currently serves as president. Offer-

ing her time and talent at local events such as Earth Day and the Environmental Awareness Fair for Students, Molly Brown serves as a true emissary of the conservation movement.

During the 103rd Congress, Molly Brown traveled to Washington, DC, to testify before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior concerning the need for additional funding for Back Bay. Ms. Brown provided the Subcommittee with extensive information regarding the Refuge's plans to expand its boundaries and improve its natural habitat. The Back Bay land acquisition was one of only 33 projects funded nationwide in the Department of Interior Appropriations Act of 1994, attesting to the value of Ms. Brown's knowledgeable and articulate testimony.

It is with pleasure and honor that I join the other citizens of the Second Congressional District of Virginia in thanking and commending Molly Brown for her successful efforts in promoting awareness and appreciation of our area's natural resources, for her continuing efforts to obtain essential funding and Congressional support for Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge, and for her boundless enthusiasm for the Refuge system as a whole. She is a most deserving recipient of the 1995 National Wildlife Refuge Volunteer of the Year Award.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AP-  
PROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL  
DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RE-  
SCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR  
1995

SPEECH OF

**HON. BILL ORTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 15, 1995*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this opportunity to explain my vote against the rescissions and supplemental spending bill which passed the House last week.

On Wednesday night, I was pleased to vote for the "lockbox" amendment offered by Representative BREWSTER. I have been involved from the beginning in the development of this provision, which ensures that spending reductions are strictly dedicated to deficit reduction, and not simply reallocated to other spending programs or used to finance tax cuts. The lockbox amendment, approved by a 418 to 5 vote of the House, clearly stated that spending would be reduced by some \$55 billion over the next 5 years, and that all of these cuts could only be used to reduce the deficit.

Based on this amendment, and the resulting deficit reduction, I was prepared to vote for final passage of this bill. However, just prior to a final vote on the rescissions bill, the Budget Committee held a markup of legislation to lower spending caps for the next 5 years. At this markup, the Budget Committee chairman announced that he planned to use all of the savings in fiscal years 1996 through 2000 from the rescissions bill to finance the Republican tax cuts. He also announced that the lockbox provisions which would prevent this

maneuver would be stripped from the bill prior to a conference report.

Without ascribing motivations or analyzing negotiations that took place, the effect was that the approximately \$55 billion in outyear savings in the rescissions bill would not end up reducing the deficit by even a single dollar.

This made the bill unacceptable to me. Many of the cuts in this bill will be painful, especially in the areas of education, elderly housing, and children's programs. I could not in good conscience vote for these cuts, without assurance from leadership that they would honor the provisions of the lockbox amendment. So, reluctantly, I voted against final passage.

In addition, I must say that this decision was not made any easier by the unfair, highly restrictive way in which the bill was brought to the floor. Last week I explained in detail how this rule effectively protected 80 percent of the discretionary budget from budget cuts.

I also explained how the rule made it almost impossible to restore funds for good programs through cuts in bad or wasteful programs. I was prepared to support additional spending cuts in other parts of the budget to restore cuts that I believe were unfair or unwarranted. I would like to take this opportunity to identify those cuts I opposed.

The rescissions bill makes significant and unwise cuts in programs that promote opportunities. Cuts in impact aid and national service will hurt our education efforts. Cuts in foster care and grants for drug-free schools will have a negative effect on our children. And, cuts in information infrastructure grants will slow our efforts to develop and expand opportunities on the Information Superhighway. All of these are high priority areas.

I also oppose the excessive level of cuts for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. While I could support modest cuts in the CPB, the bill makes 30 percent cuts in fiscal year 1997 funding, on a path to terminating Federal support. These cuts will have a significant negative effect on public broadcasting, especially for rural areas.

Finally, the bill makes excessive cuts in housing and community development programs. Cuts which I believe should have been rejected or scaled back include public housing modernization, community development block grants [CDBG's] drug elimination funds, and public housing operating subsidies.

Especially unfair is the cut of \$404 million in operating subsidies for public housing authorities. It is fundamentally unfair to have agencies plan on receiving certain funding levels, and then make significant cuts in the middle of the year. Furthermore, the way these cuts are being implemented is especially unfair. PHA's with a fiscal year starting in July 1 will bear a disproportionate portion of the cuts, while those with an earlier fiscal year will be largely spared. I could not support this.

Again, I want to make it clear that I was prepared to support offsetting cuts to restore these important programs. I was also prepared to vote for additional cuts beyond those proposed by the committee—if the rule hadn't prevented this.

For example, I planned on offering an amendment with Rep. KLUG to zero out funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. However, because of the short time limits placed on debate of this bill, we did not have