

are taking away would have provided 67,000 more families with housing certificates and vouchers. For the first time in the more than 20 years of this program, there will be no incremental funding of tenant-based rental assistance—a program which is widely acknowledged by conservative analysts to be HUD's most cost-effective one.

Mr. Chairman, the list of important and innovative housing programs to be cut by this legislation goes on and on and time prevents me from listing all of them. I wish to note for the record, however, my opposition to Republican cuts of \$90 million in the lead-based paint program; \$350 million in pension fund rental assistance; and \$38 million in the Youthbuild Program, which not only increases affordable housing, but also provides job training and skills for lower income Americans.

I am also opposed to the \$350 million cut in the Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] Program. CDBG funds allow community-based organizations to provide a wide range of services in their communities. Why, at a time when we are trying to promote community control are we tying the hands of communities trying to meet community needs?

What is the response of my Republican colleagues to our concerns about the impact of these draconian cuts? They say we simply cannot afford to provide housing for needy Americans. I say we simply cannot afford not to provide this housing.

This bill cuts funding which has already been voted on by Congress and signed into law by President Clinton. In many cases, communities and housing providers across the country struggling with trying to meet ever-growing needs with limited funds, will lose money for community development and for housing which is part of a community plan and which is already underway. Where progress is being made, it will be stopped. Would that halting progress is the only consequence under the Republican plan. Unfortunately, the bill before us today takes giant steps backwards in the fight against homelessness.

If we have learned anything about homelessness over the course of the past decade, it is that it costs less to keep people in affordable housing than it does to help homeless people with the transition back to being fully-functioning members of our society. The Republican cuts in our national housing programs are not only inhumane and cruel, but they are also inefficient and costly. While the Republican leadership trumpets the saving they propose today, they are covering up the costs their cuts will create tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided and cruel bill.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB BARR

OF GEORGIA

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. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who chairs the subcommittee dealing with HUD, in a colloquy if he is willing.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to do so.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, many communities throughout the State of Georgia, including those within my own district, have raised a concern regarding the proposed reduction of \$349 million in community development block grants. I am informed that the cut amounts to as much as an 8 percent reduction from what has already been publicly announced and communicated to them.

Mr. LEWIS of California. The gentleman is correct. Many local communities have been notified of their fiscal year 1995 allocations and have initiated community meetings to plan for the release of CDBG money for the wide variety of eligible purposes.

Mr. BARR. So can we expect the committee to help us make a determination of how to assure these communities that they will receive what they were previously promised?

Mr. LEWIS of California. The report accompanying this bill directs OMB to cause the affected agencies, including HUD, to stop obligating funds proposed for rescission. I am very concerned that HUD in particular has attempted to move funds out the door as soon as they suspected they were rescission candidates. If we can get OMB to put the brakes on, I am sure that we can make a factual determination of how much of the proposed cut should be restored in order to keep faith with the local planning that has naturally progressed prior to the full committee's action late last week. And I am more than willing to do so in conference if HUD and OMB step up to the plate on this.

Mr. BARR. I appreciate knowing that you have the same understanding I do regarding the dilemma faced by my communities in Georgia. They will be very pleased to know that we are working on a solution.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] for his efforts.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

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:

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Crane amendment which would increase the cuts in funding for the corporation for public broadcasting.

Mr. Chairman, I have received hundreds of letters from my constituents, in the sixth Congressional District of California, opposing the republican leadership's attacks on the CPB. These attacks will hurt our local PBS stations, KRCB and KQED, which are an important source of educational and cultural programming for adults and children in my district.

KCRB and KQED have helped thousands of adults get their high school degree and pass college level courses. Workers on farms in isolated areas; welfare mothers striving to become self-sufficient; and individuals seeking to improve their job skills have benefitted from the educational programming offered by KRCB and KQED.

Mr. Chairman, no commercial stations are offering these much-needed educational services!

In addition, KRCB, KQED and other PBS stations are home to valuable programming for our children. As a mother of four, I remember how difficult it was to find entertaining and educational programs for my children. I often relied on my local PBS station as do many parents who do not want their children watching the increasingly violent adult programs which are prevalent on commercial television stations.

For the price of one dollar per person, the corporation for public broadcasting ensures that every American household, rich or poor, urban or rural, has access to a wide range of educational and cultural programming.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small price to pay for the valuable services provided by PBS stations throughout the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Crane amendment.

THE SYMBOL OF OUR NATION

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the introduction of historic legislation that will finally give the American flag the recognition it deserves as a symbol of our Nation.

As many as 235 Members of the House have co-sponsored this bill to amend the U.S.

Constitution to allow States to pass laws outlawing abuse of our flag. We are proud of the American flag and we want to protect it.

The issue of flag desecration has been with us for too long. As you know, in 1984, a protester at the Republican National Convention in Houston was arrested for burning the flag which was against the law in Texas. Five years later the Supreme Court struck down the Texas law and the offender was acquitted. In 1990, Congress passed a bill to remedy this situation, but it too was struck down as unconstitutional. So now our only choice is to pass this legislation, amend the U.S. Constitution and allow the States to pass their own laws to correct this problem.

As a veteran, I feel particularly strong about this proposal. Many men and women throughout our Nation's history have sacrificed their lives so that we could enjoy the freedoms we now have. The flag is a symbol of this country and a tribute to those who have protected our Nation through the years. To allow individuals to desecrate this symbol for petty purposes is to cheapen the country for which it stands. I find it extremely offensive that laws cannot be passed by States to prohibit this kind of behavior.

This bill is not meant to restrict the first amendment rights guaranteed to all Americans. I strongly believe that individuals and groups must be able to speak their minds on issues that concern them. But that does not mean burning the flag. I feel flag desecration goes beyond freedom of expression. It is an abuse of the U.S. Constitution and the freedoms that great document provides.

Our proposal is not a heavy-handed Government mandate. We want to give States the ability to pass the laws they deem necessary. Forty-six States have already passed resolutions which outlaw the desecration of the flag. Alabama joined these ranks in 1991. I think it is time for Congress to take the initiative to correct this situation once and for all. I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation and start the process for adding this historic amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

HON. KAREN L. THURMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 1995

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month, the Appropriations Committee met to consider offsets to pay for a \$5.6 billion supplemental spending for the California earthquake relief. The committee cut more than \$17.3 billion, including \$208 million for six veterans health clinics and other medical equipment. One of the clinics targeted for elimination is in my district of Gainesville, FL. Mr. Speaker, the immediate question that comes to mind is: To what will the remaining \$12 billion rescinded from the appropriations bills be applied? Many theories have been advanced, but most of them certainly indicate that vital programs for children, the elderly, and other vulnerable citi-

zens are being cut simply to provide tax breaks for the rich.

I came to the floor today hoping to offer an amendment that would restore the \$208 million rescinded from the veterans' health care budget, but because of the restrictive nature of this rule my amendment would be out of order.

My amendment would have targeted six actual pork projects and cut down on wasteful Government spending, while protecting the security of veterans who in many cases have risked their lives in defense of this Nation. The six projects targeted in my amendment included unauthorized courthouses and a Tokamak Reactor Energy Program which would cost taxpayers \$2.2 billion in the coming years.

The six outpatient clinics that would have been restored by my amendment are a critical part of the VA's plan to move from delivering costly inpatient care to delivering cost-effective outpatient care. According to the VA officials in my district in Gainesville, existing space deficiencies currently prevent the medical center from offering care in a timely manner. These projects would provide better health care to more veterans at less cost to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Committee on Rules is not protecting the security of our vulnerable citizens. They are not interested in going after the real pork. The rule they have set provides for only further rescissions in what the Appropriations Committee considers pork, and not what the average American knows is pork and Government waste. Furthermore, they are denying Democratic Members the opportunity to offer amendments that would get the job done. Mr. Speaker, this issue really comes down to a matter of priorities: Are we going to forsake the many men and women who have risked their lives in defense of this Nation, simply to provide tax subsidies for the rich? I for one, will not retreat on the promise we have made our veterans, and I urge my colleagues to stand firm and oppose this gag rule.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. THOMAS W. EWING

OF ILLINOIS

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. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159 and to commend Chairman LIVINGSTON and the Appropriations Committee for all their hard work on these two supplemental appropriations bills. It is truly a new era when the Appropriations Committee demands that supplemental appropriations bills, emergency or otherwise, be paid for with offsetting spending cuts.

No doubt, each Member of this body would like to change certain provisions of these bills, but these rescissions are applied in a balanced and fair manner. Furthermore, H.R. 1159 recommends several important policy corrections.

I am particularly pleased the committee included language that allows HUD to waive the one-for-one public housing replacement requirement when public housing is no longer habitable and in need of demolition. This has been an ongoing problem in my congressional district.

The city of Danville, IL has been trying to receive approval to demolish the decaying and vacant Carver Park housing project for some time. Despite unanimous public support for the project's demolition and orders from the city government, Federal law has prevented the demolition of this dangerous and environmentally hazardous property.

I am also pleased the committee has taken action to prevent President Clinton from enforcing his Executive order prohibiting companies from permanently replacing striking workers. Our Nation's present labor negotiation system is balanced and fair for both labor and management. Each side faces consequences for their actions which serve as an incentive to bargain in good faith. The President's Executive order would alter the current balance.

Last, the President's Executive order is an effort to usurp congressional authority and should be overturned by this Congress. Major changes to our Nation's labor law should not be instituted without congressional approval.

Again, I thank the committee for acting to restore balance to our Nation's labor law and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1159.

COMMON SENSE LEGAL STANDARDS REFORM ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 956) to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for other purposes:

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, on March 10, the House passed H.R. 956, the so-called Common Sense Product Liability and Legal Reform Act of 1995. Unfortunately, the final bill distinguishes itself by not having enough to do with product liability reform and having very little to do with common sense. The bill is an extreme measure that makes sweeping changes in the Nation's legal system that go far beyond the scope of fair and balanced product liability reform. It protects wrongdoers at the expense of injured individuals. It excludes procedural safeguards designed to put U.S. companies on a more equal footing with foreign corporations. It creates extreme and rigid rules that fail to account for circumstances involving gross misconduct or severe and permanent injuries. It fails to simplify current law and creates a complex and confusing jurisdictional puzzle.