

The fact is the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, led by a very able, nonpartisan, tough lady, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] dismissed 64 of the 65 complaints. There was nothing wrong with the Newt book deal. They never said he was guilty of anything. But the other side is going to continue these character assassinations because they view that as the only way they can regain control, reverse the election, and once again turn back the clock and go for more spending, more deficits, and the ruin of this country.

This freshman class was sent here to get the job done. We will not be deterred by these types of personal attacks on our leader. We will stay here to balance the budget and do what the American people sent us here to do.

THE GOPAC DEAL

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, about 6 months ago I addressed this House about the GOPAC deal with NEWT GINGRICH. My words were written down then necessarily. But the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly well. So the mills of the gods have caught up with Mr. GINGRICH, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has said that it is time to really look at the true facts.

The Republicans have showered this floor with acrimony, swaggering bravado. I have heard the President vilified and called a bugger. I have heard welfare recipients called alligators, all from this side of the aisle. So to say now that we are trying to assassinate Mr. GINGRICH's character is wrong. We are not trying to do that.

I am happy to say today that the President of the United States vetoed the reconciliation bill and well he should have. Regardless of the type of pen that he used, he turned back this really, really vicious attack against the poor and the elderly and the underserved of this country.

ETHICS COMMITTEE RESULTS

(Mr. SHAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to stand before this House and thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], for her courage. She is one of the most ethical people I have ever met.

I think colleagues on both sides of the aisle can agree. During this thorough, bipartisan investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, she was not allowed to defend the actions of the committee. The investigation committee had six different specific complaints. Five of them were dropped. Only one is being

looked at, and that is to hire a special counsel to investigate the tax implications of two nonprofit organizations which helped the Speaker in his course, a course that was in 21 universities, a course for which he never received a penny.

Was he guilty of encouraging people to call an 800 number to learn more about this course? Yes, if you call that guilt.

Was he guilty he had an unpaid advisor help him during the transition to decide who he should hire in his office? Yes, if you call that guilt, I do not.

He had a town meeting and he advertised his town meeting on the floor of the House.

Bottom line: The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct dropped five of the six complaints and is having a special counsel look at the one remaining issue, the tax implications of the Speaker's college course.

I salute my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They worked hard and resolved a number of difficult issues on a bipartisan basis. I hope we can now get back to the business of balancing our Federal budget.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the more the American people know about the Gingrich revolution, the less they like.

I was so proud yesterday when the President vetoed the Gingrich budget. It is what the American people have asked him to do. The American people have spoken. They do not support a budget that cuts Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. Last month the President cut a deal with the Republicans to balance the budget in 7 years while protecting the priorities of the American people. The budget that the President vetoed yesterday failed to meet that agreement because it did not protect the values that the American public holds so dear. It is time for the Republicans to send the President a balanced budget that protects the priorities of the American people and then he will sign it and then we can get on with the business of the people.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING WITHDRAWAL OF PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

(Mr. PETERSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], offered a privileged resolution concerning the investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of Speaker GINGRICH. This request was nonprejudicial. It was not a character assassination. It simply asked for a report of the activities of that committee.

Last night's action by the committee and the assurance that the House will receive a report on the investigation was welcome news. I regret we had to resort to a privileged resolution to get such a report, but in light of last night's announcement, I am announcing that we will not offer our privileged resolution as planned today.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 291

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the further conference report to accompany, and the amendment reported from conference in disagreement on, the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, and against the motion printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, are waived. The conference report, the amendment reported in disagreement, and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its final adoption without intervening motion except debate pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 291 allows for the consideration of the further conference report to accompany H.R. 2099, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and various independent agencies.

In my opinion, this is probably the most important of all of the appropriation bills. It provides the money required to meet the needs of our veterans and also provides the funding necessary to ensure adequate housing for the needy, the disabled, and the disadvantaged. Members will recall that the House voted to recommit this conference report on November 29, and I hope we got it right this time.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, and against the motion to dispose of Senate amendment No. 63 as printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference.

Finally, the rule provides that if the conference report is adopted, then the motion printed in the joint statement of managers to recede and concur in Senate Amendment 63 with an amendment shall be debatable for 1 hour. Senate amendment 63 was reported in technical disagreement, and pertains to the funding necessary to carry out the orderly termination of programs and activities under the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, this is basically the same conference report with various technical changes recommended to improve the bill.

Those who rely on veterans benefits and housing assistance should not have to go through the anxiety of wondering whether or not their benefits will be reduced or discontinued. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support this conference report.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding the customary one-half hour of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this, the second rule that has been reported to provide for the consideration of the conference report on the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. We oppose just as strongly the conference report itself that the rule would make in order.

Even though the House voted on November 29 to recommit the conference report, ostensibly because of cuts in funding for veterans programs, it was clear at the time that many Members were just as concerned about the unprecedented cuts included in this bill in spending for the environment and for housing.

Interestingly, the new conference agreement is virtually identical to the

one the House voted to recommit. In fact, no changes were made in veterans funding, as the recommittal motion demanded. What the conferees did was take this opportunity to make so-called technical corrections, including one that weakens HUD's antiredlining regulations.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees not only did not respond to the wishes of the House, but also took advantage of the recommittal to further weaken our Nation's commitment to fair housing laws.

We would not be in this position at all if the legislation before us did not so flagrantly violate the rules of the House. As has been the case for all the rules for considering this legislation, the one before us today sanctions flagrant and wholesale violations of the House rule that prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill. By protecting the major and substantive policy changes contained in the bill, it continues the objectionable trend that has developed this year of allowing the Committee on Appropriations to subvert the authorizing committee process.

When we Democrats were in the majority and proposed rules that protected by waivers even the most minor and technical provisions, our Republican colleagues protested loudly and vehemently. Had we attempted to protect the kind of major policy changes contained in this appropriations bill, you would have screamed in indignation, and you would have been right to have done so.

We have tried to be patient with the majority's frequent, flagrant, and unwarranted waivers of rule XXI, the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill, that have been contained in the rules for consideration of appropriations bills this year. We recognize from our years of being in the majority it is nearly always impossible to avoid all violations of rule XXI in an appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, however, the waiver provided in this bill goes far beyond the bounds of what can reasonably be considered legitimate or appropriate. While the conference agreement is less draconian than the House-passed bill, the waiver still sanctions the Committee on Appropriations' rewriting of environmental and housing laws. It sanctions the Committee on Appropriations' usurpation of the function of the authorizing committees, which is an egregious misuse of the waiver.

It has become increasingly clear that the new chairmen of the authorizing committees are willing to cede their responsibilities to the Committee on Appropriations. They should, rather, defend the integrity of the legislative process by insisting on their committees' right to make major policy changes the way they should be made, after following the deliberative committee process of hearings and full consideration of authorization legislation.

Indeed, the Committee on Rules itself should be disturbed about the

precedents that are being set. Instead, the Committee on Rules is acquiescing to this subversion of an open and accountable committee process. As the history of this bill demonstrates, many of these policy revisions would have been unable to withstand the scrutiny of full scale debate.

Despite the fact the conferees made improvements in the radical bill originally approved by the House, we are still faced with legislation making drastic follow policy changes that will seriously affect virtually all of our citizens. Consider what this bill does to the environment. For example, it slashes funds for environmental protection by a unprecedented 21 percent. These cuts would cripple EPA's enforcement efforts, seriously weakening the implementation of virtually every environmental law, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the law regulating the use of pesticides. It would limit EPA's authority to initiate cleanups at new Superfund sites.

In addition, five legislative provisions remain in the bill, language protected by this rule. Many of the other controversial 17 riders approved by the House have simply been shifted to report language, where they are less visible, but where they still pose an equally serious threat to public health.

The riders retained in legislative language include provisions barring EPA oversight of wetlands policy, limiting EPA authority to list new hazardous waste sites for cleanup under the Superfund law, and barring EPA from issuing a new standard to protect the public from contamination of drinking water by radon. These are changes that hamper the EPA's ability to protect the health and safety of our citizens.

When the funding cuts and legislative changes contained in this bill are combined with the changes to environmental policy made in other bills the House has passed this year, including the Clean Water Act revision and the so-called regulatory reform bills, this effort amounts to nothing less than a full scale assault on the environmental protection laws that have served our Nation so well, and which many of us believe need to be strengthened, not weakened and not repealed.

The other area that is cut drastically by this conference report is housing, where funding is reduced by 21 percent or \$4 billion from this year's level. Homeless programs are cut by 27 percent. Here, too, the funding cuts in the legislative changes in the bill amount to significant changes in housing policy, resulting in a dramatic shift in the course of our Nation's commitment to affordable and accessible housing for all our citizens.

For example, this bill means that no new public housing will be funded, even though the number of families who need help continues to grow each year. If all that were not enough, this legislation also eliminates all funding for a number of programs, including the

President's AmeriCorps National Service Program, the Community Development Bank Initiative, the FDIC Affordable Housing Program, and the Office of Consumer Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this conference report represent the misguided budget priorities of the Republican majority. Those priorities are forcing Congress to make deep cuts in domestic programs in order to pay for unnecessary increases in defense spending, including \$7 billion for more weaponry than the Defense Department requested, and for tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bad rule for an unworthy bill. It protects egregious violations of our rule prohibiting legislating in an appropriations bill, and it does so in order to allow Congress to make damaging changes to environmental and housing laws. The rule should be defeated.

The President has, and properly so, vowed to veto the bill, because it does not uphold the values so important to the American people. What we should do is to send this bill back to conference today, where the conferees should take seriously the need to make substantive changes in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, why are we considering this bill today?

Just last Wednesday, by a vote of 216 to 208 the House wisely recommitted this horrible VA/HUD conference report because it made too many cuts in veterans health benefits.

So if the bill is so bad, why is it here again? If a majority of the House couldn't bring themselves to vote for this bill last week what's going to make them vote for it this week?

I had hoped the conferees would have gotten rid of these unfair veterans cuts but the only changes to this bill are a few technical changes and a few new commas and semicolons.

This bill is nearly exactly the same bill that was carried out of here in a coffin last week.

My guess is that the only difference between last week's bill and this week's bill is a few broken arms. Otherwise I can see no reason why anyone would support this dreadful bill.

And, it doesn't stop with veterans health cuts. This bill still guts Federal safeguards that protect our air, water, land, and public health from toxic pollution. It is a dangerous attack on American families, and American veterans, and it belongs in the trash can. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and defeat this bill, again. Veterans need their health care this week just as much as they needed it last week.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to

the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule on a bad bill. It should be rejected. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], for making this time available.

The bill has not been changed. The Wall Street Journal says it. What does it say? It says that the House Republican leadership determined to overcome an embarrassing loss last week and will try again to pass a compromise \$80.6 spending bill, but without restoring additional funds for veterans medical care. It goes on to say that new construction funds will be cut back by the GOP.

But this is where the leadership hopes to get votes, by adding language that raises the hopes of additional medical clinics in the home district of three lawmakers, who it goes on to name.

I think that is wonderful. But what we really need is a bill which is fair and decent and which takes care of the veterans. I would point out to my colleagues that there is not a new nickel in this bill for veterans care. The same abuses with regard to the environment are there, the same improper legislation in an appropriations bill is there.

Remember, the bill last week was overwhelmingly rejected by this body, and the reason was that it did not provide adequate care to American veterans. Better than 1 million veterans will not be getting care and better than 40 facilities will close which are now providing health care to veterans because of this bill and budget. Also better than 5,000 people who are providing health care to American veterans will lose their job at VA under this bill.

The quality of care for American veterans will continue to erode to satisfy my Republican colleagues' desire to balance the budget at the expense of the poor, the unfortunate, and the veterans.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow up on what the gentleman from California said, and that is that the rule should be defeated with regard to this conference report, if only because we have continued to have this battle over authorizing language or riders in the bill.

As you know, on two occasions in this House, we have asked and we have voted to remove the antienvironmental riders that apply to the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA. Yet we still have some of them in the bill. We have the rider that deals with wetlands that essentially guts the EPA's ability to veto a bad wetlands decision. We also have the rider that says that no Superfund sites can be added to the national priority list. And many of the 17 riders that we voted against on the floor of this House twice still exist in the report language of the bill.

If I could just talk about the two provisions that remain in the statute itself, one with regard to the Superfund Program. The Superfund Program is actually cut back in this legislation by about 19 percent. If no new sites can be added, it really cripples, if you will, the efforts to the EPA when they find hazardous material and contaminated hazardous sites. When they reach a certain level that they should be added by the Superfund, all of a sudden they cannot be considered and cleaned up pursuant to the Federal program.

When you talk about wetlands protection, particularly from my home State of New Jersey, this is a very serious problem in areas which are rapidly developing. The EPA has not traditionally exercised its authority on wetlands that much.

□ 1215

They are very discreet, I would say, in exercising their veto over the Army Corps of Engineers' actions. So it makes absolutely no sense to say in this appropriations bill, in this conference report, that EPA's ability to deal with wetlands protection is simply taken away.

Overall, the bill continues this onward thrust to dismantled our ability to protect the environment. The cuts in the EPA are around 20 percent overall. The cuts in enforcement are 25 percent. I have said over and over again, if we cannot enforce good environmental laws, what is the use of even having them. And I am afraid that is what this is all about. There are many people here who simply do not want to see our environmental laws enforced, so they go, in a roundabout way, to make sure they cannot be enforced, to make sure the polluters are able to do their thing, so to speak, by cutting back on enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to go. We should defeated the rule and we should also defeat the conference report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first off, I want to acknowledge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], a good marine, back there.

Mr. Speaker, I tend to get excited and upset when I see political shenanigans going on around here. I was very proud to have served in the U.S. Marine Corps. I was very proud to have been elected to come to this body 18 years ago. I was very proud to have served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 10 years and serve as the ranking Republican on that committee.

I would like to invite all my colleagues to come up to my Saratoga office, where I have a wall half as wide as this room here full of plaques from every major veterans organization in America, national veterans' organizations, talking about how much we have done for the veterans of this Nation.

Then I see this kind of shenanigans on the floor here where somebody comes on the floor and they say we are not providing enough money for veterans. These same people that are saying this, and this is why I get so exasperated, are people that voted against peace through strength day in and day out, year in and year out, when we were trying to bring down the Iron Curtain and stop the spread of international communism around this world. These same people voted against the defense budget day in and day out. They voted against contra aid in Central America when we were trying to stop the spread of communism right here in this hemisphere. They voted against the deployment of intermediate range missiles, which was finally what really brought the Soviet Union to their knees. They voted against aid to El Salvador. They voted against every single defense budget that I can recall, even when we had an effort to try to strengthen the CIA.

All these so-called veterans supporters were voting against all of these things, and yet they have the gall to come on this floor here today and say we are not spending enough money for the veterans.

Upstairs, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Rules, when they made these same kind of ridiculous arguments, we pointed out to them that in this appropriation bill, which provides for the funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Housing and NASA, and a myriad of other agencies and bureaus, we pointed out that almost every one of them were being cut. I think maybe every one of them were being cut except for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. SONNY MONTGOMERY, from the other side of the aisle, the ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, and one of the most standup men I know, he and I and the gentleman from Arizona, BOB STUMP and the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, and others fought to get a level of funding for the medical care delivery system, that part of the budget, up to about \$600 million, over a half billion dollars, and we succeeded. And, oh, how the liberals complained because we were cutting housing and we were cutting the EPA.

We just heard a little of it down here on the floor a minute ago, cutting NASA, cutting all these other sundry agencies. Well, up in the Committee on Rules I made the offer. As my friends know, we lost. We could not maintain that whole \$600 million in additional spending when everything else is being cut and finally had to settle for about \$400 million. But that is almost a half billion dollars more than last year. I said, I will make this offer. Where do we want to take it out of the rest of this budget, because that is where it has to come from? Do we want to take it out of housing? Oh, no, we cannot take it out of housing. Do we want to

take it out of EPA? Oh, no, we cannot take it out of EPA. Do we want to take it out of NASA? Oh, my gosh, no. We had people from Texas there and they would not take it out of NASA.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are today with this phony argument saying that they want to recommit this bill and reinstate and add another \$200 million for veterans. Let me tell my colleagues, that is the most phony argument I have ever heard in my life. And I tell my colleagues, I personally resent it, and I want everybody to come over here and I want them to vote for this rule. Then I want them to vote for this bill, which, in my opinion, gives a fair and adequate increase to the veterans budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman at the microphone is an outstanding marine veteran, but he is not the only veteran in the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely. I just pointed to another good one.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman can point to another one here.

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have our differences on what is wrong. The only thing I am making a point of is that this budget came in with \$200 million less than the House position. Is that not so, Mr. SOLOMON?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me how I could fix that. We were not informed on how those on the other side of the aisle were putting the budget together, when they had all those raw figures. We are closed off of that room. So at one time, after the gentleman brings the budget, he says where would I fix it?

All I am saying is, if the House came in with that figure originally, the veterans need that money today as much as they needed it last week. And when the bill was recommitted, no one looked at that veterans figure to try to make some changes. It is still the same figure as it was when the bill was defeated here last week. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a good point. I worship the ground a former President walked on, and I have not talked to him since last February 6, when we passed the line item veto. That was Ronald Reagan. He taught me something, and it always bothered me, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and that is when we compromise, are we compromising our principles?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we really believe in something, we should not give in. He said, JERRY, in all the years I was President, for 8 years, he said I could not have it all my way. We had to compromise. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say to Mr. MOAKLEY, there is

another body over there, and we have to live with them. We cannot just ignore them.

Now, we have 250 veterans hospitals out there, and all of these outpatient clinics and all of these people. We need to keep those going. The money expires. We have to pass this bill. Somewhere along the line we had to compromise. So if we can get \$400 million more for the veterans medical care delivery system, and it came out of NASA, HUD, and Housing and we cannot get another penny out of there, I think it is time we compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time we voted for this bill because I think it is fair for everybody. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield once again, I would say, no, I think we should stay with the House position on the veterans. It was the veterans who came forward that were responsible in killing this bill, and I do not see any changes that affect them in here. I would be very surprised if a lot of people from your party do not walk in with casts on their arms if they are forced to change their votes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time once again, let me say that I think the people in my party will do what I ask them. I hope the gentleman does not change his mind, because we are just getting the President's new budget.

The President, when he finally got around to giving us a 10-year balanced budget, according to his figures, he was going to cut veterans benefits by \$9 billion within the first 7 years of that 10 and then \$17 billion overall. We just got this new budget he set up this morning, and lo and behold, what does it have in it? Four billion dollars, not \$200 million. Four billion dollars in additional cuts in veterans benefits.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want him to stick with me and fight that with every ounce of strength he has.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has erred on his figures.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading it out of Congress Daily in the Washington Post. Do they make errors?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, my very good friend, who has done such an admirable job in one of the most difficult positions in this Congress, and that is having to appropriate funds for this whole myriad, this big part of this entire budget.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding, and I did not want to intervene in the magnificent discussion between members of the Committee on Rules, but I must say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that your colleague and ranking member on the Committee on Rules is absolutely

wrong when he suggests that we did not make an effort to find this money.

As a matter of fact, when we got our direction from the House, the biggest difficulty with that motion to recommit was the fact the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] chose not to find offsets. It was obvious he was playing a political game in the process.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is what I resent.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Having said that, nonetheless, we went back and took a very, very hard look. The reality is that the only account in this bill that had an increase had to do with VA medical care, some \$400 million. There are significant reductions, actual reductions, in housing and EPA and NASA, in FEMA, and all of them less under the CR, to say the least. As we go forward, those accounts will be affected very significantly.

But to suggest we did not try to find that money, the reality was that we could not go back and get more out of HUD. Maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] wants that, I am not sure. We could not go back and get more out of EPA. Maybe Mr. OBEY wants that, but I am not sure. He did not indicate it. We did try to find the money, and came to the conclusion that the only account that had been increased was VA medical care; and, indeed, it was appropriate for us to have the House recognize that support for our veterans.

It is very, very important that we not distort this process. Some in the House, maybe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], I am not sure, some in the House believed the President was going to veto the defense bill, and from that they would take away some money from defense and give to these social accounts. Now, that did not occur. The President let that bill become law. We did not get a veto.

I never expected it, frankly, but we did not get extra money. Maybe that was their wish list, whereby we would provide more money for every one of these social programs. But, indeed, that did not occur, and because of it, this bill is fairly balanced and should not be distorted further because of the political process that appears to be taking place on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say to the gentleman, we are doing everything we can to cooperate. We voted, many of us the other day, for the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill. There was a lot in there I did not like. It was too much spending. But we have to keep the Government running. We have to keep it going. This is an effort, a compromise to do that.

This is probably the most important part of the entire budget except for the Department of Defense. That is why we need to compromise and pass this bill today.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does the gentleman know of any veteran or veterans organization that is not interested in our Nation reaching a balanced budget? Do not the veterans organizations, at least they have expressed it to me, feel very strongly that our whole economy and their benefits and everybody else's benefits, Social Security, the whole gamut of what the Government provides, depends on our reaching a balanced budget as soon as possible so that the work of the gentleman from California and his committee, and all the other committees, and the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, in trying to contract the Government spending and keeping those benefits flowing in a rational manner all lead to a balanced budget which benefits everyone? Is that not what the veterans want for our country? I ask that rhetorically.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time once again, I would say to the gentleman, yes, everyone does, and so does 69 percent of the rest of the American people.

I am going to ask the gentleman to yield back the balance of the time and I will move the previous question, but I would hope that everyone would come over here. We have the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], we have four more appropriation bills to nail down here in some way and we want to work together.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say I find this debate ironic. This is December 7. A fairly significant military event happened on that day, as all of us know. I think it is ironic that on December 7 we are being asked by our Republican friends on this side of the aisle to adopt an appropriations bill which will reduce funding for veterans medical care by \$213 million below the amount originally provided in the House bill.

□ 1230

Do we want that money restored? You betcha. Do we want more money in this bill in general? You betcha. I make absolutely no apology for that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said that those who brought this motion to the floor, in the gentleman's words, had voted against providing aid to the Contras. You bet I did. It was an illegal war. The gentleman said that we voted against aid to Salvador. Not me. I voted for a significant amount of aid to Salvador.

The gentleman said we voted against the Pershing missile. No, I did not. I supported the Pershing missile. I thought that was the one missile that was necessary to bring the Soviet Union to their senses. I think the gentleman ought to get his facts straight.

Second, let me point out that the President is going to veto this bill. It is

\$900 million below where the President wants it on the Veterans' Administration, and \$1.6 billion below on the Environmental Protection Agency. While my colleagues have very reluctantly eliminated the antienvironmental riders in the bill, they still have included many of those same riders in the statement to the managers, which still puts pressure on the EPA to follow those antienvironment suggestions being made by this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would make the point that this bill, when it comes back from conference, has \$1.5 billion more to use, and yet the account for veterans medical care is reduced by \$213 million. We do not believe that makes sense.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle can talk all they want about there being a nominal increase in the funding for veterans medical care, but the increase provided will not keep up with inflationary cost increases to provide VA medical care. I think the committee understands it.

Mr. Speaker, this reduction will mean that nearly 50,000 veterans will be denied treatment at VA facilities; nearly 20,000 inpatient visits will not occur; nearly 430,000 outpatient visits will not be accommodated; more than 2,700 personnel years in the VA will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that is the kind of present we want to give our veterans on December 7. I would urge, after this rule is disposed of, that we vote for the recommittal motion when it is offered again, to insist that the committee do what this House said they ought to do in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this committee does not have to reduce EPA funding in order to facilitate this request of ours. What they do need to do is go back to the drawing board and get a new budget allocation from the Committee on Appropriations central office so that they do not have to skewer the progress we want to make in veterans health care and in environmental protection.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidentially a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 175, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 842]

YEAS—242

Allard	Galleghy	Myrick
Archer	Ganske	Nethercutt
Armey	Gekas	Neumann
Bachus	Gilchrest	Ney
Baker (CA)	Gillmor	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Gilman	Nussle
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Oxley
Barr	Goodling	Packard
Barrett (NE)	Gordon	Parker
Bartlett	Goss	Paxon
Barton	Graham	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Greenwood	Petri
Bateman	Gunderson	Pombo
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Portman
Billrakis	Hamilton	Pryce
Bliley	Hansen	Quillen
Blute	Hastert	Quinn
Boehlert	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boehner	Hayes	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hayworth	Regula
Bono	Hefley	Riggs
Brewster	Heineman	Roberts
Brownback	Hergert	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hobson	Roth
Bunning	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burr	Hoke	Royce
Burton	Horn	Salmon
Buyer	Hostettler	Sanford
Callahan	Houghton	Sawyer
Calvert	Hunter	Saxton
Camp	Hutchinson	Scarborough
Canady	Hyde	Schaefer
Castle	Inglis	Schiff
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Seastrand
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Jones	Shadegg
Christensen	Kasich	Shaw
Chrysler	Kelly	Shays
Clinger	Kim	Shuster
Coble	King	Skeen
Coburn	Kingston	Skelton
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (MI)
Combust	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Condit	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cooley	LaHood	Smith (WA)
Cox	Largent	Solomon
Crane	Latham	Souder
Crapo	LaTourette	Spence
Cremeans	Laughlin	Stearns
Cubin	Lazio	Stenholm
Cunningham	Leach	Stockman
Davis	Lewis (CA)	Stump
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Talent
DeLay	Lightfoot	Tate
Diaz-Balart	Linder	Tauzin
Dickey	Livingston	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	LoBiondo	Thomas
Dornan	Longley	Thornberry
Dreier	Lucas	Tiahrt
Duncan	Manzullo	Torkildsen
Dunn	Martini	Traficant
Ehlers	McCollum	Upton
Ehrlich	McCrery	Vucanovich
Emerson	McDade	Waldholtz
English	McHugh	Walker
Ensign	McInnis	Walsh
Everett	McIntosh	Wamp
Ewing	McKeon	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	Metcalf	Weldon (PA)
Fields (TX)	Meyers	Weller
Flanagan	Mica	White
Foley	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Forbes	Molinari	Wicker
Fox	Mollohan	Williams
Franks (CT)	Montgomery	Wolf
Franks (NJ)	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Frelinghuysen	Morella	Zeliff
Frisa	Murtha	Zimmer
Funderburk	Myers	

NAYS—175

Abercrombie	Boucher	Conyers
Andrews	Browder	Costello
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Coyne
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Danner
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	DeLauro
Becerra	Clay	Dellums
Beilenson	Clayton	Deutsch
Bentsen	Clement	Dicks
Berman	Clyburn	Dingell
Bishop	Coleman	Dixon
Bonior	Collins (IL)	Doggett
Borski	Collins (MI)	Dooley

Doyle	LaFalce	Rahall
Durbin	Lantos	Rangel
Edwards	Levin	Reed
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Eshoo	Lincoln	Roemer
Evans	Lipinski	Rose
Farr	Lofgren	Roybal-Allard
Fattah	Lowe	Rush
Fazio	Luther	Sabo
Fields (LA)	Maloney	Sanders
Filner	Manton	Schroeder
Flake	Markey	Schumer
Foglietta	Martinez	Scott
Ford	Mascara	Serrano
Frank (MA)	Matsui	Sisisky
Frost	McCarthy	Skaggs
Furse	McDermott	Slaughter
Gedjenson	McHale	Spratt
Gephardt	McKinney	Stark
Geran	McNulty	Stokes
Gibbons	Meehan	Studds
Gonzalez	Meek	Stupak
Green	Menendez	Tanner
Gutierrez	Mfume	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)	Tejeda
Harman	Minge	Thompson
Hastings (FL)	Mink	Thornton
Hefner	Moakley	Thurman
Hilliard	Moran	Torres
Hinche	Nadler	Torricelli
Holden	Neal	Towns
Hoyer	Oberstar	Velazquez
Jackson-Lee	Obey	Vento
Jacobs	Olver	Visclosky
Jefferson	Ortiz	Ward
Johnson (SD)	Orton	Waters
Johnson, E.B.	Owens	Watt (NC)
Johnston	Pallone	Waxman
Kanjorski	Pastor	Wilson
Kaptur	Payne (NJ)	Wise
Kennedy (MA)	Payne (VA)	Woolsey
Kennedy (RI)	Pelosi	Wyden
Kennelly	Peterson (FL)	Wynn
Kildee	Pickett	Yates
Kliczka	Pomeroy	
Klink	Poshard	

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Bevill	Fowler	Tucker
Bryant (TX)	Hancock	Volkmer
Chapman	Istook	Watts (OK)
de la Garza	Rivers	Young (AK)

□ 1253

Mr. SKAGGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 842, I was on the floor and voted my voting card. Evidently an electronic malfunction occurred and my vote was not recorded. If it had been properly recorded, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 291, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans' Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to House Resolution 291, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, December 6, 1995, at page H14112.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and on the Senate amendments reported in disagreement and that I might include tables, charts, and other extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure once again to bring to the House floor the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1996 Appropriations Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs, housing, and other independent agencies. Following Housing passage of the motion to recommit, I anticipated that the conferees would follow the direction of the House and add an additional \$213 million to the VA medical care account.

Unfortunately, when that motion was made, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] chose not to supply necessary offsets so it would be in order to facilitate our effort in responding to the House's direction. So as a result of that lack of direction, Senator BOND and I made a serious effort to locate offsets but soon discovered that removing \$213 million from the other accounts, to say the least, would distort our bill considerably.

As Members can see from this chart, which outlines the major agencies in this account, it is apparent that most of our agencies have been reduced very significantly from the 1995 appropriations year. HUD, for example, is down by \$350 million. NASA down by \$352 million. EPA is down by \$235 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious by this chart that there is only one account, there is only one account within this bill that had an increase. And that increase was some \$400 million for VA medical assistance. It is true that when the bill left the House we had more money in this specific account, but everybody knows that when we deal with the other body, we must make sure that we try to make sense out of the priorities of both bodies. In this case, it is very obvious that the priorities involved making sure that we did not continue with further reduction in programs like important housing programs as well as important programs in EPA.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the House to recognize that the present CR that we are dealing with for EPA, for example, creates major adjustments in terms of money

availability. If we look at the current CR we are working under, EPA is cut by 11.5 percent. For housing programs, for example, they are 12.5 percent below the levels of the current conference report.

□ 1300

This is a far, far greater reduction than the reductions in the VA-HUD bill that is before us today. These remaining eight days provide a window of opportunity for narrowing the differences that divide the Congress and the White House. With every passing day, indeed with every passing hour, this window of opportunity is closing.

If the White House is serious about resolving the differences that remain between the White House and the Congress, the time to act is now. We are suggesting to the administration that they take a hard look at what a CR really means. If we should decide by the action on the floor today not to send this bill forward, not to have an opportunity to change it between now and the time it actually goes to the White House, then indeed it is very likely that all of these programs will operate under a CR that is considerably longer than ever anticipated and a continuing resolution that is even more severe than these numbers we see on the chart before us.

If indeed Members of the House want to give support to important housing programs, if they really care about EPA, if indeed we are interested in seeing that these programs go forward in a way that makes sense, the important thing today is to vote no on the motion to recommit that will be before us shortly and, beyond that, vote aye on final passage in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just 1 week ago I stood before the House in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2089, the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations act. As I stated then, this bill grossly underfunds many critical programs upon which this Nation depends for decent and affordable housing, veterans benefits, a safe and clean environment, science and technological investments.

Earlier this year, the House demonstrated that it shared my position with regard to protecting our environment and adopted the Stokes-Boehlert motion to instruct when the House appointed conferees. Then upon bringing the conference report to the floor for consideration, the House registered further concern about insufficient funding for yet another important program, veterans medical care, and re-committed the bill to conference.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report brought back for consideration shows plain and simple that the leadership does not care that the House wanted this bill changed. The basis of recommitment was to maintain the House posi-

tion for veterans medical care. Nothing in this bill has changed with regard to that instruction.

In fact, it appears that the leadership's interpretation of recommitting a bill based on specific instructions means merely changing votes of Members who voted to recommit the bill. I think that veterans and veterans organizations should watch today to see which Members voted with them just 8 days ago in favor of more money for veterans medical care by recommitting the bill, and now, without any changes in the bill, changed their votes against adding the additional funds barely a week later.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report completely ignores the House instruction. This is total disrespect, disregard, and defiance to this body, after it re-committed this bill with instructions. In flagrant disregard of the House instruction, the conferees decide not to add any more money to VA medical care, and, after changing just a few commas, semicolons, and adding a little language, sent the same bill back here today in total derogation of the House's instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before this is a bad bill. The President has said it is a bad bill. The House said it was a bad bill when it sent it back to conference. Since the conference report has not changed to reflect the House instructions, maybe the House needs to tell the conferees again. The President has given us his position on the bill, and that is the statement that I have received on the statement of administration policy that says this:

The President will veto this bill, if presented to him in its current form. The bill provides insufficient funds to support the important activities covered by this bill. It would threaten public health and the environment, and programs that are helping communities help themselves, close the doors on college for thousands of young people, and leave veterans seeking medical care with fewer treatment options.

The President's statement also says:

In addition, the administration would like to work with the Congress to address the other concerns that were outlined in the conference letter of November 6, 1995.

The President finally says:

Clearly, this bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear. The President urges Congress to send him an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serves the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not serve the American people, and I urge support for the motion to recommit and to vote against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the committee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is the same conference report as before, but a decidedly different budgetary playing field.

Since the last time we were here, President Clinton has signed the Defense bill, which, for the time being, takes off the table the honey pot of money the administration was seeking to redirect toward spending on social programs.

Indeed, the choice before us today seems more clear today than ever before.

Either President Clinton signs this bill, or all of the programs under its jurisdiction will most likely be funded at the levels contained in the last continuing resolution.

This bill is really the last, best chance we have to increase spending on environmental protection; to increase spending on affordable housing; to increase spending on space exploration and scientific research compared to current funding levels.

The numbers are indisputable. Every major program in this conference report gets an increase. NSF up 0.63 percent; FEMA up 1.74 percent; NASA up 1.92 percent; VA medical care up 2.47 percent; EPA up 11.46 percent; and HUD up 12.44 percent.

So I urge my colleagues, think long and hard about that before you vote.

Now Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to address the veterans medical care issue.

There has been a lot of debate about the conference committee's actions following this latest motion to recommit. And I think it is time we start separating the facts from all the political theater.

When the conference report was last brought to the floor, the minority moved that it be sent back to conference to add more money for veterans' medical care.

At the time, I doubt that even the sponsors of the motion to recommit believed that it would prevail.

After all, motions to recommit are procedural votes that are, with few exceptions, largely symbolic in nature.

Certainly, this motion to recommit did not have the same significance as, say the Stokes-Boehlert motion we considered earlier this fall.

But I think that many Members saw this vote as an opportunity to demonstrate their concern for the Nation's veterans. Who knows, maybe some Members voted to recommit the VA-HUD bill just out of habit.

Either way, the motion passed.

But I think it is clear that this was not an organized attempt to put more money into veterans medical care. If it were, the sponsors surely would have offered a package of offsetting spending cuts to fund the increase. They did not.

So the conference committee treated the motion for what it really was—a feel-good vote.

I believe that every Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, shares a genuine concern for those Americans who have sacrificed their health and well-being in defense of our great Nation.

Indeed, in the bill before us today, we have treated veterans medical programs better than any other program under our jurisdiction.

The lesson here is that procedural votes, however politically appealing, have real consequences.

So I urge my colleagues, let us keep the process moving along. Vote for the conference report, and resist any further procedural potshots fired from the sidelines.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra said, "It's deja vu all over again." On December 7, the day on which the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, we are bringing up a bill of special concern and interest to our veterans. This is exactly the same bill that was rejected by the House recently, because it slashed veterans health care some \$400 million below the administration's request, and some \$213 million below the choke-hold level that the House had passed. The same bill is back before us. Let us reject it again, because it is no better bill today than it was last week when we rejected it.

I remember my vote last time, and I know my colleague do. We voted for veterans, for their families, for their children. We told the majority that while we favored a balanced budget, we do not favor a budget that balances on the back of our veterans. We said that with their slashing of Medicare, their trashing of Medicaid, and their bashing of every other item in the social safety net, adequate health services for our Nation's veterans becomes even more vital.

We said then this bill is unacceptable. It is still unacceptable. It has not changed. It will cut funds for construction of two hospitals, including one needed to replace a hospital damaged in the L.A. earthquake of 1991. It will lead to firing of health care workers. It will lead to denial of health care for veterans. It includes the same punitive constructions on the budget of the Administrator and the Secretary of the Veterans Affairs Department.

A vote against this bill will simply inform the Committee on Appropriations conferees, who have disregarded the instruction of this House, that they cannot so lightly do it, and that when the House informs them they are to take care of the veterans, they should do so.

A vote against the bill that arbitrarily cuts 22 percent from EPA's general budget is also a good vote. It makes a total additional 25 percent cut in environmental enforcement. These cuts, totaling over \$1.6 billion, come on top of nearly \$1.3 billion in last year's rescission bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this outrageous behavior by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN]. (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement for a second time. I again thank the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for yielding me this time. He deserves credit for doing a terrific job on a tough but very essential bill.

As I said last week on the House floor during consideration of this conference agreement, we have done the best we could, given our allocation. We have prioritized our Nation's needs. No one ever said it would be simple balancing our Federal budget, but I believe it has been done responsibly.

It is easy for those in the minority to say that we need more money. But the fact is, what we need to do is to live within our means. We have spent our allocation, and there is no more money left.

That is why I was surprised when this conference report was recommitted with instructions to add more money to veterans medical care. This program, unlike the majority of the other programs included in this bill, received nearly a \$400 million increase, an increase of \$400 million.

Yesterday in conference committee the question was asked of the minority, where should the increased funding for veterans medical care come from? No suggestions were given, and the reason no suggestions were given was because they know that in order to govern, to really balance the Federal budget, and to serve people's needs, we all have to make tough choices.

A delicate balance has been reached in this conference agreement, and taking funding from one program and giving it to another would disrupt this essential balance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. We have done our job. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as I did last week, I strongly oppose this mean spirited and draconian HUD-VA appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. Nothing has changed. It was a bad bill then and it is a bad bill today. It still victimizes people who are helpless—they have neither money nor power, which are commodities that seem to get attention these days. And it still slashes one-fifth of the budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

What this conference report still does, make no mistake, is place the burden on cities and States, while the Federal Government takes a walk and abrogates its responsibilities. The Republicans call it devolution; I call it shirking our responsibility in favor of the wealthy at the expense of America's poor and working families.

I still urge a "no" note on this conference report, which merely victimizes further the victims of poverty.

□ 1315

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, under this conference agreement, VA medical care is increased by \$400 million. Increased. A real increase of \$400 million at a time when the word "increase" is becoming a rarity. It comes at a time of declining veteran population and a decline in the utilization of VA hospitals.

In addition, medical research is increased by \$5 million over last year's level, and the minor construction program is increased by \$37 million over last year's level. The VA-HUD appropriations agreement is fair to veterans' programs. In fact, the VA-HUD Act reflects cuts in virtually every agency program or account except VA's medical care account. This increase comes at a time in which the veterans' population will decrease by 2.5 million and the VA hospitals, it might surprise my colleagues to know, on any given day has between 23 percent and 50 percent of all beds in those VA hospitals lying vacant.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the adoption of this agreement, is integral to our balanced budget plan. And what will a balanced budget mean to Arkansas' veterans, my home State? With a balanced Federal budget, according to a recent study, interest rates will drop 2.7 percent. For an Arkansas veteran that means, on the average mortgage, \$1,591 per year that they will save. That is for an Arkansas veteran. On a school loan, on an average 10-year student loan in Arkansas, they will save \$645 when we do this. They will save \$148 per household because of the decreased cost of local and State governments.

A balanced budget is good for veterans and this is a step toward that balanced budget, which we need.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan invests dollars and dignity in veterans' programs. It also makes a commitment to future veterans that America will be anchored on a sound, strong financial basis. This bill is pro veteran. I urge support for it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It is basically the first step of a two-step process which we are going to see within this Congress. The first

step is putting the EPA on a starvation diet. Squeeze down the amount of money they have to clean up Superfund sites. That is what this bill does.

Meanwhile, at the same time, in the Committee on Commerce, there is a Superfund gutting bill which does at least two things, but more. One, it puts a cap of only 125 more sites that can ever be cleaned up under Superfund. Ever. Only 125. There is at least 1,200 or 1,500 more sites in the country, but that is all it will be, 125.

Second, it gives polluter rebates. It is the Ed McMahon polluter's clearing-house sweepstakes. The Superfund bill in the Committee on Commerce says to polluters, congratulations, you may have already won millions of dollars in fabulous cash rebates. All you have to do is wait for Congress to pass that bill that is in Commerce right now, and soon our prize van will be on its way to your corporate headquarters with a rebate check in hand to pay you for cleaning up sites that you willfully or negligently polluted in the past, draining out all remaining money that is in Superfund.

So think of this as the one-two punch. Finishing off Superfund once and for all, drain the revenues here so that we cannot clean up any of the existing sites that are on the list, sorry, and then put a cap on any future sites in the next bill coming down the line.

Mr. Speaker, we must vote no here so that we can have the full debate we need on what the responsibility is of the Government of this country to clean up these neighborhood nightmares across the country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I commend him on handling a bill that I think is very important to the future of our veterans and the future of our Nation's space program and handling the bill extremely well.

This bill fully funds our manned space flight program and the shuttle account at the levels the President asked for. It also includes funding for the construction of a new veterans clinic in my district. The veterans in my district have been asking for a health care facility for 12 years. It is one of the largest areas in the Nation of veterans that does not have a medical health care facility, and we have some funding in this bill to provide them with some good quality outpatient medical care.

Mr. Speaker, as many know, prior to coming here I was a practicing physician, and this will meet about 80 to 90 percent of the health care needs of the veterans in my district. It is a good bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

What I think was disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, was a motion to recommit to add more money to a veterans account and then no attempt to find an offset

for where those funds would be coming from. I had hundreds and hundreds of veterans support me in my campaign last year because they want the budget balanced. They know if we do not balance the budget, there will be no money for health care for veterans, there will be no money for the space program. There will be no money for anything. We will be broke.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful to see people getting up and saying let us put more money into this and then not come up with a place to find the money. We need to get our priorities in order. We need to balance the books. We need to be responsible with the way we handle the people's money. This is the people's money.

I know what would happen if the minority were the majority. They would just borrow the money again. They would add more money to our Nation's debt.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of this committee has crafted a well-thought-out bill that meets the needs for the future of our Nation, for the future of our space program and for the future of our veterans. It is a good bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the bill and vote, yes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a disaster. This conference report hits veterans where it hurts most. It cuts funding for new construction of veterans outpatient medical facilities. Many aged and ill veterans are forced to try to travel miles to get to a VA facility and this would decrease transportation assistance. Many are simply doing without desperately needed health care.

If that is not enough, this bill hurts another vulnerable population, families and children, who simply need a place to live. Decent housing, shelter, a roof over their heads. This bill cuts housing by 21 percent. What an indictment on our values. We wave the flag and proclaim our love for veterans, yet when their backs are turned, we stab them in the back by ignoring their health care needs. And where are our so-called family values? These are real lives, real people, real children, real families we are hurting.

I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report. It does not even deserve the dignity of a debate.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

(Mrs. VUCANOVICH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the veterans throughout our Nation need to know the

truth about this conference report. It is a good piece of legislation that deserves to be passed and signed into law. Why? Because without this legislation veterans will not get the health care they deserve. This bill provides the VA-Medical Care Account with \$400 million more than last year. It is the only account in the entire bill to receive an increase.

What will happen if this bill does not pass or is vetoed by the President? Should we have to fund all the accounts in the bill under a continuing resolution, those levels will not be nearly as high as the levels in this bill. That is true for veterans programs, housing programs, environmental programs, and disaster readiness. That is why it is essential that this bill be passed and signed by the President.

All of these programs are important, and this conference report reflects this fact by providing funding to improve housing for our poor, to eliminate drugs in our neighborhoods, to maintain essential environmental programs, and to provide good health to our veterans.

These are our Nation's priorities and this legislation provides funding for these priorities. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 2099. If you care about the veterans and other citizens in your district, you will know it is the right thing to do.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the committee.

(Mr. NEUMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. The freshman class came here about 10 months ago with a very strong responsibility to get this budget balanced in 7 years or less. When we look at the overall budget picture, we see Medicare spending going up from \$4,800 per person to now over \$7,100 per person in the system. We see Medicaid spending going up at a rate faster than the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to allow these areas of the budget to increase, and at the same time get to a balanced budget over a 7-year period of time, someplace, somewhere the budget has to be brought under control. And much to the credit of our chairman, this is one of the places where the budget was, in fact, brought under control.

Our chairman has hit the number that he was given in order to bring the budget into balance over this 7-year period of time, and, clearly, he is to be commended for doing that. This area of spending in the HUD-VA budget and budget authority is down over \$9 billion from last year. This is truly a credit to the chairman of this committee and to all the people that have been actively involved in bringing this in line.

The American people have said it is time to get this budget balanced. Clearly, this bill we have on the table today is an important and significant step in the right direction.

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

SHIRLEY VOLKMER, WIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD VOLKMER, PASSES AWAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this unanimous consent to speak out of order for a moment to inform the House that Shirley Volkmer, the wife of our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, HAROLD VOLKMER, passed away this morning in Arlington Hospital.

I would like to notify the Members that visitation will be held tomorrow, Friday, December 8, from 6 p.m. until 8 p.m. at the Murphy Funeral Home located at 4510 Wilson Boulevard in Arlington, VA. Visitation will be held from 2 p.m. until 5 p.m. Sunday, December 10, at the O'Donnell Funeral Home in Hannibal, MO.

Services for Shirley Volkmer are scheduled for 10 a.m. Monday, December 11, at the Holy Family Catholic Church in Hannibal, MO.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today my Republican colleagues have a choice, a very clear choice. I believe they must choose between their commitment to veterans health care versus towing the party line.

Last week, 25 House Republicans showed independence and courage in saying no to their party and no to \$213 million in conference cuts to veterans health care. These 25 Republicans should be saluted for putting veterans above partisanship. Sadly, rather than saluting them, the House Republican leadership scolded them for supporting veterans.

Let me quote for my colleagues one House leader from today's Wall Street Journal. Referring to the 25 Republicans, the leader said this, and I quote, "I was madder than hell. They had forgotten the big picture and they were doing things on their own individual initiatives."

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for this House when Republicans are criticized by their own leadership for showing their own individual initiatives to support veterans. The Journal article went on to say this: "The loss infuriated the leadership, which wants to show its political muscle and reverse the outcome without making high profile concessions on spending."

Mr. Speaker, when did showing political muscle become more important than helping veterans? I would suggest that showing political courage is far more important than showing political muscle.

I urge my 25 Republican colleagues, who cast a tough vote, a courageous vote in favor of veterans last week, to do so again today. How can anyone explain to veterans why in 1 week they switched their vote on \$213 million in veterans health care? More important, by putting veterans above partisanship, we can ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the quality health care they so deeply deserve.

I urge my 25 Republican colleagues to vote today for the same motion to recommit that they voted for just a week ago. Our veterans have stood up for us. Now, on Pearl Harbor Day, it is time for us to stand up for them.

□ 1330

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Taking just a moment, I was kind of curious about the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. I presume, since the gentleman knows full well that his party is not willing to take additional funding out of HUD or out of EPA, I suppose the gentleman would want to take it out of NASA. We can take more out of NASA, if the gentleman would like, and put it back into veterans programs, but I am not sure that his district or his State would understand or appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, may we have some understanding as to how much time each side has left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, what this legislation is about speaks to the priorities of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the Republican leadership, and those priorities are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of Americans are finding it increasingly difficult to locate affordable housing, should we be making major cuts in our housing programs which will result in higher rents for the working poor and increased homelessness? The answer is no.

At a time when people from one end of this country to the other are worried about the impact of pollution and pesticides in our air, our water, and in our food, should we be making devastating cuts in environmental protection? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of our veterans, the people who put their lives on the line to defend this country, are today unable to receive the health care and the other benefits which they have been promised, should we be laying the groundwork in this legislation for a 7-year budget which makes devastating cuts to our veterans programs? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, this country must move forward toward a balanced budget, but we should not do it on the backs of our veterans, the elderly, the children, the middle class, and the poor.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise really to speak in response to some of

the things we have heard here, because listening, it is almost like some of our veterans across the country might think we do not care about them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that our veterans know and understand that under the bill we are about to pass, spending on veterans benefits is being increased by \$400 million. It is the only category, as we looked at this whole thing, where we did in fact do increases. Only in Washington do we call a \$400 million increase for our veterans a cut.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is very important that we reassure the veterans in this Congress, and the veterans across this country, that veterans benefits are not being cut. Veterans benefits under this bill are going up by \$400 million.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This bill wildly misses the mark. It misses the mark on fairness, because it misplaces our values and it is about misguided priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter for the balanced budget and have voted for a coalition budget that balances the budget in a fair manner by the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill will cut housing by 22 percent, it will not restore \$213 million in badly needed veterans benefits, and it misplaces our priorities in science, where it rewards a space station that is \$80 billion over budget and threatens our science in programs like the Galileo project that will hopefully be tremendously successful today in helping us discover what takes place on Jupiter.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to defeat this misguided, misplaced bill and to continue to work on efforts such as the coalition budget to balance this budget in a fair manner.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments in this debate about priorities. This bill is doing everything it can with the limited resources we have to prioritize those tax dollars to the people who need the money the most.

Mr. Speaker, it deals with housing in a way that holds people very accountable for the condition of those houses, but ensures that people who need to live in public housing, who need a lift up, will get that.

So, public housing is not cut, nor is it going to send anybody out into the streets. The money is spent to ensure that people who need to live in those houses have a decent place to live and ensures the accountability of those people who are on the boards of directors of public housing in the various communities.

Mr. Speaker, as far as veterans benefits are concerned, I will say two things. First, it is an increase of \$400 million. That is an actual increase. I am a veteran of Vietnam, wounded. I spent time in the system. As a former Marine Corps, wounded Vietnam veteran, and the list goes on and on, and there are a lot of Americans out there that are in that category, I have been through the system.

Mr. Speaker, I have been through naval hospitals. I have been through veterans hospitals. I continue to visit them as a Member of Congress and also as a wounded veteran who occasionally will need their services. This bill makes sure, and we are held accountable, this bill makes sure that veterans receive the benefits that they deserve.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking minority member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, we are being asked to pass a bill which reduces veterans funding by \$900 million, and which cuts environmental protection funding by \$1.6 billion below the amount requested by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to do that on any day. I certainly do not think we ought to do that on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor. That is not the message I want to send to veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that on the environmental side, while the committee has removed, after the House voted to instruct them to do so, while the committee has removed the 17 antienvironment riders, the polluter's dream list, from the bill, they have, nonetheless, retained some of those same provisions in the statement of the managers, which still puts pressure on EPA to follow those misguided suggestions. I do not think we ought to do that on December 7, or any time.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a number of charts displayed by our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle. I would simply make two points. If those charts compared agency-to-agency funding from one year to another, they would show that total VA funding is \$43 million below last year, and \$915 million below the President.

In a very simplified chart, if this line across the page is represented by the President's budget, veterans are cut by \$915 million. Or if I can use a comparative chart, the bill which came back from conference had \$1.5 billion more than what was contained in the House bill, represented by this baseline. But, in fact, veterans got \$213 million less in funding, even though the bill was expanded by a billion and a half dollars. Now, that hardly sounds to me like veterans are being given high priority.

Mr. Speaker, we are being told on the Republican side of the aisle by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], that, after all, we have a 2-percent increase in here for veterans. There is a nominal increase for

veterans health care, but the fact is the inflation rate in health care is 10 percent a year.

Mr. Speaker, when we provide only a 2 percent adjustment, that means in real purchasing power there is a significant decline in what we are going to be able to provide for veterans. That is why 50,000 veterans will be denied treatment at VA facilities; nearly 20,000 inpatient visits will not occur; 430,000 outpatient visits will not be accommodated; and, 2,700 personnel-years will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, we are also told, "Gee whiz, you folks did not prepare any offsets." There are a number of offsets that the committee could provide. They know where they can find them. But let me suggest that we did ask the Committee on Appropriations to provide a different outcome, because we offered a motion in full committee where the allocations are made between the 13 various subcommittees. We offered a change in allocation from that adopted by the Republican majority which would have provided significant additional assets in this bill. I believe the number was around \$200 million additional in outlays.

Mr. Speaker, In my view, if we want to correct the problem, we ought to go back and provide a different 602 allocation. That is what we ought to do. What my Republican colleagues have done is to short-sheet this bill in order to enable the country to buy twice as many B-2 bombers as the Pentagon wants, and in order to enable the country to go down the road in spending \$70 billion on an aircraft that we do not need for another 15 years in the case of the F-22.

In order to finance those additional funding requests that the Republican majority has, we are being told we ought to cut education, squeeze veterans, squeeze health care, squeeze environmental protection. I do not think that is what this Congress ought to be all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, in closing, that in addition to the problem which we have in veterans, which can be corrected by the motion to recommend, we need to have a substantial increase in environmental funding, and this bill simply does not provide it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], my classmate and colleague.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office and I saw all these words flying back and forth, and I was reminded of an adage we have back in Wisconsin that actions speak louder than words. I was reminded that yesterday President Clinton vetoed the balanced budget bill. But to do it, he flew a pen from Texas, from the LBJ Library, up here to Capitol Hill, to Washington, to the White House, to veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if he is so interested in veterans on this historic day of Decem-

ber 7, I would have given President Clinton this pen and he could have vetoed the bill, and he could have saved all of that money and could have given it to the veterans.

□ 1345

We have got too much symbolism here. It is about time for some intellectual integrity. Our friends on the other side are throwing all this barnyard stuff over here. Let us do something for the veterans on December 7. Let us do something for the children of this country. Let us do something for the United States of America for which all those veterans fought, and let us have a balanced budget for the first time in 26 years and really do something for this country, rather than all this symbolism.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, let us, if we might, try to set the record straight on a couple of aspects of this bill that are pretty much irrefutable. This bill eliminates national service as we know it in this country, never to occur again. It eliminates community development financial institutions. It decimates the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to do what it has set out to do, whether it is Superfund cleanup or rewarding polluters, as this bill does, it is bad news for the EPA, for the environment and for Americans no matter where they may be. And it goes so far, it cuts the EPA by 20 percent.

Some critics are upset because some of us have raised the question about veterans and are arguing, well, veterans are concerned about a balanced budget. Every veteran I know is, but they are also concerned about knowing that they will have someplace safe to take care of them in their old age. We were not worried about offsets when we were sending them into World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. We should not be worried now except to say that we have an obligation to veterans that goes beyond just maintaining the funding.

We cut 60 percent in construction facilities alone and that adversely affects veterans no matter who they are or where they are. Finally the bill reduces funding for housing by 20 percent. It takes all of the things that many of us have worked for on both sides of the aisle under the name of a balanced budget and eliminates them by saying, this is what we have to do.

Conscience tells me what we have to do is to reorder priorities. In doing that, we will find other ways to take care of the balanced budget, but not by decimating the EPA, by doing away with housing throughout this country and housing programs, and by severely hurting veterans who all across this Nation are looking for decent, adequate veterans care and a right to believe that this country and this Congress on December 7, Pearl Harbor day, have their best interests in mind. It is

a bad bill. In fact, it is a disaster. I would urge its defeat.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a slap in the face to Florida's veterans. The President requested \$154 million for the Brevard County Hospital which would serve Florida's veterans in and around my district. But the Republicans in Congress took away that money. That hospital so desperately needed by veterans will not be built.

Where do sick veterans in Florida go for hospital care? For the last few years, hundreds of Florida veterans who have developed psychological problems are shipped out of State. That's right. They get shipped off to Mississippi and Alabama for their care. Two beautiful States, indeed, but far away from their loved ones in Florida. I think this is wrong. To me, there is nothing more compelling than the need to care for veterans who suffer the effects of fighting our wars. That's why Florida needs the Brevard County Hospital.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the VA-HUD appropriations bill. President Clinton has announced his intention to veto this bill because it funds veterans programs at \$900 million less than what he requested in his budget.

Right now, nearly 2-million veterans live in Florida, nearly 60,000 in my district alone. More veterans live in Florida than in any other State except one. And 100 veterans move to Florida every day. These men and women are growing older and need medical care.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a slap in the face to Florida's veterans. The President requested \$154 million for the Brevard County Hospital which would serve Florida's veterans in and around my district. But the Republicans in Congress took away that money. That hospital so desperately needed by veterans will not be built.

Where do sick veterans in Florida go for hospital care? For the last few years, hundreds of Florida veterans who have developed psychological problems are shipped out of State. That's right. They get shipped off to Mississippi and Alabama for their care. Two beautiful States, indeed, but far away from their loved ones in Florida. I think this is wrong. To me, there is nothing more compelling than the need to care for veterans who suffer the effects of fighting our wars. That's why Florida needs the Brevard County Hospital.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, with this bill, almost all renovation and construction of veteran's health facilities will terminate. A funding freeze would lead to a sharp reduction in the number of employees who counsel veterans and decide claims for benefits. The VA's award-winning medical and prosthetic research program would be cut in every year under the freeze.

Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget is a top priority. And I am committed to doing just that. The President is also committed to a balanced budget. But in balancing the budget, a shared

sacrifice is necessary. And I share the President's view that we must not balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's most fragile citizens—seniors, veterans, poor women, children, and the disabled.

Our Nation's veterans earned their benefits through service and sacrifice. It should be America's highest priority to honor our commitment with our veterans. I believe it is wrong to abandon our veterans who have gone in harm's way to serve our country. We need to take care of our U.S. service men and women—when they are fighting our wars, and when, as veterans, they need health care. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my position on H.R. 2099 has been consistent from the beginning. It simply does not have a sufficient enough allocation to address all the vital programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. It is irresponsible to even consider sacrificing one critical program over another solely because the Republican leadership does not want to provide additional money for this bill overall.

There was an opportunity for us to do this, just 2 days ago, when the House full Committee on Appropriations met and increased the 602(b) allocation for other appropriations bills. However, the VA-HUD allocation was not considered as a part of these discussions. We are not even talking about making up the \$9 billion difference between the President's budget request and this conference report.

The President in good faith tried to negotiate a package that would have added an additional \$2 billion for VA HUD as well as support the remaining appropriations bills at a level that would retain some very important domestic programs. I think it is important for me, before closing, to say that I have just received, while here on the floor, a statement of administration policy. It is dated December 7, 1995. In the statement of administration policy we are told that the President will veto this bill if it is presented to him in the current form.

This is after the administration has been advised of the action taken by the conferees yesterday in conference. I will not read other parts of the bill, of the statement except to say this: The President said, the bill provides less than the President requested for veterans medical care. The bill also includes significant restrictions on funding for the Secretary that appear targeted at impeding him from carrying out his duties as an advocate for veterans throughout the country. Finally, the bill does not provide necessary funding for VA hospital construction.

The President ends the statement by saying: Clearly, this bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear. The administration would like to work with the Congress to address the issues discussed above as well as the other concerns that were outlined in the conferees letter of November 6, 1995. The President urges Congress to

send him an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serves the American people.

Obviously, this bill does not serve the American people.

Lastly, I would just make reference to a letter I received, dated December 7, 1995, from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. The Secretary says in his letter to me: "Dear Congressman STOKES, I was greatly pleased to see that the House voted yesterday"—this is referring back to the previous vote—"to recommit the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD Independent Agencies Appropriations Act back to the conferees with instructions to provide an additional \$213 million for VA medical care."

It goes on further to say: "It is my great hope that the conferees will be able to agree on a figure that represents the sense of the House as evidenced by yesterday's vote."

Secretary Brown then says: "It is also my hope that the conferees will be able to address the issues of the punitive cuts in my office and three VA staff offices. These cuts were a reaction against what I consider were my honest efforts to be sure that the veterans community and the public were aware of the facts in the budget debate. I understand the conferees reacting against my outspoken advocacy for VA medical funding. But their action will result in adverse personnel actions through either furloughs or layoffs for many dedicated career civil servants who are performing essential services."

We have a chance today to try and give the conferees one additional chance to clean up this bad bill.

I think the House has spoken once before. This is a golden opportunity for us to once again tell the conferees of the House and Senate that this bill is intolerable, that the President is going to veto it. Congress has the first opportunity and the first responsibility to act before the President has to take the serious action that he has indicated. I urge Members to support the motion to recommit and vote against this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from Secretary Brown to which I referred.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, November 30, 1995.

Hon. LOUIS STOKES,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STOKES: I was greatly pleased to see that the House voted yesterday to recommit the FY 1996 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act back to the conferees with instructions to provide an additional \$213 million for VA Medical Care. Your leadership in opposing the conference report was instrumental in the successful motion to recommit. I applaud your outstanding efforts.

You and I have talked often about the necessity for providing adequate funding to take care of the medical needs of our sick and disabled veterans. It is my great hope that the conferees will be able to agree on a figure that represents the sense of the House, as evidenced by yesterday's vote.

It is also my hope that the conferees will be able to address the issue of the punitive cuts in my office and three VA staff offices. These cuts were a reaction against what I consider were my honest efforts to be sure that the veterans community and the public were aware of the facts in the budget debate. I understand the conferees reacting against my outspoken advocacy for VA medical funding, but their action will result in adverse personnel actions, through either furloughs or layoffs, for many dedicated career civil servants who are performing essential services.

Once again, I want to thank you for your outstanding leadership and your dedication to our Nation's veterans.

Sincerely,

JESSE BROWN.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I first want to say too, that we very much appreciate our colleagues' patience with this process. It is not usual that we go back at a bill more than one time, and in this circumstance to have a bill recommitted by the House for a specific purpose is not the normal process. Because of that, we are taking up a good deal more of the House's time than would be normal.

I think it is important for the Members to know exactly what the circumstances were at the time of that recommittal motion. At that point in time, there is little doubt that there were those on the other side of the aisle, some on this side of the aisle, who thought the President did plan to veto the defense bill. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], has referred to his own belief that there were several billions of dollars in the defense bill that the President had not sought and, therefore, he might very well veto it.

The motion to recommit in part was in hopes with that veto that they would get more money for this bill and there could be additional dollars put back in the veterans programs. The fact is that that veto did not take place. So we are dealing with a specific and limited number of dollars within this bill.

Just as important, I think it is critical for all of us to understand that we are on a pathway to attempting to balance our budget over a 7-year period. Between this year and the year 2002, we hope to get to a balanced budget. If we are to do that, we must recognize that there are only a few bills around that have sizable numbers of discretionary dollars.

This bill makes the single greatest contribution of all of our appropriations bills toward balancing that budget, a savings from the President's request of some \$9.2 billion. Between now and the time this bill gets to the President's desk, he can still come forward and participate in a serious way in this process, if indeed he has some other adjustments or priorities that he would make.

Please, have the President and his people come and talk to us. He has yet

to suggest any change that would make this bill more satisfactory from his point of view. Between now and the time the Senate finishes its work, there is a narrow window of opportunity for him to do that. Otherwise, the President is playing politics with this bill rather than seriously seeking partnership by way of working with the legislative branch.

I want to tell my colleagues that there has only been one major disappointment this year in this process. My disappointment lies with the difference I see between the way the majority and the minority worked with each other in the House versus the other body. I was most impressed by the fact that the other body found itself in the same situation we are in, limited numbers of dollars because we are in a new reality.

We are attempting to reduce the rate of growth in spending and eventually balance the budget. Recognizing that in the other body, the Democrats and Republicans alike worked together in a very positive way within limited circumstances to try to accomplish a bill that met most of their needs. In the House, I am disappointed to say, we have not had that experience. I must say that one of my best friends on the other side of the aisle is my colleague and my ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. I say to my colleague that it is a great disappointment to me that we have not been able to work together in a positive way in this new atmosphere.

I do understand his and his colleagues' great disappointment with the fact that we are not in a situation where Congress is going to continue to just take last year's spending, increased by inflation, and then add on more. That has been the pattern for the 15 years I have served on the subcommittee. But indeed, in that new environment, I would have hoped we could have worked together in a positive way instead.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my distinguished chairman and my friend that I share with him the concerns that he has expressed in terms of the manner in which the process in the House has not been the same as it was in the past. As the gentleman knows, when I chaired the same subcommittee which he now chairs, I attempted at all times to involve the gentleman in the process and did so in a way where he was never caught in the dark as I have been caught in terms of this particular bill. I have not been included in the same way I included the gentleman. I just want to say to the gentleman I hope that he could have handled the matter a little differently.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I really did not intend to discuss this on the floor, but the reality is that this year we have given the gentleman information ahead of time in printed form. We have in-

formed him well ahead of time. In the past this Member had these issues discussed the night before the bill went forward with no material to take home, no material to discuss. Indeed, we believe we have been radically more open than it was in the past.

If I could continue with my comments, I am not sure, I must say, while I have expressed my disappointment, and I hope that my colleague and I will discuss this further in private, I do not know where my colleague would take the additional funds that he suggests that he would like to give back to the veterans by way of this recommittal motion.

□ 1400

I cannot believe that he is not appreciative of the reality that veterans' programs are increased in this bill. It is the only account that has an increase in this bill. Above and beyond that, every one of these other programs has been reduced. I do not think my colleague would want to take more money out of HUD. I cannot believe my colleague would be interested in taking more money out of EPA. I really do not believe my colleague wants to close down NASA.

The reality is that this is a balanced bill, as balanced as it can be within the constraints of the limitations of this new age.

Let me say that it is also important for the Members to know that I have not heard from one veterans' group that has not been satisfied with this bill. Indeed most recognized the reality, that they have an increase in this bill while no other agency has an increase.

Further, I think it is important for our colleagues to know that should we decide in this body not to go forward with this legislation, then we are left with the continuing resolution and we are likely to have a continuing resolution for a very extended period. Under those circumstances every one of these accounts would be spending out at considerably less, perhaps as much as 25 percent less, than they would under this piece of legislation.

This is a very, very difficult bill. It is complex obviously, but, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that this is the first serious effort to take a gigantic step in the direction of balancing our budget, the largest single contribution towards balancing the budget and moving down that pathway toward 2001. This is a good bill. It recognizes our constraints, and at the same time it recognizes our critical responsibilities to the people who are served by the programs that come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, and, Mr. Speaker, with that I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues in the final analysis to vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I submit the following material for the RECORD.

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions.....	17,828,862,000	17,849,972,000	17,849,972,000	17,849,972,000	17,849,972,000	+23,080,000
Readjustment benefits	1,288,600,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	+58,700,000
Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training				8,880,000		
Subtotal	1,288,600,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,382,180,000	1,345,300,000	+58,700,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	24,780,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	+130,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite)	507,095,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	-2,973,000
Negative subsidy for guaranteed loans		-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000
Administrative expenses	65,228,000	78,085,000	65,228,000	65,228,000	65,228,000	
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite)	43,939,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	-20,989,000
Administrative expenses	59,371,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	-7,233,000
(By transfer)					(6,000,000)	(+6,000,000)
Direct loan program account (indefinite)	25,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	+3,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,000,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-700,000)
Administrative expenses	1,020,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	-561,000
(Loan level)	(97,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(+2,000)
Education loan fund program account.....	1,081	1,083	1,000	1,000	1,000	-81
(Limitation on direct loans)	(4,034)	(4,120)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(-34)
Administrative expenses	195,000	203,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	54,000	58,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,984,000)	(2,022,000)	(1,984,000)	(1,984,000)	(1,984,000)	
Administrative expenses	767,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	-390,000
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account.....	218,000	455,000	205,000	205,000	205,000	-13,000
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	19,818,183,081	19,493,538,083	19,480,417,000	19,487,297,000	19,480,417,000	-135,746,081
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care	16,214,684,000	16,961,487,000	16,777,474,000	16,450,000,000	16,564,000,000	+349,316,000
(Transfer out)				(-5,700,000)	(-4,500,000)	(-4,500,000)
Legislative offsets			-170,000,000	-170,000,000		
Total	16,214,684,000	16,961,487,000	16,607,474,000	16,280,000,000	16,564,000,000	+349,316,000
Medical and prosthetic research.....	251,743,000	257,000,000	251,743,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	+5,257,000
Health professional scholarship program.....	10,388,000	10,388,000	10,388,000			-10,388,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	89,799,000	72,282,000	83,802,000	83,802,000	83,802,000	-6,187,000
(By transfer)				(5,700,000)	(4,500,000)	(+4,500,000)
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	500,000					-500,000
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(54,000)	(58,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	
General post fund (transfer out)	(-61,000)	(-63,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	
Total, Veterans Health Administration.....	16,547,102,000	17,301,135,000	16,933,205,000	16,800,802,000	16,884,802,000	+337,500,000
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses.....	890,183,000	915,643,000	821,487,000	872,000,000	848,143,000	-42,050,000
Offsetting receipts			(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(+32,000,000)
(Transfer out)					(-6,000,000)	(-6,000,000)
Total, Program Level	(890,183,000)	(915,643,000)	(853,487,000)	(904,000,000)	(874,143,000)	(-18,050,000)
National Cemetery System	72,804,000	75,308,000	72,804,000	72,804,000	72,804,000	
Office of Inspector General	31,815,000	33,500,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	-915,000
Construction, major projects.....	354,284,000	513,755,000	183,455,000	35,785,000	138,155,000	-218,139,000
(Transfer out)			(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)
Construction, minor projects.....	152,834,000	229,145,000	152,834,000	180,000,000	180,000,000	+37,066,000
Parking revolving fund.....	16,300,000					-16,300,000
(By transfer)			(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(+7,000,000)
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities	47,397,000	43,740,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries	5,378,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-4,378,000
Total, Departmental Administration	1,570,915,000	1,812,091,000	1,309,777,000	1,249,886,000	1,326,196,000	-244,718,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....	37,734,180,081	38,608,762,083	37,723,399,000	37,337,585,000	37,691,218,000	-42,962,081
(By transfer)	(61,000)	(83,000)	(7,061,000)	(12,781,000)	(17,561,000)	(+17,500,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3,135,034)	(2,498,120)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(-698,034)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory	(19,489,311,000)	(19,381,762,000)	(19,381,762,000)	(19,381,762,000)	(19,381,762,000)	(-127,549,000)
Discretionary	(18,244,869,081)	(19,245,000,083)	(18,381,637,000)	(17,975,823,000)	(18,329,456,000)	(+84,588,939)

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Selected Housing Programs						
Housing certificates for families and individuals performance funds.....		6,509,955,000				
Public and Indian housing capital performance funds.....		4,884,000,000				
Annual contributions for assisted housing.....	11,083,000,000		10,182,359,000	6,994,358,000	10,155,795,000	-927,205,000
Prepayment authority.....					4,000,000	+4,000,000
Transfer from UDAG.....	(100,000,000)					(-100,000,000)
Severely distressed public housing.....	500,000,000			500,000,000	280,000,000	-220,000,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts.....	2,536,000,000			4,380,882,000		-2,536,000,000
Flexible subsidy fund.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS.....		186,000,000				
Congregate services.....	25,000,000					-25,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Recession of budget authority, indefinite.....	-36,000,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	+2,881,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Recession of prepayment recaptures.....	-66,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-97,000,000
Homeownership assistance.....	6,875,000					-6,875,000
Recession of budget authority, indefinite.....	-184,000,000					+184,000,000
Public and Indian housing operation performance funds.....		3,220,000,000				
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects.....	2,900,000,000		2,500,000,000	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	-100,000,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing.....	280,000,000			280,000,000	280,000,000	
Affordable housing performance funds.....		3,338,000,000				
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,400,000,000		1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants).....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
National homeownership trust demonstration program.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Youthbuild program.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing counseling assistance.....	50,000,000		12,000,000			-50,000,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	
(Limitation on guarantee loans).....	(22,368,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(+14,512,000)
Violent crime reduction program.....		3,000,000				
Total, Selected housing programs (net).....	18,705,875,000	17,946,836,000	13,896,240,000	14,740,101,000	14,734,676,000	-3,971,199,000
Homeless Assistance						
Homeless assistance fund.....		1,120,000,000				
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,120,000,000		676,000,000	780,000,000	823,000,000	-267,000,000
Community Planning and Development						
Community opportunity fund.....		4,850,000,000				
Community opportunity performance program account.....		21,000,000				
Administrative expenses.....		900,000				
Community development grants.....	4,800,000,000		4,800,000,000	4,800,000,000	4,800,000,000	
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(2,054,000,000)		(1,000,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(-554,000,000)
Credit subsidy.....			10,500,000	15,750,000	31,750,000	+31,750,000
Administrative expenses.....			225,000	675,000	675,000	+675,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology.....	42,000,000	42,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	-8,000,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities.....	33,375,000	45,000,000	30,000,000		30,000,000	-3,375,000
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	451,219,000	479,479,000	437,194,000	436,219,000	420,000,000	-31,219,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(485,355,000)	(527,782,000)	(505,745,000)	(532,782,000)	(532,782,000)	(+37,427,000)
(By transfer, GNMA).....	(8,824,000)	(9,101,000)	(8,824,000)	(9,101,000)	(9,101,000)	(+277,000)
(By transfer, Community Planning and Development).....		(900,000)	(225,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(+675,000)
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(935,368,000)	(1,017,262,000)	(931,988,000)	(980,777,000)	(982,558,000)	(+7,180,000)
Office of Inspector General.....	36,427,000	36,968,000	36,427,000	36,968,000	36,567,000	+140,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(10,961,000)	(11,263,000)	(10,961,000)	(11,263,000)	(11,263,000)	(+322,000)
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	(47,388,000)	(48,251,000)	(47,388,000)	(48,261,000)	(47,850,000)	(+482,000)
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight.....	15,451,000	14,895,000	14,895,000		14,895,000	-556,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-15,451,000	-14,895,000	-14,895,000		-14,895,000	+556,000

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Housing Administration						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(100,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(+10,000,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(180,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	308,848,000	341,598,000	308,848,000	341,598,000	341,598,000	+32,749,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-308,848,000	-341,598,000	-308,848,000	-341,598,000	-341,598,000	-32,749,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(20,885,072,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(18,000,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(-3,485,072,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(220,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	187,470,000	187,470,000	187,470,000	202,470,000	202,470,000	+5,000,000
Program costs.....	188,398,000	188,398,000	88,820,000	108,880,000	88,000,000	-103,398,000
Subsidy - multifamily.....	-134,098,000	-37,998,000	-37,998,000	-37,998,000	-37,998,000	+96,100,000
Subsidy - single family.....	-81,873,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	+54,829,000
Subsidy - Title I.....	-24,480,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	+803,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	148,638,000	287,048,000	178,273,000	218,883,000	198,683,000	+53,017,000
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(142,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(-32,000,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	8,824,000	9,101,000	8,824,000	9,101,000	9,101,000	+277,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-282,700,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-245,800,000
Administrative Provisions						
Procurement savings.....	-3,538,000	+3,538,000
FHA mortgage insurance limits.....	-3,000,000	+3,000,000
GNMA REMICs.....	-180,000,000	+180,000,000
GNMA REMICs II.....	-30,800,000	+30,800,000
1-year extension of HECM's demonstration.....	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
FHA Assignment Reform.....	-1,078,000,000	-1,078,000,000
Non-judicial foreclosure.....	-10,000,000	+10,000,000
Multi-family property disposition - FHA fund.....	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Sec. 213 - demonstration.....	30,000,000	+30,000,000
Sec. 224 - FHA fund.....	34,000,000	34,000,000	+34,000,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net).....	24,853,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,381,383,000	20,323,187,000	19,348,122,000	-5,305,366,000
Appropriations.....	(24,841,518,000)	(24,538,151,000)	(19,589,302,000)	(20,521,286,000)	(19,548,241,000)	(-5,395,277,000)
Rescissions.....	(-288,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+89,881,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(284,939,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(238,000,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(-28,039,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(515,140,000)	(548,988,000)	(525,755,000)	(583,841,000)	(583,841,000)	(+38,701,000)
Consisting of:						
Advance appropriation available.....	800,000,000	-800,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill.....	24,853,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,381,383,000	20,323,187,000	19,348,122,000	-5,305,366,000
Total, title II.....	25,463,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,381,383,000	20,323,187,000	19,348,122,000	-6,105,366,000
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	20,285,000	20,285,000	20,285,000	20,285,000	20,285,000
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses.....	500,000	-500,000
Community Development Financial Institutions						
Community development financial institutions fund program account:						
Loan subsidy.....	125,000,000	123,850,000	-125,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	20,000,000
.....	350,000
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	42,508,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-2,508,000
Corporation for National and Community Service						
National and community service programs operating expenses.....	575,000,000	817,478,000	8,000,000	15,000,000	-580,000,000
Additional termination costs for national service.....	8,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	-2,000,000
Total.....	577,000,000	819,478,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-582,000,000
Court of Veterans Appeals						
Salaries and expenses.....	9,429,000	9,820,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-429,000

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses	12,017,000	14,134,000	11,298,000	11,946,000	11,946,000	-71,000
Environmental Protection Agency						
Research and development	350,000,000	426,661,000	364,082,000	-350,000,000
Science and Technology	500,000,000	525,000,000	+525,000,000
Environmental programs and compliance	1,881,614,000
Abatement, control, and compliance	1,417,000,000	1,746,823,000	-1,417,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(296,722,500)	(-296,722,500)
Program and research operations	922,000,000	1,017,296,000	-922,000,000
Program Administration and Management	1,670,000,000	1,550,300,000	+1,550,300,000
Office of Inspector General	26,542,000	33,050,000	26,542,000	27,700,000	26,500,000	-42,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	15,384,000	14,078,000	5,000,000	11,700,000	11,000,000	-4,384,000
Transfer from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	669,000	710,000	426,000	600,000	500,000	-169,000
Subtotal, OIG	44,595,000	47,838,000	33,968,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-4,565,000
Buildings and facilities	43,670,000	112,620,000	26,620,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+16,130,000
Hazardous substance superfund	1,435,000,000	1,507,937,000	1,003,400,000	1,003,400,000	1,163,400,000	-271,600,000
Legislative proposals - reforms	55,000,000
Transfer to OIG	-15,384,000	-14,078,000	-5,000,000	-11,700,000	-11,000,000	+4,384,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(306,000,000)	(-306,000,000)
Subtotal, Hazardous substance superfund	1,419,616,000	1,548,859,000	996,400,000	991,700,000	1,152,400,000	-267,216,000
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund	70,000,000	77,273,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	-24,173,000
Transfer to OIG	-669,000	-710,000	-426,000	-600,000	-500,000	+169,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,150,000)	(5,265,000)	(6,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(-1,150,000)
Subtotal, LUST	69,331,000	76,563,000	45,401,000	45,227,000	45,327,000	-24,004,000
Oil spill response	20,000,000	23,047,000	20,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-5,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,420,000)	(8,420,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(-420,000)
Water Infrastructure / State revolving fund	2,262,000,000	1,865,000,000	1,500,175,000	-2,262,000,000
Safe drinking water State revolving fund	700,000,000	500,000,000	-700,000,000
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	2,340,000,000	2,323,000,000	+2,323,000,000
Environmental services - user fees	-7,500,000
Procurement savings	-7,525,000	+7,525,000
Total, EPA	7,240,667,000	7,359,409,000	4,892,430,000	5,661,927,000	5,711,027,000	-1,529,660,000
Executive Office of the President						
Office of Science and Technology Policy	4,961,000	4,961,000	4,961,000	4,961,000	4,961,000
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	987,000	2,168,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+3,000
Total	5,978,000	7,169,000	5,961,000	5,961,000	5,961,000	+3,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief	320,000,000	320,000,000	235,500,000	222,000,000	-96,000,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan	2,418,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	-263,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(175,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-150,000,000)
Administrative expenses	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000
Salaries and expenses	182,000,000	172,331,000	182,000,000	166,900,000	166,900,000	+6,900,000
Office of the Inspector General	4,400,000	4,673,000	4,400,000	4,673,000	4,673,000	+273,000
Emergency management planning and assistance	215,960,000	210,122,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	-12,916,000
Emergency food and shelter program	130,000,000	130,000,000	100,000,000	114,173,000	100,000,000	-30,000,000
Administrative provision REP savings	-11,525,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-732,000
Procurement savings	-1,441,000	+1,441,000
Equipment sales (sec. 518)	-30,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
National Flood Insurance:						
Salaries and expenses	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(+20,562,000)
Flood mitigation	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(+70,464,000)
Premium increase	-21,000,000
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	821,907,000	776,119,000	664,937,000	480,783,000	678,610,000	-143,297,000
General Services Administration						
Consumer Information Center	2,004,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	+57,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,454,000)	(2,502,000)	(2,502,000)	(2,802,000)	(2,602,000)	(+148,000)
Department of Health and Human Services						
Office of Consumer Affairs	2,166,000	1,811,000	1,811,000	-2,166,000

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Human space flight	5,514,867,000	5,509,800,000	5,449,800,000	5,337,800,000	5,456,800,000	-66,297,000
Science, aeronautics and technology	5,901,200,000	6,006,900,000	5,588,000,000	5,990,700,000	5,845,900,000	-55,300,000
Rescission	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
National aeronautical facilities	400,000,000					-400,000,000
Mission support	2,554,587,000	2,726,200,000	2,618,200,000	2,484,200,000	2,502,200,000	-52,387,000
Office of Inspector General	18,000,000	17,300,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	
Administrative provision: Transfer authority					(60,000,000)	(+60,000,000)
Total, NASA (net)	14,376,684,000	14,260,000,000	13,671,800,000	13,798,500,000	13,820,700,000	-555,984,000
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(800,000,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(801,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(-341,000)
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities	2,280,000,000	2,454,000,000	2,284,000,000	2,284,000,000	2,274,000,000	-6,000,000
Rescission	-35,000,000					+35,000,000
Major research equipment	126,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	-56,000,000
Academic research infrastructure	250,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	160,000,000	100,000,000	-180,000,000
Education and human resources	605,974,000	598,000,000	598,000,000	598,000,000	598,000,000	-6,974,000
Salaries and expenses	123,966,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	+3,344,000
Office of Inspector General	4,380,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	+110,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	
Total, NSF (net)	3,380,520,000	3,380,000,000	3,180,000,000	3,200,000,000	3,180,000,000	-180,520,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	36,667,000	55,000,000	36,667,000	36,667,000	36,667,000	
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	22,830,000	23,304,000	22,830,000	22,830,000	22,830,000	
Department of Justice						
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair Housing activities				30,000,000		
Department of the Treasury						
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise oversight				14,885,000		
Offsetting receipts				-14,885,000		
Total, title III, independent agencies (net)	28,858,463,000	28,898,568,000	22,571,178,000	23,337,080,000	23,556,167,000	-3,102,278,000
Appropriations	(28,710,988,000)	(28,898,568,000)	(22,571,178,000)	(23,337,080,000)	(23,556,167,000)	(-3,154,801,000)
Rescissions	(+45,000,000)					(+45,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(823,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(18,207,000)	(18,802,000)	(17,802,000)	(-806,144,500)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(775,000,000)	(718,028,000)	(718,028,000)	(718,028,000)	(718,028,000)	(-56,974,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(801,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(580,000)	(-341,000)
TITLE IV						
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:						
FSLIC Resolution Fund	827,000,000					-827,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program	15,000,000	15,000,000				-15,000,000
Total	842,000,000	15,000,000				-842,000,000
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General	32,000,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	-20,800,000
Total, title IV, Corporations	874,000,000	26,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	-882,800,000
Grand total (net)	89,920,181,081	89,898,762,093	78,687,380,000	81,008,212,000	80,806,827,000	-9,313,234,081
Appropriations	(80,280,888,081)	(80,067,881,083)	(78,686,478,000)	(81,207,331,000)	(80,806,046,000)	(-9,455,846,081)
Rescissions	(-333,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+134,881,000)
(By transfer)	(100,081,000)	(83,000)	(7,081,000)	(12,781,000)	(17,581,000)	(-82,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(823,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(18,207,000)	(18,802,000)	(17,802,000)	(-806,144,500)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,200,823,034)	(1,075,421,120)	(1,075,383,000)	(1,075,383,000)	(1,075,383,000)	(-125,180,034)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(284,836,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(236,000,000,000)	(236,800,000,000)	(236,800,000,000)	(-25,036,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(516,041,000)	(548,826,000)	(528,315,000)	(554,401,000)	(554,401,000)	(+38,380,000)

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Total appropriations in this bill (net)	89,920,181,081	89,899,782,083	79,897,390,000	81,008,212,000	80,806,927,000	-9,313,234,081
Scorekeeping adjustments	-7,987,944,000				21,000,000	+8,008,844,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	81,932,217,081	89,899,782,083	79,897,390,000	81,008,212,000	80,827,927,000	-1,304,290,081
Mandatory	20,316,311,000	19,361,762,000	19,361,762,000	19,361,762,000	19,361,762,000	-954,549,000
Discretionary:						
Crime trust fund.....		3,000,000				
General purposes:						
Defense (Function 050):						
Federal Emergency Management Agency:						
Salaries and expenses.....	82,411,000	44,008,000	42,081,000	43,874,000	43,874,000	-18,537,000
Emergency management planning and assistance...	137,147,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	-113,122,000
Selective Service System.....	22,630,000	23,304,000	22,630,000	22,630,000	22,630,000	
National Science Foundation:						
Research and related activities		62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	+62,600,000
Total, Defense	222,488,000	153,935,000	151,636,000	153,429,000	153,429,000	-69,059,000
Nondefense discretionary	61,383,418,081	70,351,085,083	60,183,982,000	61,464,021,000	61,112,736,000	-260,862,081
Total, General purposes.....	61,615,906,081	70,505,000,083	60,335,568,000	61,647,450,000	61,266,165,000	-349,741,081
Total, Discretionary	61,615,906,081	70,505,000,083	60,335,568,000	61,647,450,000	61,266,165,000	-349,741,081

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this conference report and to the rule governing its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, last year 1,200 neighborhood law offices provided legal services to 1.7 million clients. The majority of these people were women and children living in poverty.

The conference report before us today contains a two-part attack on the Legal Services Corporation, which last year provided about 60 percent of the funds used by neighborhood legal service organizations. The balance of legal services funds comes from private attorneys, foundations, local charities, and State and local governments.

This conference report continues the majority's assault on the weakest members of our society.

The first part of this attack is to reduce Federal funds for the Legal Services Corporation by \$122 million. This is a cut of 31 percent.

The second part of this attack is to restrict the type of legal services that the local legal services organizations can provide with their own non-Federal funds.

Let me illustrate the unfair consequences of this restriction by sharing with the House a letter I received yesterday from Marcia Cypen, executive director of Legal Services of Greater Miami. She points out that Legal Services of Miami now uses non-Federal funds to represent aliens. Under this conference report, Legal Services of Miami would have to choose between giving up all Federal funds or else stop representing those aliens who are applying for admission as a refugee or for asylum. Many of these aliens have work permits and are working, but they are too poor to get private legal assistance. They must come to Legal Services of Miami if they have been beaten by their husbands, illegally locked out by their landlords, or cheated by a merchant.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the majority to put restrictions on the use of Federal funds. But it is wrong for the majority to impose its ideological views on services provided by donations from private groups and State and local governments that believe it is important that all poor people have access to our legal system.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against this conference report.

LEGAL SERVICES OF GREATER MIAMI, INC.,

Miami FL, December 5, 1995.

Congresswoman CARRIE P. MEEK, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MEEK: Thank you for requesting our program's input on HR 2076 which includes funding for the Legal Services Corporation in 1996.

A crucial failing of the bill is that it precludes representation of certain classes of aliens with non-LSC funds. The particular classes of aliens affected are listed on the attached page. On a practical level what this means is that we cannot, for example, use

non-LSC funds to represent a Haitian woman who is beaten up by her husband, illegally locked out by her landlord, or cheated by a used car dealer if she has applied for political asylum and has a work permit but her political asylum application is still pending. Unfortunately, there are many aliens who remain in this limbo situation for several years.

Approximately five percent of our current non-immigration caseload consists of aliens who will no longer be eligible for legal services with non-LSC funds in 1996. This could be remedied if Section 504 (d)(2) (B) were amended to allow non-LSC funds to be used to represent aliens not eligible for representation with LSC funds.

In addition, HR 2076 precludes us from collecting any attorneys fees in 1996. This is inconsistent with the stated goal of reducing LSC's dependency on federal dollars. Our program has relied on income from attorneys fees to bolster our budget, and the lack of this income in 1996 will reduce our services even further.

We appreciate your concern on behalf of the poverty community of Dade County. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

MARCIA K. CYPEN,
Executive Director.

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 5, 1995
Subject: Ineligible aliens under proposed LSC restrictions
From: Esther Olavarria Cruz
To: Marcia Cypen

I have made two lists, which is necessary to better explain who cannot be represented under the proposed LSC restrictions:

List of aliens who can be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Lawful permanent residents.
2. Aliens who are the spouse, parent, or unmarried child under 21 of a U.S. citizen and have filed applications for permanent residence.
3. Asylees (individuals granted asylum).
4. Refugees.
5. Individuals granted withholding of deportation (higher standard than asylum—very rare).
6. Individuals granted conditional entry before 4/1/80 (old refugee category—almost no aliens now in this category).
7. H-2A agricultural workers (limited to representation in employment contract matters only, such as wages, housing, transportation and other employment rights—very small category).

List of aliens who cannot be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Asylum applicants.
2. Parolees.
3. Special immigrant juveniles (undocumented children adjudicated state dependents because of abandonment, neglect or abuse).
4. Battered spouses of U.S. citizens (unless otherwise eligible under #2 above).
5. Battered spouses of permanent residents.
6. Aliens in exclusion or deportation proceedings.
7. Aliens with immediate U.S. citizen spouses, parents, or unmarried minor children who have not filed for permanent residence.
8. Relatives of permanent residents (unless otherwise eligible above).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. The level of funding for VA medical care is \$213 million below the level approved by the House earlier this year, and is almost \$400 million less than the President requested.

The chairman of the subcommittee said they couldn't find any more money for the veterans. But where did they find over \$800 million for the EPA? Why is spending for housing programs almost \$1 billion more than the House-approved level?

Members need to understand that the VA can't be opening new clinics when we don't give them the funds to do so. Yet that is what this conference report does.

I believe that the bill falls short. It ignores the instruction that a majority of House Members voted for last week. It's wrong. We can find the money to do the right thing for veterans. The President is going to veto this bill anyway, and he should. We should not vote for a bill that doesn't honor our commitment to veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2099 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on Senate amendment numbered 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. With objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 219, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 843]

YEAS—198

Abercrombie	Boucher	Coleman
Ackerman	Brewster	Collins (IL)
Andrews	Browder	Collins (MI)
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Condit
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	Conyers
Barcia	Brown (OH)	Costello
Barrett (WI)	Bryant (TX)	Coyne
Becerra	Cardin	Cramer
Berman	Clay	Danner
Bishop	Clayton	DeLauro
Bonior	Clement	Dellums
Borski	Clyburn	Deutsch

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)

Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy

Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Tate
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Townes
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Yates

Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Mazullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinar
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Packer
Paxon

Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery

McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moorhead
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton

Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Bentsen
Bevill
Chapman
de la Garza
DeFazio
Fowler
Istook
Morella
Pelosi
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Schroeder
Tucker
Volkmer
Young (AK)

□ 1421

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, VENTO, HOYER, OBERSTAR, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, BRYANT of Texas, and CONYERS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant the provisions of clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 844]

YEAS—227

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Billray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn

Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gillmor
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn

Alvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn

Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman

Abercrombie

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
DeLauro
Dellums
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Richardson
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta

NAYS—190

Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Richardson
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui

McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
Frost
Funderburk
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Gephardt
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinar
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton

Slaughter	Thurman	Waxman
Spratt	Torres	Whitfield
Stark	Torricelli	Williams
Stokes	Towns	Wilson
Studds	Trafigant	Wise
Stupak	Velazquez	Woolsey
Tanner	Vento	Wyden
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	Wynn
Tejeda	Ward	Yates
Thompson	Waters	
Thornton	Watt (NC)	

NOT VOTING—15

Bevill	Fowler	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Istook	Schroeder
Chapman	Johnson, Sam	Tucker
de la Garza	Kasich	Volkmer
DeFazio	Pelosi	Young (AK)

□ 1439

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. BROWDER and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment Number 63:

Page 51, strike out all after line 20, over to and including line 3 on page 52 and insert:

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service in carrying out the orderly terminations of programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 103-82), \$6,000,000: Provided, That such amount shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation and the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

Page 53, strike out all after line 9, over to and including line 7 on page 60 and insert:

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

For program administration and management activities, including necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$1,670,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1997.

Page 60, after line 8 insert:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Page 60, line 13, strike out [\$28,542,000] and insert: \$27,700,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COMBEST). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

AMENDMENT NUMBERED 63

Mr. LEWIS of California moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service in carrying out the orderly termination of programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 103-82), \$15,000,000: Provided, That such amount shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation and the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the motion in disagreement that is before us involves a disagreement between the other body and the House relative to the funding of that program which is known as AmeriCorps. The actual amendment involved here increases the amount from \$6 to \$15 million, and provides a foundation whereby we will be moving toward termination of that program.

Essentially it is a reflection of the will of the House, which has voted on other occasions essentially to terminate the funding for AmeriCorps, and that is what the motion of disagreement is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is really no point in spending much time on this amendment reported in disagreement. The issue here has little to do with the positions of the House or the Senate regarding the funding level for the Corporation for National and Community Service. The House bill would terminate the corporation and allow the use of funds previously appropriated to accomplish the orderly shutdown. The Senate bill appropriates \$6 million to carry out the orderly termination of the corporation's activities. Obviously, the difference between the two bills is not great. The motion offered by the gentleman from California would provide \$15 million for the corporation's termination costs.

Technically, this motion violates the rules of the House, and under normal circumstances that would be the reason it is reported in disagreement. However, since the Republican managers of the bill chose to get waivers of the rules in about a hundred other instances where they violated the rules, I don't think that is the real reason.

It would appear that the underlying reason the managers of the bill re-

ported this amendment in disagreement is to allow an avenue for action if a further understanding on the prospects for administration approval of this bill can be reached. Given the administration's recent policy statement on this bill, it seems to me the gulf of differences is too large to be bridged without a sizable increase in the allocation for the bill, rendering this action futile.

Mr. Speaker, I would just note the reason that I take this position is because in the statement of administration policy, which was received from the President's office, they make reference to the conference report including no funds for the President's successful National Service Program. It says if such funding were eliminated, the bill would cost nearly 50,000 young Americans the opportunity to help their community, through AmeriCorps, to address vital local needs, such as health care, crime prevention, and education, while earning a monetary award to help them pursue additional education or training.

□ 1445

Then it states emphatically the President will not sign any version of this appropriations bill that does not restore funds for this vital program.

So, with these observations, Mr. Speaker, I see no need for lengthy debate on this matter, and would advise Members that I do not intend to seek a recorded vote on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], that there is no reason to have extended discussion on this motion in disagreement. I think it is important to say, however, that one of the reasons the motion is in this form is because we wanted to make a technical change that would allow the other body, under the rules of the other body, if it so chose, to amend this motion in disagreement further.

Mr. Speaker, if between now and that time the administration is serious about wanting to rearrange or make adjustments in this bill that will lead to agreement between the legislative branch and the executive branch that would cause the President to sign this bill, there is that option. It is a very narrow window. It seems to be closing very rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, should the President's people inform the President of this opportunity, it could very well be that we could have a final bill that is signable and thereby service these agencies in a fashion that makes sense. If the President chooses not to do this, it is likely to lead to a long-term continuing resolution that will cause all of these agencies to be funded at something like 25 percent below the 1995 year.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, the motion in disagreement is in the form

that it is in. I would urge the Members to support my position on the motion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to House Resolution 291, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, for whatever reason, my vote on H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens Right To Work Act, was not recorded. I strongly support the bill and I wanted my vote to be "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on December 5, I was unable to be here due to illness and I missed rollcall votes numbered 834, 835, 836, and 837. Had I been here, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall 834, "yes" on rollcall vote 835, "yes" on rollcall vote 836, and "yes" on rollcall vote 837.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. FAZIO of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of yielding to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to announce the schedule for the next week and the remainder of this season.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this vote marks the end of the legislative business for the week. On Monday, December 11, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no legislative business that day.

On Tuesday, December 12, the House will meet at 10 o'clock a.m. and recess immediately to receive Prime Minister Peres of Israel in a joint meeting of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the House will reconvene at 1 p.m. for morning hour and 2:30 p.m. for legislative business. We will first consider two bills on the Corrections Day Calendar: H.R. 1787, a bill to repeal the saccharin notice requirement; and H.R. 325, the commuter option bill.

After consideration of the correction of corrections day bills, we will take up

a number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through the bills now, but a list will be distributed to Members' offices. We will then turn to H.R. 2621, legislation concerning disinvestment of Federal trust funds.

Members should be advised that we do not expect recorded votes until 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, December 12.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we expect to consider the following bills, all of which will be subject to rules: H.R. 2666, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for H.R. 1977, the Interior Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for H.R. 2546, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for S. 1026, the Department of Defense authorization bill; H.R. 1020, the Integrated Nuclear Spent Fuel Management Act; the conference report for S. 652, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995; and, H.R. 1745, the Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995.

Also, it is possible that legislation pertaining to the deployment of troops in Bosnia would be considered next week.

As Members know, the continuing resolution expires Friday, December 15. I am hopeful that progress will be made in ongoing budget negotiations that would result in legislation that will balance the budget in 7 years; permanently increase the public debt limit; and, fund those areas of government for which appropriations bills have not yet been approved.

However, given these unusual circumstances, it is impossible to inform Members with any accuracy when the House will adjourn next week.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman further to inquire if it is possible to give the Members any more certainty when the Bosnia resolution would be considered. I know that every Member would want to be present for that debate and that vote.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot be more precise. I know that that would not happen on Tuesday. It could not happen before Wednesday, I am sure, out of consideration for the Members. Other than that, I really cannot give the gentleman any more precise information.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday and Thursday are the most likely dates?

Mr. ARMEY. Most likely.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would respond further, I know that we have a need for a third CR. Everybody is aware of the fact that it seems we have six appropriation bills that have not yet made it to the President for signature or veto.

Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman give us some understanding as to when it will be possible to extend this CR to

a time when all of us could conclude it would be realistic, many assuming it might be sometime in mid-January?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to yield on that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is aware that even today, after informing the press, the President's negotiations team is going to present to the budget negotiation meetings their recommendation for a 7-year balanced budget with OMB scoring. We would obviously want to give that all the consideration it is due.

Of course, seeing that the President is moving in the direction of a 7-year balanced budget, we remain hopeful and optimistic that during the course of this weekend and next week that we will come to a conclusion of these budget negotiations. At that time, of course, as we have racked up the work, we will address the question and the need for a continuing resolution to handle that discretionary spending for bills not yet approved by the President.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the general budget debate is going to continue for a while, and there are many, many issues in disagreement, but the fundamental need to keep the government functioning now is, I think, something that grows more important to more Members as we get closer to the holidays.

I have heard from both sides of the aisle, and on the other side of the Capitol as well, that there is no stomach for sending Federal employees on another unnecessary furlough around the holidays, when we are not going to be able to resolve the fundamental budget issue anyway.

Mr. Speaker, is there any hope that we could have at least a short-term extension of the CR to allow the Republican majority to catch up with the schedule on the appropriation bills?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from California in regretting the President's earlier decision to shut down the Government and unnecessarily furlough workers. I can only assure the gentleman from California we will present the President with an opportunity to maintain continuing operation of the Federal Government and to avoid that.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from California would join me in hoping that given that opportunity that the President will most certainly be presented with, that he would opt this time to not shut down the Government as he did last time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is certainly no question, when we have not sent six of the appropriations bills to him by the December 7 date, well beyond the normal October 1 fiscal year date, it is kind of difficult to blame the President.