

cranes and other equipment to the local community. Similarly, they would retain all the pier space with the closure of a number of naval activities at the naval station.

Their decision would be like moving all the troops out of Fort Ord, but holding onto the base. They cannot and should not have it both ways. Either they retain the facilities or turn them over to the local community so that Guam can recover the job losses. This schizophrenia will leave our community in a straitjacket without the tools for our own economic survival. If the Navy closes down these facilities and retains the assets we will be left with no access to the waterfront and a few empty buildings. This does not bode well for forming a successful reuse plan when we cannot even be given the opportunity to use our own resources.

According to recent statements by the Secretary of Defense William Perry and other officials in the Pentagon, the decision to pull back from Guam was opposed by some high ranking uniformed officers, including the Commander in Chief, Pacific Command, Adm. Richard Macke. Apparently, Admiral Macke indicated that without Guam, the Navy will be forced to count on foreign facilities in Japan to meet their needs and would lose the most forward deployed U.S. military base on American soil in the Pacific. The CINC understands the big picture and the need for Guam as a strategic base. However, the computer model used by the Pentagon did not consider these implications.

Computer models, bean counters, and technocrats did not consider such factors as reliability, loyalty and the long-term effect of these closures on our position in the Pacific. Apparently suits in the Pentagon overruled some of our uniformed military personnel who understand the need to maintain an SRF in Guam.

A more logical approach than the one taken in the Secretary's recommendation would be a joint use agreement with the local government. Under such an arrangement, the Government of Guam could act as a corporate operator of the major facility, SRF. The Navy would then pay the government of Guam to operate the facility and retain access to it in times of crisis. In this way, the equipment and quality of work force is maintained and used for commercial use but the Navy does not have to pay for the entire cost anymore. It makes good economic sense by saving the Navy money and giving the local community the economic tools to survive.

If this approach is rejected and BRAC decides that Guam is not needed as a forward deployed base then the Navy must turn over the assets and land upon completion of the closure. Otherwise, there is no way that the people of Guam could possibly recover the 25 percent loss to their economy and 5 to 10 percent reduction in the work force. The least the Navy can do if they are

going to close these facilities is to give the local community the tools to recover from the loss.

Since the Navy has taken the easy way out by making a wishywashy decision, it is now up to BRAC to decide.

Madam Speaker, I urge BRAC to make the right decision.

SAVE FLORIDA VETERANS PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Madam Speaker, last week the Republican members of the House Committee on Appropriations voted to rescind \$206 million in the VA's budget for this year. These funds were intended for six VA facilities and medical equipment to provide better health care for our Nation's veterans.

Of these six projects that were cut, two were in the Florida, Gainesville ambulatory care unit that has been on the list for over 18 years, and one in Orlando that is a win-win situation, an example of how Government works well.

When the Base Closure Commission recommended closing the naval training facility, the Department of Defense, along with Veterans' Affairs, worked together to turn that facility over to the veterans who really needed the facility in the Orlando area. The amount of this funding was \$14 million. There could be no backing down on this matter. A vote to keep our veterans projects is a vote to keep our promise to our veterans.

These cuts targeted at veterans are another example that the Republican "Contract With" is a "Contract on America," and a Contract on American veterans.

Madam Speaker, one project was for a \$14 million project to allow the VA to relocate from its present location to the Orlando Naval Training Center hospital, identified for base closure, for use as a satellite outpatient clinic and a 120-bed nursing home facility.

The existing outpatient clinic in Orlando is a disgrace. It lacks sufficient examining rooms, waiting areas, and bathrooms. There is no privacy for examining women veterans and parking is severely limited. These veterans in east central Florida have already waited too long for access to a quality health care facility.

The other funds were \$17.8 million for a VA ambulatory care addition in Gainesville. Funds have already been obligated for the Gainesville ambulatory care addition. In fact, last week the VA announced a contract award for the project. This project has been identified by the VA as critically necessary to relieve outpatient overcrowding problems. Lack of space prevents the medical center from offering care in a timely manner. This Gainesville project has been designed to include an ambulatory surgery facility in renovated space, along with facilities for primary care, specialty outpatient care, and women's health.

It is a national disgrace that Republicans cut these funds to provide better care for veterans. The list obviously was quickly and thoughtlessly compiled. Our Nation's veterans—men and women—who have been called upon to put their lives on the line in remote parts of the world and under the most difficult conditions. If they survive this ordeal, they should at least be able to have good care when they return to the United States.

These canceled projects prevent us from expanding our outpatient services, a national trend in health care delivery, and making our health care system more efficient and cost effective. These canceled projects are aimed at one of the most fragile groups in our society—aging World War II and Korean conflict veterans. These and all veterans should expect and receive good care. If we cannot protect them at their time of need, how can we ask them to stand in harms way to protect us?

SUPPORT AN AMENDMENT TO THE RESCISSIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] and the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] for giving me part of their time.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support, and I hope all Members would support, an amendment to the rescissions bill. This amendment would restore the \$206 million for veterans' programs which the Committee on Appropriations proposes to rescind.

Madam Speaker, I hope the Committee on Rules will permit us to offer a clean amendment to restore these funds.

The six VA projects which the committee has recommended be canceled are needed in order to improve access to necessary outpatient care in an area where over 1 million veterans reside.

Rather than producing real savings, the proposed rescissions would tend to have the opposite effect because they would cut projects aimed at making VA health care delivery more cost-effective.

As the President of the United States said yesterday, "These cuts would harm those veterans who most need the Nation's help." Enacting this measure would contradict the Speaker's assurance to me in January that Congress would not cut veterans' programs.

Madam Speaker, in some parts of the country the VA really does not have the proper health facilities to meet the veterans' needs. I am told that the clinics are too small. For example, in Puerto Rico eye doctors are forced to perform eye examinations in hallways. Many VA outpatient clinics were built so long ago that there is no privacy for women veterans. In most of these older facilities, there is only one examining

room per doctor. We would like to provide two examining rooms for each doctor, which would facilitate and speed up the process. We hope we will have the support when we offer this amendment to restore the \$206 million cut by the Committee on Appropriations.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes a.m., the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Most Reverend Augustin Roman, Auxiliary Bishop of Miami, Miami Shores, FL, offered the following prayer:

Father in Heaven, Lord and Ruler of all the Earth and its nations; You have given all peoples one common origin and Your will is to gather them as one family in Yourself.

Look upon this assembly of our national leaders and fill them with the spirit of Your wisdom so that they may act in accordance with Your will. Through their deliberations, may they seek to overcome the selfishness that divides our human family and thus help secure justice for all their brothers and sisters. For it is justice guaranteed for all and denied to no one that rightly orders our liberty while accepting Your lordship over us and so assures the security of a true and lasting peace worthy of man created in Your image and likeness. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The Chair announces that there will be 20 1-minutes on each side.

A WELCOME TO BISHOP ROMAN

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this morning we were blessed by hearing Auxiliary Bishop Augustin Roman of the Archdiocese of Miami deliver the opening invocation. My colleagues, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, BOB MENENDEZ, and I welcome him.

We have recently come to the floor to remind our colleagues of the great contribution that immigrants make to this country. Bishop Roman is another perfect example.

Bishop Roman arrived in the United States in 1966, after having been expelled from Cuba by the tyrannical regime of Fidel Castro.

In 1979, Bishop Roman became the first Cuban in 200 years to be named a bishop in the United States. The bishop holds advanced degrees in theology and human resources and serves as director of the "Ermita de la Caridad," a shrine to Our Lady of Charity, which he helped create. He has been a spiritual guide for the people of south Florida during troubled times.

Bishop Roman is also active in seeking freedom for the Cuban rafters detained at Guantanamo.

When called by the local press a hero, the bishop humbly responded that "a bishop, a priest is a servant, not a hero." This humility and compassion is what has made the bishop of one south Florida's heroes, or as he would put it, its servant.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House joint resolution No. 2.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICANS IN THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last night and this last weekend we heard the Republican majority defend their school lunch changes. It is the great Republican shell game for school lunch.

They promise a 4.5-percent increase under one shell, but they do not tell us what is under the Appropriations Com-

mittee shell. What is under the State shell, when they can cut 20 percent from the School Lunch Program and transfer it to other programs?

The Republicans are playing budgetary shell games with school lunches. They are taking a guaranteed school lunch for children and subjecting it to the authorization process, to the appropriations process, and then subjecting it to whatever a State may want to do up to 20 percent. On one hand they promise an increase in funding, on the other hand the Committee on Appropriations has been cutting the summer youth jobs and other programs for children.

Are we going to protect the lunch program, or are we going to subject it to the Committee on Appropriations and what they are doing now? Will school districts be forced to end programs when massive rescissions bills come down after they have already bought food? Maybe we should go to the kids during the year after they have already had that luncheon say, you need to give it back.

Why is Congress trying to fix a program that has been working since 1946?

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following: On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third, and cut the congressional budget. We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we plan to complete that today;

Welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; senior citizens' equity act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty, and congressional term limits to make congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL TO END THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)