

Dreier	Kennedy (RI)	Quinn
Duncan	Kim	Ramstad
Dunn	King	Reed
Ehrlich	Kingston	Richardson
English	Klink	Riggs
Ensign	Klug	Rivers
Eshoo	LaFalce	Roberts
Evans	LaHood	Roemer
Ewing	Largent	Rohrabacher
Farr	Latham	Ros-Lehtinen
Fawell	LaTourette	Rose
Flanagan	Laughlin	Roth
Foley	Leach	Royce
Forbes	Lewis (KY)	Salmon
Fowler	Lightfoot	Sanford
Fox	Linder	Saxton
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Scarborough
Franks (NJ)	LoBiondo	Schaefer
Frisa	Lofgren	Schiff
Funderburk	Longley	Seastrand
Gallely	Lucas	Sensenbrenner
Ganske	Luther	Shadegg
Gekas	Manzullo	Shaw
Geran	Martinez	Shuster
Gilchrest	Martini	Sisisky
Gillmor	Mascara	Skeen
Gilman	McCarthy	Smith (MI)
Goodlatte	McCollum	Smith (NJ)
Goodling	McCrery	Smith (WA)
Gordon	McDermott	Solomon
Goss	McHale	Souder
Graham	McHugh	Spence
Greene (UT)	McInnis	Spratt
Greenwood	McIntosh	Stearns
Gunderson	McKeon	Stenholm
Gutknecht	McKinney	Stockman
Hall (TX)	Metcalf	Stump
Hamilton	Meyers	Talent
Hancock	Mica	Tanner
Hansen	Millender-	Tate
Harman	McDonald	Tauzin
Hastert	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Taylor (NC)
Hayes	Montgomery	Thomas
Hayworth	Moran	Thornberry
Hefley	Murtha	Thurman
Heineman	Myrick	Tiahrt
Henger	Nethercutt	Torkildsen
Hinchey	Neumann	Torricelli
Hoekstra	Ney	Trafficant
Holden	Norwood	Upton
Horn	Nussle	Visclosky
Hostettler	Orton	Walker
Houghton	Oxley	Wamp
Hunter	Pallone	Watts (OK)
Hutchinson	Paxon	Weldon (FL)
Inglis	Payne (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Istook	Peterson (MN)	Weller
Jacobs	Petri	White
Johnson (SD)	Pombo	Whitfield
Johnson, Sam	Pomeroy	Wicker
Johnston	Porter	Young (AK)
Jones	Portman	Young (FL)
Kelly	Poshard	Zimmer

NOES—157

Abercrombie	Dixon	Jefferson
Ackerman	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Baesler	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Barrett (WI)	Edwards	Kanjorski
Bateman	Ehlers	Kaptur
Beilenson	Engel	Kasich
Berman	Everett	Kennedy (MA)
Bonilla	Fazio	Kennelly
Bonior	Fields (LA)	Kildee
Brown (FL)	Filner	Kleczka
Brown (OH)	Flake	Knollenberg
Bryant (TX)	Foglietta	Kolbe
Bunning	Frank (MA)	Lantos
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Lazio
Cardin	Frost	Levin
Castle	Furse	Lewis (CA)
Chapman	Gejdenson	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gephardt	Livingston
Clayton	Gibbons	Lowe
Clement	Gonzalez	Maloney
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Manton
Collins (IL)	Gutierrez	Markey
Collins (MI)	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Cummings	Hefner	Meehan
de la Garza	Hilliard	Meek
DeLauro	Hobson	Menendez
DeLay	Hoke	Minge
Dellums	Hoyer	Mink
Deutsch	Hyde	Moakley
Diaz-Balart	Jackson (IL)	Molinari
Dicks	Jackson-Lee	Mollohan
Dingell	(TX)	Moorhead

Morella	Rogers	Thompson
Myers	Roukema	Thornton
Nadler	Rush	Towns
Neal	Sabo	Velazquez
Oberstar	Sanders	Vento
Obey	Sawyer	Volkmer
Olver	Schroeder	Vucanovich
Ortiz	Schumer	Walsh
Owens	Scott	Ward
Packard	Serrano	Waters
Parker	Shays	Watt (NC)
Pastor	Skaggs	Waxman
Payne (NJ)	Skelton	Williams
Pelosi	Slaughter	Wise
Pryce	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Quillen	Stark	Woolsey
Radanovich	Stokes	Wynn
Rahall	Studds	Yates
Rangel	Stupak	Zeliff
Regula	Tejeda	

NOT VOTING—16

Becerra	Fields (TX)	Pickett
Browder	Ford	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Hilleary	Torres
Costello	Lincoln	Wilson
Cubin	McDade	
Fattah	Peterson (FL)	

□ 1151

So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The Committee resumed its sitting.  
 Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to lay the foundation very briefly for a unanimous consent to inform the Members that we have somewhere in the neighborhood of only 30 or 40 amendments left on this bill. There seems to be some agreement coming together, and some of those hopefully will fall off because of duplication and so forth.

But by way of expediting the time for the Members, I will be asking unanimous consent for a 10-minute time limitation on a series of amendments. So if the Members will bear with me, I ask unanimous consent for a 10-minute time limit on the following amendments: one amendment by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS]; one amendment by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA]; one amendment by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTTLER]; one amendment by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN]; one amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; similarly by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE]; two by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER]; one

by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]; one by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON]; all in title III.

It will be 10 minutes on a side.  
 The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask, the unanimous-consent agreement is for 10 minutes total or 10 minutes on each side?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Ten minutes on a side.  
 The CHAIRMAN. On each amendment and all amendments thereto?  
 Mr. LEWIS of California. On each of those amendments mentioned and amendments thereto, that is correct. Mr. Chairman, this will not restrict other amendments being brought forth that have been filed. It is on those specific areas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. STOKES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to object, but I would just pose a further question to the gentleman from California. By 10 minutes per amendment, does the gentleman mean each side, a total of 20 minutes on those that we agree upon, is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is correct. I would almost desperately hope that neither of us would want to take all that time.

Mr. STOKES. Time will also be controlled by the offerer and the chairman, is that correct?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, my staff helps me a little. I failed to recognize that on this list as prepared that my own amendment is not on the list and that needs to be included, as well. I think probably my staff wanted to cut me off, but I know the gentleman would not want to do that.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. chairman, I certainly would not want to do that. I would want the gentleman's amendment to be included.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.  
 Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so on behalf of myself, my colleague from New York, Mr. BOEHLERT, in order to engage the gentleman from California, Mr. LEWIS, chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, in a colloquy regarding NASA's Mission to Planet Earth.

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

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to engage in a colloquy.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you know, Mission to Planet Earth is one

of NASA's most important and relevant programs. It will benefit our environment by providing scientific information on global climate change. It will benefit our economy by providing farmers with a better understanding of how climatic conditions like El Nino can affect their crops. I understand the budget constraints under which the subcommittee must operate and commend the gentleman for the job he is doing within them, but I am very concerned by the proposed \$220 million cut in this bill, especially in light of the National Research Council's recent review of the U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program and NASA's Mission to Planet Earth, which stated that further budgetary cuts would hurt Mission to Planet Earth.

Is the gentleman from California aware of this recommendation by the National Research Council and does he agree with it?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentlewoman will yield, first I appreciate the gentleman raising this subject.

I am indeed aware of the National Research Council's recommendation which states that the program requires an adequate and stable level of funding. I would like to ensure the gentleman and the House that I agree with this recommendation and believe that Mission to Planet Earth must have sufficient fiscal year 1997 funds to succeed.

As the gentlewoman knows, there is strong bipartisan support for Mission to Planet Earth and its programs in the Senate. When we go to conference with the Senate on the VA-HUD bill, I expect to spend a lot of time dealing with this program.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those remarks, and as the chairman knows, I am particularly concerned about the near-term components of the Earth observing system, EOS, including the P.M.-1 and CHEM-1 missions.

□ 1200

Does the chairman agree with the National Research Council that these near-term components should be implemented without delay?

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

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the NRC that the program's first group of components should not be delayed. Neither this bill nor its accompanying report instructs NASA to terminate or delay these very important missions.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York, and I commend him for his bipartisan leadership on issues such as this.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from California, I strongly support NASA's Mission to Planet Earth. I view this program as a crucial piece of our Nation's commit-

ment to environmental research and development. I would like to emphasize that Mission to Planet Earth is truly about science. As the chairman knows, the National Research Council stated that the science underlining the U.S. Global Climate Change Research Program and Mission to Planet Earth is fundamentally sound.

Does the chairman agree with this assessment?

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

Ms. HARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the National Research Council that the program is scientifically sound. I believe that we need Mission to Planet Earth to provide us with better scientific understanding of global climate change. I believe that this remote sensing data will help regulatory agencies make sound, scientifically based risk assessments.

As I stated earlier, I support Mission to Planet Earth, and I will keep this program in the forefront of my mind when we go to conference with the Senate. I commend the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and many others on both sides of the aisle for their work in support of Mission to Planet Earth.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank my friends for their comments.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, for agreeing to enter into this colloquy on a very important matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to seek clarification of the committee's intent with regard to the Clean Lakes Program. I note that the committee report designates \$100 million for the Clean Lakes Program and specifically for section 319 projects under the Clean Water Act. I would like to know if it is the intent of the committee to allow section 314 projects to be funded from the \$100 million designated for section 319?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, it is the committee's intent to allow for section 314 projects under the Clean Water Act to be funded with the \$100 million designated for the Clean Lakes Program.

In fact, the State is authorized to use any portion of the \$100 million under the State and tribal grants heading for section 314 projects. It is vital that we allow States to set their own priorities for specific lake water projects and, in fact, last year we granted States the flexibility to set their own priorities for pollution control projects most critical to that individual State.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, would the chairman be willing to incorporate this clarification in report language as the bill emerges from conference?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would be happy to work with the gentleman to incorporate into the conference report a clarification of the committee's intent.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, about the air quality crisis in the Hunts Point area of the South Bronx, NY, where there is a concentration of waste transfer and sewage treatment facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I have been working closely with the Environmental Protection Agency and the regional authorities about this air quality crisis at Hunts Point over the past year. Over 43 waste transfer facilities are located in the Hunts Point community area, and over 70 percent of New York City's sludge is processed in this area. Asthma and respiratory illness in Hunts Point are higher than the city average. Over 25 percent of the 1,100 students at Public School 48 have asthma and are frequently hospitalized. In one first grade class alone 47 percent of the students have asthma and 33 percent have been hospitalized.

Would the chairman agree that the Environmental Protection Agency should continue to commit resources and work closely with my congressional office and State and local officials to continue to identify and, if possible, mitigate any environmental causes of this problem?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, to my colleague from New York I say that these types of local problems must be addressed, and EPA can offer particular expertise and guidance in providing solutions. I strongly urge, EPA to continue to work closely with him, as well as with State and local officials, to resolve this problem as quickly as practicable.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it would be helpful if the Environmental Protection Agency made an effort to evaluate and correlate the very specific air emissions that are present at the time that health problems affecting the children in my congressional district actually take place.

Would the chairman agree that the Environmental Protection Agency should conduct air quality testing in conjunction with the occurrence of specific health incidents during the next phase of testing?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the relationship between air quality problems and its impact upon people's health is fundamental to all of

these efforts. The situation you describe certainly seems to fall within EPA's particular expertise, and again, I join the gentleman in encouraging EPA to review this matter and to bring to bear its own expertise and resources along with the expertise resources of the State and the local governments.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to enter into a very brief colloquy with my distinguished colleague from California, the chairman of the subcommittee.

The gentleman and I have had numerous discussions about the plight of the Johns Manville site in Nashua, NH. This is an abandoned asbestos manufacturing plant that poses a serious threat to the health and public safety to the city of Nashua. The danger was evidenced when one of the buildings on the site experienced a partial collapse of its roof. Fortunately, the weight of the snow on top of the building prevented the release of asbestos. Nevertheless, a recently issued report indicates that any further collapse or fire at this site could necessitate a full-scale evacuation of the area's residents.

Unfortunately, the cleanup cost analysis included in the recent report was not available in time to seek funding for this project through the normal committee process. The new report indicates that the site should qualify for emergency funding and may require up to \$5.3 million for the cleanup.

From previous conversations, I know the chairman understands the importance of the project to my district. Therefore, I would like to ask him if he and the committee can work with me to address this dire situation.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say to the gentleman that he certainly made me aware of this project and its problems and I commend him for his hard work on this issue.

The committee is very much concerned and aware of the situation that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS] has described and we are willing to pursue whatever avenue is available to address it.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman very much for his willingness to work on this matter.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition in order to engage the distinguished chairman of the appropriations subcommittee in a colloquy.

I want to inquire of the subcommittee chairman with regard to the bill before us, the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act of 1997. Specifically, I am inquiring as to the committee's commitment to alleviate the disproportionate financial burden on families and businesses on the

North Shore of Massachusetts due to the cost of complying with the federally mandated Clean Water Act.

My district includes communities within the South Essex Sewage District, known as SESD, which is in the midst of a funding crisis. Families will soon face water and sewage rates in excess of \$2,000 a year to pay for federally imposed clean water mandates. The effects of these rates on families will be devastating, and the rate of increase may force some businesses to relocate elsewhere.

Also, the communities of Gloucester, Amesbury, Manchester By-the-Sea, Rockport, Essex, Ipswich, Salisbury and Lynn are facing similar funding crises.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has been diligent in making the subcommittee aware of the severity of the water and sewer rates on the North Shore of Massachusetts. To say the least, the gentleman does not exactly twist my arm, but I am very aware of these problems.

Complying with the Clean Water Act is a costly endeavor. I would assure the gentleman this committee is committed to alleviating the financial burdens associated with the Clean Water Act which are passed down from the Federal Government to families and businesses throughout the country, but particularly in his area the severity of this challenge is great.

Accordingly, we have placed \$1.35 billion in the State revolving fund. Due to budget constraints, the subcommittee was challenged to provide minimum funding this year, let alone funding for new starts.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I wish to thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue. I am concerned, however, whether the subcommittee's policy precludes the chair from working with the other body in the conference committee to secure additional funds for some worthy new starts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, I would answer your question by saying it simply indicates how serious the gentleman is about pursuing this matter.

Clearly, the other body is entitled to raise whatever issues it chooses in our upcoming conference, and I expect the Clean Water Act mandate funding to be addressed. When the issue be raised, I can assure my colleague I will work with the gentleman to find a solution to the problems of water and sewer mandates on the North Shore of Massachusetts.

Furthermore, I will recommend to the conference committee that should additional funds become available priority be given to water and sewer projects, including SESD and the oth-

ers the gentleman has made reference to on the North Shore of Massachusetts.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this issue to the committee's attention and in particular the personal time he has spent write me.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished chairman, and my friend and colleague for clarifying this most important point. I look forward to working with him in the upcoming conference.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations in a colloquy regarding language to encourage the establishment of an outpatient VA clinic in Gainesville, GA.

This is an area located in rural Hall County, and there are close to 10,000 veterans who must travel over 200 miles to receive services at the VA hospital in Atlanta. This language was included under an amendment No. 4 to the statement of the managers in the conference report on VA-HUD appropriations in fiscal year 1996, that being H.R. 2099.

I would ask the distinguished chairman if the committee would continue to encourage the outpatient VA clinic be established in Gainesville, GA?

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Georgia in this colloquy, and I want to say to the gentleman that I am very sensitive about the problems in Gainesville as well as the problems of veterans who live in rural America.

The gentleman may know that my own district is very much a rural district. In fact, in the desert portion of my territory we can comfortably fit four Eastern States, so I am acutely aware of the distances veterans must travel for care.

Please be assured that the committee continues to want to help veterans in rural areas and will continue to encourage the VA to establish an outpatient clinic in Gainesville, GA.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to applaud the chairman of the subcommittee for the excellent work he has done in crafting a very balanced bill. However, I am concerned that this year's bill before the House does not include funding for the wastewater operator training grants under section 104(g) of the Clean Water Act.

As the chairman knows, this is a program that provides assistance to small communities to help them comply with the demands of the Clean Water Act. I have supported this program in the past and continue to be supportive. I ask the chairman, is it his intent that the administration should continue this program within the funds provided in this bill?

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

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes, it is my intent that the administration continue with this program.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

If the other body specifically includes funding for the program, would the distinguished chairman consider accepting the other body's recommendation?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I very much appreciate the gentleman bringing forward this colloquy, and I want to assure the gentleman that I will not oppose funding for the program if the other body provides it. We are working very closely with the committee in the other body on this matter and matters that are similar.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his assistance on this issue. It is greatly appreciated.

□ 1215

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman and my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and the other members of the subcommittee for their hard work and tireless dedication to producing a bill that is fiscally responsible and good for America's veterans.

This 1997 VA, HUD appropriation bill fulfills a bipartisan commitment, a long-standing bipartisan commitment to the northern California veterans who served our country in the armed services. Specifically, the bill provides for phased construction of a replacement VA medical center at Travis Air Force Base located in Fairfield, CA, in my congressional district. As the gentleman, Mr. LEWIS, knows, there is a great need for an additional acute care medical facility in northern California as a result of the closure of the veterans medical center facility in Martinez, CA, after the 1989 earthquake. Northern California veterans should be able to obtain the necessary medical care within their designated catchment area, and that northern California catchment area includes 400,000-plus military veterans.

Currently the same veterans have to drive up to 8 hours to the nearest medical facility. Last year in the face of se-

vere budgetary pressures and in view of our commitment as the new congressional majority to balancing the Federal budget in 7 years or less, the Congress appropriated \$25 million for a state-of-the-art outpatient clinic at Travis Air Force Base to be located adjacent to the David Grant Medical Center Air Force Hospital.

I viewed these funds as a place holder, an adequate first step that would provide a foundation for additional funding for phased construction of the replacement hospital. The VA will build the replacement hospital adjacent to the existing military hospital at Travis Air Force Base and it will be a coverture between the VA and the Department of Defense. The plan is innovative and an ideal choice since much of the infrastructure is already in place and these two facilities will be able to share medical technology and other high-cost services.

As a veteran myself, I wholly understand the sacrifices made by veterans and their families while serving our country. The replacement VA medical center at Travis represents the fulfillment of a 6-year-old commitment spanning the last two Presidential administrations. The effort to replace the Martinez facility has enjoyed broad bipartisan support in the Congress.

At this time I would like to confirm my understanding with the distinguished subcommittee chairman that funding for phased construction of the replacement VA medical center at Travis Air Force Base in the fiscal year 1997 VA, HUD appropriations bill is at \$57.1 million and that would be the \$25 million from fiscal year 1996, reprogrammed for the replacement hospital, plus an additional \$32.1 million in this bill.

I also wish to confirm that this will provide the Veterans' Administration with full first-year funding to begin phased construction of the hospital.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I must say to the gentleman, I very much appreciate the opportunity to enter into this colloquy with him regarding this very important matter.

The gentleman may be aware of the fact that over 20 years ago, as a result of another earthquake, a major VA hospital that collapsed in southern California. The replacement hospital is located in an area that serves both my district and the district of Congressman GEORGE BROWN and others in southern California. This facility is very important to veterans who live in rural communities, similar to the long distances that Mr. DEAL was talking about earlier.

It is important for the gentleman to know that, the House as well, to know that there is indeed \$57.1 million between the fiscal year 1997 and 1996 VA, HUD appropriations bills to begin phased construction of the replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base. This subcommittee remains and will contin-

ued to be committed to fully funding and completing construction of the replacement Travis Hospital.

I also want to emphasize to my colleague that funding for this hospital at Travis is included in this bill because, to say the least, Mr. RIGGS has been waging a highly intensive campaign on its behalf. Furthermore, that full-phased construction of the Travis Hospital would not be possible, if a place holder for funding had not been adopted by way of a clinic, as we did our work in 1996.

This is a very, very difficult time in terms of funding availability. Earthquake replacement hospitals seem logical but, nonetheless, my colleague has had to struggle because of very scarce dollars. Yet those people who we are committed to serve, especially in rural areas, to deserve this kind of response. I salute the gentleman for his tenacity and dedication as a tireless advocate for his district and northern California veterans.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

I include for the RECORD a newspaper letter to the editor entitled Saluting the Real Heroes in the Drive for a VA Hospital.

[From the Vacaville Reporter, June 22, 1996]  
SALUTING THE REAL HEROES IN THE DRIVE FOR A VA HOSPITAL

REPORTER EDITOR: This is in response to a letter to the editor (The Reporter, June 1) in which the writer states he is not one of Kelli Eberle's veterans and that Congressman Frank Riggs was not effective in obtaining funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital at Travis Air Force Base.

Few have worked longer or harder at securing funding for the VA hospital than Frank Riggs and his efforts at securing funding within his own party have finally been successful.

I would like to ask the writer the following questions:

When is the last time you wrote a letter or called your representative in support of the VA hospital?

When was the last time you attended an Operation VA meeting?

In addition to his efforts in Congress, Frank Riggs has also been in constant contact with Solano County veterans.

The real heroes are: Art Jarrett and Robert Fletcher of the American Legion, who have written thousands of letters and made hundreds of phone calls to veterans organizations and representatives, lobbying for the VA hospital; the city of Fairfield, for having the courage to spend money in support of this project; and the people of Operation VA, who have spent the last four years working and lobbying for the VA hospital.

For the record, one of the most active advocates of the VA hospital is Kelli Eberle. I, and the 30-plus signers of this letter, am proud to have Kelli refer to me as one of "her veterans."

JEFFREY L. JEWELL,  
President, United Veterans Memorial Association, plus 30-plus signers.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] be permitted to offer amendment number 54 on page 64, line 4, a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER: Page 64, after line 4, insert the following new item:

ELIMINATION OF FUNDING FOR CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this title for "Corporation for National and Community Service" is hereby reduced to \$0.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the committee of today, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies and the distinguished ranking member for allowing me to proceed out of order.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today on behalf of taxpayers and concerned citizens in my district and across the country, to appeal to my colleagues to help me defend a wasteful bureaucracy. In addition, there is an even more basic principle at issue here that I will touch on in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to eliminate funding for AmeriCorps and its office of inspector general.

Now before I go any further in explaining my amendment, I want to remind everyone in this Chamber of a very important fact. When the VA/HUD appropriations bill came to the floor last year—it came without any funding for the AmeriCorps Program.

In fact, the VA/HUD appropriations bill also passed the Senate—without any funding for the AmeriCorps Program. It was only in the final omnibus appropriations bill, which was passed and signed into law, that we funded AmeriCorps.

Let's not allow our appropriations bills to be held captive again in order to fund a program that goes against the best interests of this country's fiscal health and our children's future.

I would also like to remind the Members in this Chamber and the American people, that when President Clinton signed into law the National and Community Service Trust Act of 1993, he created one of the largest so-called volunteer service bureaucracies in history—that is, AmeriCorps.

Not only does this program compete with depression-era programs in size, it also competes with the Pentagon in examples of outrageous spending, such as \$900 hammers, and the NEA in ludicrous granting of funds.

AmeriCorps was founded upon President Clinton's idea of a new kind of public-private partnership—whereby the Government splits community service costs with the private sector. However, a 1995 GAO audit found that the agency received little support from the private sector, and instead relied heavily upon public support.

Less than 12 percent of the program's per-participant costs were leveraged from the private sector.

The remaining 88 percent, \$309 million in 1994, was funded by the taxpayers.

The same GAO report shows annual costs can range from about \$22,200 to as high as \$66,715 per participant.

It isn't surprising then that the GAO audit finds volunteers working for Federal agencies cost the public an average of \$31,000 each.

I find it quite a paradox that we are paying individuals to volunteer for the Federal Government.

I would also like to share with the rest of America what they don't always get to hear: That is, AmeriCorps promotes a politically correct agenda, earning it the name "P.C. Corps" by the Washington Monthly.

Taxpayers may be shocked to know that AmeriCorps recruits volunteers such as former gang members and ex-convicts to engage in activities such as teaching sex education to children, providing HIV courses to sixth-graders, and using methods such as a soft-core porn novel to teach character development.

Moreover, after my colleague, Mr. HOEKSTRA, discovered in congressional hearings that much of AmeriCorps' books were unauditible, the House Opportunities Committee began to investigate.

Oddly enough, the committee found a number of questionable grants, including a \$400,000 grant to the AFL-CIO to provide financial management training to AmeriCorps grantees.

And although the act which established the program clearly states that no funding or participant shall be used to directly benefit any partisan political organization, AmeriCorps has predictably funded liberal advocacy groups.

I wonder if the people know that part of a \$1.2 million grant to a local coalition in Denver was used to require AmeriCorps members to distribute campaign-related leaflets opposing a city councilman's re-election bid? Fortunately for the taxpayers, this grant was withdrawn after reports surfaced.

Such flagrant use of taxpayers' dollars does not even take into account that AmeriCorps volunteers often can be seen at administration photo-ops and media events, bearing their now familiar grey AmeriCorps T-shirts and

cheering for President Clinton and Vice President GORE. It's no wonder that the President supports this program, Mr. Chairman.

But there is a larger issue at work here, too. How long do we allow the Federal Government to wrestle away the power of the people to join together out of civic virtue in order to meet our communities' needs?

At what costs to society and liberty do we allow the Federal Government to demean the entire ideal of citizenship by paying workers to volunteer?

My friend, Balint Vazsonyi says, "The spirit of voluntarism is being choked by coercion." Mr. Chairman, I couldn't agree more. Our Government wants to replace active civic compassion with coercive community service programs.

We need to support the kind of civic virtue that promotes private voluntarism—not the kind that is bought with Federal tax dollars by a government that crushes the spirit of citizenship and undermines the value of personal and civic responsibility.

Finally, with soaring budget deficits and a more than \$5 trillion national debt, I am standing up for the taxpayers who cannot support such a proposition any longer.

I believe it was Representative HOEKSTRA who wrote in regard to AmeriCorps: "Like many Washington programs, good intentions and bad philosophy equal wasted money and disappointing results." Mr. Chairman, AmeriCorps boils down to nothing more than a Federal jobs program. It must be eliminated on the basis of economics and principle.

That is why I am asking all of my colleagues to support this amendment to eliminate AmeriCorps funding.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member who seeks recognition in opposition to the amendment?

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment to take all of the money out of the AmeriCorps program. I think we made substantial progress this year by putting this money in and avoiding the veto that we received last year of this legislation. This is a program that the President has initiated. It is a program that he feels is a national program to help the young people of this Nation be active in terms of the kind of jobs that they perform on behalf of the Nation, and they proceed to acquire their educations.

I think it is important for us to look at the fact that this is a bipartisan program. I think AmeriCorps takes a great deal of pride in the fact that it is bipartisan. Two-thirds of the AmeriCorps programs are chosen by governor-appointed State commissions, three-fifths of which are headed by Republicans to address local needs.

It is a program that works. An evaluation of the AmeriCorps programs found that just one-tenth of AmeriCorps members taught 23,641 students, tutored 24,867 individuals, mentored 14,878 youth, helped 2,551 homeless people find shelter, planted more than 210,000 trees, collected, organized, and distributed 974,103 pounds of food and 5,000 pounds of clothes, developed and distributed 38,546 sets of information about drug abuse, street safety, health care, and other issues.

□ 1230

They also ran violence prevention, after-school programs for 49,632 youth, performed energy audits for more than 18 million square feet of buildings, levied 69,369 hours of service by unstipended volunteers.

In addition to it, I think one of the factors that is very important is that a recent 1995 GAO report concluded that AmeriCorps almost tripled the amount it was required to raise from noncorporation sources in its first year. Congress directed AmeriCorps programs to raise \$31 million. They raised \$91 million. Of this amount, \$41 million, a figure more than the amount required from all sources, came from the private sector alone. We think this financial support proves that leaders at the local level across the country feel that AmeriCorps is an effective way to meet the needs of their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any greater investment that we can have than the amount of money we are putting into investing in the young people of this country. They are the future of this country. As we move into the year 2000, the 21st century, it seems to me that we ought to be doing more to equip our young people for the future leadership that we are going to give them for this country.

I would urge the Members to reject the gentleman's amendment and vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

My colleagues, I must say that this is the first occasion, at least in my recollection, that I have seen the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] present an amendment on the floor, at least on one of my bills. I must say, as I was watching him make that presentation, he reminded me of one of my brothers, and I wondered what he was doing here, a younger brother, I might mention, Mr. HOSTETTLER. Unfortunately, for that and other reasons, I rise reluctantly to oppose the amendment by my colleague.

I do realize that not all the Members of the House support the AmeriCorps program. There are a couple of other potential amendments that would impact funding of the corporation as well. I know that Members may differ as to why they do not support the AmeriCorps program.

I personally have felt from our first involvement in this program that we needed to carefully evaluate its effectiveness. We are in the midst of trying to continue to move forward on that evaluation at this very moment. I believe the program has merit and deserves a chance to prove itself. I am also very sensitive to some of the questions that have been raised by my colleague. He particularly mentioned one that involved campaign activity, which I must say, if it did actually take place, would be against the law. I am sure the corporation is not advocating that sort of activity. However, some young person could have found themselves in excess, and we want to review that sort of activity with great care.

As stated in a committee report, there is need for a further independent evaluation of this program. But lack of further evaluation does not warrant eliminating the program, at least at this point.

I also believe that Senator Wofford, who is making beneficial modifications to the program, has provided a good deal of energy and time, not just working on the program, but communicating to us about his efforts. Zeroing out the funding for the Corporation for National and Community Service simply ignores the experience of this past year. There is no way that I can see where this bill can be signed into law without funding for the corporation. I mean it made the bill veto bait doing the fiscal year 1996 debate.

So let me suggest to my colleagues that there are two points here. First, the House has been very responsive to the work of the committee dealing with a very, very difficult series of Federal responsibilities, balancing one program or agency against another. At this point in time, I don't believe that we should inject an item that would very likely lead to a veto of all this work. It does not matter to me specifically in terms of the level of funding, but indeed to zero out the program would help none of us in the final analysis.

We have been down this road before; I do not wish and do not believe the leadership wants to have last year's fight all over again. Mr. Stokes and I both want this bill to be signed. I think it is a bill the President will be able to sign when we get through the conference, and so I urge the Members on that basis and others to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, this is a program that, I think, is a little misguided. It is a failed Government program. It does follow the liberal mantra of the need for perceived voluntarism in America. Whenever there is a problem, let us come up with a program, and once again we have done that with our Federal Government. But it sends such a confusing message.

The American College Dictionary says a volunteer is someone, and I quote, someone who does charitable work or helpful work without pay, end of quote. Well, AmeriCorps pays people even while there are 89.2 million Americans, according to the independent survey conducted in 1994, 89.2 million Americans 18 and over volunteer about 4.2 hours per week, and yet we have a program here that pays volunteers \$31,000 per year. That is \$15.65 per hour. It includes health insurance; it includes a stipend to go to college. It is not the type of voluntarism that is the American tradition.

It also takes money away from programs that could be very valuable like Pell grants or like money for volunteers. People have actually risked their lives for this country, and yet they get better benefits by being a paid volunteer. And where do these people work? Well, 1,200 of these AmeriCorps volunteers are at the Department of Ag, 525 are at the Interior Department, 210 at the Justice Department, 135 at the EPA, 60 at the National Endowment for the Arts.

Another example is the political activity during the Summer of Safety, quote unquote, program in San Francisco. They were out there campaigning against the three strikes and you're out provision in the crime bill.

This is what President Clinton called citizenship at its best. I think most taxpayers disagree.

Although I respect the goals of the young men and women who are involved in the AmeriCorps, I admire the other 89.2 million Americans who truly volunteer without pay. They volunteer their time, they volunteer their energy and their spirit. Let us not fool ourselves and the American people into believing that AmeriCorps has anything to do with true voluntarism or true citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a commitment to both true spirit of voluntarism and to reducing the Federal deficit. I support its adoption.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 1½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we be given 10 additional minutes to be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes on each side?

Mr. STOKES. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the idea of terminating AmeriCorps is perhaps appealing if one does not know the issues, but it is very dangerous and unwise if the facts are analyzed which are involved here.

Thousands of young Americans have been educated and benefited by this; enormous public good has been achieved by the program. The program is cost effective. It pays back better than \$1.54 to \$3.90 for every dollar that is invested. It has generated thousands of volunteer hours by nonparticipants. It has come in well below the costs per participants, better than a thousand dollars less per participant. It raised \$41 million in the private sector during the first year alone.

This is something which appeals to Republican Governors. Governor Engler, Governor Weld, Governor Wilson, Governor Merrill all support AmeriCorps. Religious groups, the Catholic Network of Volunteer Service, the Episcopal Church, Aguda Israel of America and more support AmeriCorps. Corporations like General Motors, IBM, Microsoft, American Express, Nike, Tenneco, Bell South, U.S. Health Care, Home Depot support AmeriCorps. Even the wives of our Presidential candidates, Hillary Clinton and, to my Republican colleagues I would observe, Elizabeth Dole, support this program.

In Michigan alone it has stimulated the creation of some 13 major programs. Better than 400 participants a year are involved in this, and the work on behalf of the State of Michigan has been productive indeed.

Why then would we want to terminate a program which is showing such tremendous success on behalf of the people? Why would we want to terminate a program which has such widespread beneficial consequences and such enthusiastic support of prominent and responsible Americans? I cannot conceive of a reason. Perhaps someone can better that.

I urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. HOSTETTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN].

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment because I strongly support balancing the Federal budget by ending wasteful Government spending.

Mr. Chairman, the AmeriCorps Program is just that, a wasteful Government program. The Hostettler amend-

ment will end the boondoggle that the AmeriCorps Program has stood for, and I believe it will end it once and for all.

We have worked very hard to balance the budget these last 2 years, and I do not believe that we have a dime to spare for the feel good programs that do not really have any purpose. Ending AmeriCorps is the right thing to do.

Let us look at the facts. AmeriCorps costs the U.S. taxpayer a breathtaking \$600 million a year. That is over \$21,000 a year per volunteer, with more than half the money drained away by the bloated administrative costs.

What do grantees get out of this? Well, besides a very heartwarming experience they could do for free, they get \$5,000 toward their college education. Well, I am all in favor of encouraging college education, which is why my Republican colleagues and I voted to increase the student loan program, but AmeriCorps manages to spend \$21,000 to give young people a \$5,000 grant for college. Well, would it not make more sense just to hand over the \$5,000 without spending the other \$16,000? Instead, President Clinton, instead of cutting this program, he wants to expand it. Yes, he would like to spend \$6 billion over the next 5 years expanding this program.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Corporation for the National Service, which oversees the AmeriCorps Program, spends millions of dollars for contracts to provide, quote, training to its grantees. Who does that training? Well, a \$400,000 contract to the AFL-CIO, the big Washington labor bosses who provide the financial management training. Well, how interesting. From this program alone our Nation is handing out \$400,000 to the labor bosses who are trying to buy Congress for themselves and the liberals that they favor. No wonder the President and his liberal followers enjoy the AmeriCorps Program so much. It doles out money to liberal groups that lobby for his reelection and for his liberal policies.

An editorial entitled "AmeriCorps Programs Should End," in my local paper, the Omaha World-Herald, put it best. It says the program will teach a new contingent of young Americans the glories of landing on the public payroll, thereby carrying on a Democratic tradition of more Government, more benefits, and more make-work jobs. That is the editorial out of the Omaha World Herald, July 18, 1995.

The article is as follows:

[From the Omaha World Herald, July 18, 1995]

#### AMERICORPS PROGRAM SHOULD END

Sen. Charles Grassley of Iowa has looked again at the numbers behind President Clinton's AmeriCorps program and come to an inescapable conclusion: The program should be ended.

It is a costly boondoggle. It costs an average of \$27,000 for each volunteer, Grassley said, using figures from the General Accounting Office. More than half the spending is on administration.

The five-year program consumes \$600 million a year, Grassley said, and involves 20,000

"volunteers," who are paid a salary and provided medical benefits, child care and tuition waivers. They are assigned to government agencies or nonprofit organizations. Clinton has said he wants the program to expand every year until 100,000 people are enrolled. He has estimated the cost at \$6 billion over five years.

All that to deliver a college-tuition certificate worth less than \$5,000 to each participant. If the goal were merely to hand out tuition money, it could obviously be achieved more efficiently by putting the money in an envelope and mailing it to anyone who managed to be accepted by a college or university.

As government programs go, this one is spectacularly inefficient and breathtakingly expensive.

Defenders contend that the program has much more to it than merely the distribution of tuition assistance. It is intended to "re-knit community," they contend, although exactly how the program will re-knit anything has yet to be explained. More probably, the program will teach a new contingent of young Americans the glories of landing on the public payroll, thereby carrying on the Democratic tradition of more government, more benefits and more make-work jobs.

But taxpayers seem to be getting tired of all that. Witness what happened Nov. 8 to the make-up of both the House and the Senate. So Congress may have a better idea about whether re-knitting communities with a national service corps should be among the highest priorities.

Facts such as those highlighted by Grassley provide effective ammunition against the program. It only remains for Congress to consider again the message that voters conveyed so emphatically last November—and then act on it.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment because it makes the right choice in ending a wasteful Government program. That is the necessary step in our fight for a balanced budget.

As my colleagues know, it would be nice to turn volunteers back into what they originally were meant to be, and that is a volunteer, and as the gentleman from Wichita, KS [Mr. TIAHRT] said, a volunteer is someone who works without pay.

□ 1245

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN].

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hostettler amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague's amendment is misguided and shortsighted. We should be engaged in expanding AmeriCorps, not in its elimination.

Almost 3 years ago, when Congress created the AmeriCorps Program, we expected great things from national service. The Congress expected AmeriCorps to help communities meet their public service needs with real results.

We expected AmeriCorps to unite individuals from different backgrounds in the common effort to improve our communities.

We expected AmeriCorps to encourage its members to explore and exercise their responsibilities to their communities, their families, and themselves.

Today, almost 2 years after the first 20,000 AmeriCorps members hit the field in over 1,000 communities across the country, the Corporation for National Service and its AmeriCorps Program has met every one of these expectations. And in many cases, it's exceeded them.

The essence of the Republican opposition lies in the fact that they don't want to support something so closely identified with President Clinton, especially something that's been proven as successful as AmeriCorps. Mr. HOSTETTLER, and the rest of my Republican colleagues know that the President will veto this bill if this amendment passes.

I believe that the attacks on AmeriCorps are not based on merit. In 1995, the General Accounting Office reported on the status the National Service programs.

In the GAO's year-long review of AmeriCorps the GAO confirmed the corporation's statements about its funding for each AmeriCorps member.

The GAO said that the corporation's resources total about \$17,600 per member. In testimony before the Congress earlier this year, the corporation projected its costs at approximately \$18,800 per member. This is precisely in line with what the Congress directed the program to spend. The GAO also saw accomplishments that are consistent with the purpose of the national service legislation, concluding that AmeriCorps is fulfilling the mission we gave it in all of its detail and complexity.

Finally, the GAO's figures show that the AmeriCorps programs have far exceeded anyone's expectations regarding their ability to raise nontaxpayers' dollars to support their programs. Congress told AmeriCorps that it had to meet our commitment to national service with \$31 million in locally based matching funds this year. From the private sector alone, the AmeriCorps programs raised \$41 million. Every cent of this money came from private donations—not taxpayer dollars—from individuals and over 600 companies and foundations. The decision on whether or not to continue national service will tell us a lot about ourselves. We should put partisan politics aside. Let's work together to continue to provide young people an opportunity to help themselves, as they help our communities and learn service as a way of life. AmeriCorps has kept its promise to the American people. The Congress should, too.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think it is noteworthy that this is being sponsored and spoken for primarily by the freshman Republicans in this House of Representatives. Those who have followed their agenda over the last year and a half will not be surprised that they would come out for an amendment to end AmeriCorps.

This amendment is mean-spirited. This amendment is cynical. This amendment says to young men and women who are willing to give a year or two of their lives in public service for the lowest wages, with the chance at the end of it that they will get a

\$5,000 scholarship, they are saying that this is wasteful. Wasteful. Wasteful, that these young men and women would take the personal responsibility for their own lives and futures, and be willing to give back to this country?

Mr. Chairman, this is the same spirit that motivated the Peace Corps under President Kennedy, to say to young men and women, step forward, serve your country, do something, and we will be proud of you, and you will be proud of your experience. But these freshman Republicans will hear none of that. For them, it is a liberal boondoggle. They have forgotten, many of them, how many times they have had to turn to the Government for college student loans.

We should vote against this amendment and stand up for the idealism that this program represents.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, asked us to give one reason why AmeriCorps should be eliminated. I can think of many. Perhaps let us go back to what the President said he was going to give us when he promised us AmeriCorps: a well-run, businesslike program; a national service corporation which will run like a big venture capital outfit, not like a bureaucracy.

This year we had oversight hearings. We had oversight hearings because we asked Arthur Andersen, the auditors who took a look at AmeriCorps, to tell us what they found. Over \$300 million of taxpayer funding per year. The auditors came back and said this corporation that was going to be the benchmark for the private sector, the corporation lacks strong management controls, the corporation lacks data integrity, the corporation lacks data security, the corporation has failed to segregate accounting duties, the corporation lacks budgetary controls, the corporation could not prepare reliable financial statements. The bottom line: The benchmark of Government service is a program whose books are not auditable.

Mr. Chairman, stopping a program like that is not mean-spirited; it is realistic, and it is being good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars. The problem with AmeriCorps is, yes, those radical Republican freshmen, they have a vision for service. They know what makes America great. The authentic American spirit is, in 1993, 89.2 million American adults volunteered in this country. They gave on an average of 4.2 hours per week, or 19 billion hours of total service, with an estimated value of \$182 billion.

Americans also contributed \$126 billion in charitable causes. This is in addition to the \$324 billion the American people spent on assistance to the poor in Federal, State, and local taxes. We have a great volunteer spirit.

The problem in Washington, Mr. Chairman, is that we think Washington defines voluntarism. We believe that the bureaucracies on Independence Avenue, which is more like Dependence Avenue, that they are better equipped to define volunteers; that this faceless bureaucrat in Washington can better define what needs to happen at the local level in voluntarism; that we ask American taxpayers not to send money to charities directly, because they cannot make that decision, send it to Washington so we can make that decision for them, so we can be the bureaucrat that says, "This charity in your community deserves support. This one does not."

End this program. Move decision-making back to where it should be, back to the local citizens, back to the taxpayers. Let them decide which charities to support, not the Federal Government, which cannot even keep its own books.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to offer a different perspective on the same set of hearings we just heard commented about. The amendment, which would eliminate funding for AmeriCorps, ignores the steps that have been taken to answer the concerns that have been raised and that were investigated at that series of hearings. We heard about the progress to correct the shortcomings. While I initially shared many of the concerns we have heard discussed here about cost overruns or potential political abuses, we have found that even the strongest critics from the other body have worked out a 10-point program which the director presented at these hearings to deal with the AmeriCorps Program and to strengthen its administration, based on its start-up experience.

We had hearings on the financial standards, and in fact the director came in and made a commitment to working with the inspector general, with the auditors, Arthur Andersen and Williams, Adley, to correct its financial weakness. In fact, one of the opponents to this, one of the critics of the program from the Financial Executives Institute at this hearing gave away his time and decided not to use his prepared statement after hearing the director's testimony. Instead, he offered his assistance to the Corporation for National Service, based on the trust that he had seen pledged there.

"I think there is a sincere desire to do this now," he said, to work this out, "and I will pledge whatever resources my committee and FEI has to help the organization achieve what is within reach," and that is a clean audit. But do not leave it to me to suggest this.

Let me just close by suggesting what the Governor of Massachusetts, Republican Bill Weld, said of AmeriCorps: "It



is a fine deal all the way around, and possibly one of the most intelligence uses of taxpayer dollars ever."

In the words of Republican Governor John Engler of Michigan, he said, "AmeriCorps captures the promise found in all citizens, young and old, who see the problem in their communities and work together to solve those problems." This is community-driven, community decisionmaking, and community problem-solving from the grass-roots up. We should do no less with AmeriCorps itself. I urge that we reject the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For clarification purposes, the Chair would like to indicate, for the dividing of time, since the unanimous-consent request for the additional 5 minutes on both sides was made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the Chair granted the additional 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio and to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

That being the case, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 1½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 1½ minutes remaining and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has the right to close.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I met with a number of high school students out on the House steps. They had a lot of questions, particularly as it pertained to the deficit. I reminded them about my record and I told them about my priority: Education. I was a cosponsor of this bill when it first came up several years ago. It sounded like a wonderful idea.

But we have spent more than \$1 billion so far and it just has not worked. In fact, the statistics have come out and said that it is an average of about \$26,000 a student. That is not worth it. As we look at education, the needs for parents today to send their kids, sons and daughters, on to higher education, it is important that those doors are open, but not at \$26,000 a student. We can find a lot of Pentagon coffee pots to buy before we buy a pig in a poke like this program here. I would just urge my colleagues to support this amendment. We have tried it for a couple of years. It has not worked.

As I have talked to my students and families in higher education institutions, there is not a lot of love for this program. It does not work. We need to be surgeons here, particularly with the deficit we have today. We need to weed out programs that do not work. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes".

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hostettler amend-

ment. In just 2 years, AmeriCorps has made it possible for thousands of young people to realize the dream of an affordable college education. AmeriCorps participants earn part of their tuition by working in their communities.

In my district, AmeriCorps members are protecting the environment in the Berkshires, under the direction of those Berkshire County communities. They are tutoring low-income students in Gardner, and they are working with the police department on community policing and elder abuse protection, the Triad Program, in Holyoke. At a time when college costs are skyrocketing, AmeriCorps presents a good way for students to earn money to pay their tuition while working in their communities.

To quote again from the Republican Governor of my State, and I quote, "The Federal Government shouldn't pass up the opportunity national service represents to help people help themselves." I urge a no vote on the amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] to close.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by pointing out a few things. A vote for this amendment is not a vote against volunteerism. Let me highlight what the American Heritage College Dictionary says that a volunteer is. A volunteer is a person who performs or offers to perform a service of his or her own free will, or to do charitable or helpful work without pay.

It was alleged earlier that weaknesses have been taken care of as a result of some work done inside the corporation, but I need to point out that since that hearing, that there has only been action to take care of 9 of 33 material weaknesses in the corporation. Usually with one of those situations, any other corporation would be out of business.

It was also alleged earlier that for some reason freshmen of the House, of the Republican side of this House, have offered this initiative. The fact is that we are freshmen, and by the very nature of that term, we have been out in the real world before we came to Congress, before we came to this Capitol Hill address. We have seen real volunteerism at work. We have seen, and we know the statistics are true, that 90 million Americans every year volunteer. This is a vote for fiscal soundness and not against volunteerism.

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

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members of the House to defeat this amendment. Some in the well a few moments ago said we need more surgeons here. I disagree with the gentleman. We need to train more of our young people in America today to be surgeons. We need to make a greater investment in the young people in this country.

I would hope that today the Members of this House will show that they have

great faith in our young people in this country, and want to give them the chance and the opportunity by defeating this amendment. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I simply ask the Members for a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to decrease AmeriCorps funding.

The AmeriCorps National Service Program gives Americans of all backgrounds the opportunity to serve our country and defray the cost of a college education. It is not a wasteful program, as some critics contend, unless you truly believe that public service and increased educational opportunity are wasteful.

In response to Mr. HOSTETTLER's contention that the AmeriCorps Program represents coercive volunteerism, I remind him that members of the U.S. armed services are also compensated financially and are praised, as they should be, for their volunteer efforts to protect and defend our country.

AmeriCorps members increase volunteerism. Harris Wofford and the Corporation for National Service are committed to maintaining a cost-effective, productive program through public-private partnership.

This innovative program has produced impressive results in increased volunteerism and access to higher education. More than 20,000 AmeriCorps participants each year have met needs in communities while realizing the dream of a college education. This program represents a solid investment in our young people, who represent the future of America.

In a Congress determined to slash education funding, we must recognize the AmeriCorps Program as a student financial aid program that reaps significant rewards for local communities.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, here they go again. As NEWT GINGRICH and his Republican leadership team slash Federal funding in such critical areas as education, the environment, and housing, they often refer to the growing need for nonprofit charitable and religious organizations to take on more responsibility in meeting critical needs in these areas. At the same time they are calling for these institutions to shoulder a greater burden, however, they are intent on destroying one of the newest and most innovative resources such groups have to increase their capacity to handle these additional responsibilities.

The AmeriCorps Program strengthens traditional volunteering. From the Boys and Girls Clubs to the YMCA, America's largest and most respected volunteer organizations all utilize and vigorously support AmeriCorps. Habitat for Humanity, one of Speaker GINGRICH's favorite nonprofits, has become an enthusiastic partner of AmeriCorps. They've experienced first hand how the full-time sustained presence of AmeriCorps members helps them accomplish more, while at the same time teaching them to use occasional volunteers more effectively.

In my congressional district, this partnership was used to create LEAP—Leadership, Education, and Athletics in Partnership [LEAP]. LEAP was designated an AmeriCorps Program by the Corporation for National and Community Service in August. LEAP helps about 1,000 inner-city children build their

learning skills through mentoring and community support.

LEAP is best known for its summer program. During the summer, college and high school students serve as counselors in public housing developments where the kids whom they counsel live. The program has both academic and social components. The kids spend 3 days a week in a classroom environment. They learn things such as swimming, photography, and the like.

Participating college students are from New Haven area colleges. The high school students are all from New Haven public schools and, in most cases, serve their own, or nearby, neighborhoods.

With a grant from AmeriCorps, contributions from individuals, private and corporate foundation and other grants, LEAP's budget has doubled. And for every 900 hours of service to AmeriCorps, students receive \$2,300 toward their student loans or college tuition payments.

AmeriCorps enhances the work of traditional volunteer organizations, while allowing them to significantly expand their reach and enhance their accomplishments. Charities and religious institutions—the backbone of the voluntary sector in America—view AmeriCorps as a tool to increase their capacity to deal with social problems.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the tide of funding cuts to programs that help our Nation's kids. Vote against the Hostettler amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am certain most of our colleagues remember the bruising fight waged last year in an attempt to end funding for the AmeriCorps Program.

I am equally certain that most of our colleagues remember the loud public outcry and the Presidential veto which occurred once that misguided priority was passed by the Congress.

And lastly, I am perfectly certain that most of our colleagues remember the large bipartisan majority who eventually voted to increase AmeriCorps funding. While some of my colleagues may have voted "yes" in an effort to keep the Government open, I voted "yes" because I believe AmeriCorps is a vital example of the good work Government can do.

The gentleman from Indiana has offered an amendment to reverse this bipartisan agreement to preserve AmeriCorps. It also would reverse the efforts of the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee to provide the funding needed to sustain this program. Both of these committees have voted in support of funding the well-run, highly popular AmeriCorps Program.

I plan on following the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. I will vote to continue funding for AmeriCorps, with my only regret being that difficult budget circumstances make it unlikely that Congress can provide the full amount this program deserves.

I hope that, at minimum, the 399 Members who voted in favor of increasing AmeriCorp funding in last year's Omnibus Appropriations bill join me once again in support of this worthwhile program.

The question raised by the gentleman from Indiana remains: Can our country afford to reward voluntarism in this period of fiscal austerity? My answer, and the answer of the appropriators is "yes," which is why we have before us a program that will return as much as almost \$4 to the taxpayers for every dollar spent.

Investing in AmeriCorps volunteers, produces homes in poor neighborhoods, feeds the hungry, shelters the homeless, cleans the cities and towns, teaches the uneducated.

Investing in AmeriCorp volunteers, produces a core of educated youth who have learned a strong dedication to their fellow Americans with sweat and toil.

Mr. Chairman, with that education, and that volunteer ethic, AmeriCorp participants are going on to make our country a more prosperous, and more compassionate, place to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTTLER].

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the nose appeared to have it.

Mr. HOSTETTTLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 456, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTTLER] will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. DURBIN: Page 65, line 16, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Page 66, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I just have an explanation? I believe my amendment was up next.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, I thought I had spoken to the chairman of the committee.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would tell the gentleman, it is a matter of other business taking place around the Capitol that is very important now. If we have a series of votes now, that will not help that process, so we are going to delay the vote on this and the gentleman's amendment will follow.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. The agreement is my amendment will come up after the vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTTLER].

Mr. LEWIS of California. The logic is that if that should pass, there is not a need for a lot of other amendments.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

□ 1300

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment which I offer restores \$1.5 million for the Environmental Protection Agency for a program known as the Toxic Release Inventory. To put this in layman's terms, we are talking about chemicals. We all understand from our human experience that chemicals are very important. They are important of course in medicine, they are important of course in our commerce, and they are important in our daily lives. But we also realize that chemicals can be dangerous, and toxic chemicals by definition are dangerous in nature.

So in 1988, we said to the Environmental Protection Agency under this Toxic Release Inventory Program that they should monitor the toxic chemicals across the United States to determine whether or not they are being discharged in a way that might cause a serious public health problem.

This was a program which over the years was applauded, not only by those in government, environmental groups, and consumer groups, but even by responsible business groups who realized that they had to be good corporate citizens. They did not want to misuse toxic chemicals and cause cancer, learning disabilities, any type of deformities that might result from their misuse.

It was interesting when we passed this toxic release, community right-to-know law that many of the major chemical companies in the United States announced that they accepted the challenge from the Federal Government: They would announce the release of their toxic chemicals into the environment, and they went a step further, large companies did, and said, we are going to set out to dramatically diminish the release of toxic chemicals.

So, since this program was put in effect in 1988, it has been estimated that the release of toxic chemicals in communities and cities and locals across the United States has been reduced over 40 percent. Why? Quite simply, because many of these businesses faced with disclosure, faced with the requirement to report to the Environmental Protection Agency were much more careful.

This is a good program. It is one which major companies subscribe to and understand to be part of their responsibility as American citizens. Yet,

the Republicans again this year, as last year, come forward in an effort to stop this program, to cut the funds from the Toxic Release Inventory, the community right-to-know program.

I say to my colleagues, this is a mistake; \$1.5 million in a bill of this magnitude is a very small amount. This is an effort by a special interest group, and I would say a very selfish special interest group, which does not want to report to the American people what is happening to toxic chemicals in the workplace.

Now, that is not fair. It is not fair to the families which count on this reporting so that they know whether the drinking water which they are using in a community is safe, whether the emissions out of a smokestack near the community are safe; it is not fair to the workers at the place of employment who basically should know whether or not they are being exposed to toxic chemicals every day; and it is not fair to the local units of government who should be advised as to whether or not there are toxic chemicals on the premises. If there is a fire, a hurricane, a tornado, an earthquake, the local mayor, the police department, the fire department have a right to know whether toxic chemicals are being used.

This effort by the Republicans to cut money for this program is very shortsighted. The people across America understand that the era of big government is over, but families across America count on our government to protect them from invisible dangers and threats. Each time we drink a glass of water in our home communities, we expected it to be pure and safe. We hope that some governmental unit is protecting our family to make sure there is not an unseen danger in that drinking water.

This effort, this Republican effort to stop the community right-to-know legislation, to stop the Toxic Release Inventory strikes a dagger at the heart of the relationship between families and their government. We have got to make sure that families have that confidence. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment which restores the money to the Environmental Protection Agency.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have not made up my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, there is 10 minutes reserved on each side, 10 minutes for and 10 minutes against.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take 5 minutes of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to focus just for a moment, for I do not rise in opposition to this amendment. In fact, I intend to suggest to my colleagues that we accept this amendment.

However, before doing that, I would like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] to note that I had the privilege in my past life to serve in the California State legislature as chairman of an air quality subcommittee. There I led the fight of a very, very important and early environmental battle. It led to the creation of the toughest air quality management district in the entire country, one that has served as a model for the country.

I know from that experience and others that work on behalf of the environment has absolutely nothing to do with partisan politics. I have heard the gentleman today on the floor consistently inject Republican versus Democrat on issues that are critical to the American people and have nothing to do with politics, especially partisan politics.

So, I am very disconcerted by that pattern of the gentleman to try to partisanize almost every issue that comes to the floor.

Having said that, we need effective and adequate reporting. There has been dramatic decreases in the problem we are dealing with here, and it is time to consider readjusting. Timing is the question. I would urge the gentleman to restrain himself in terms of creating polarization around here when the environment is best served by our working together and recognizing that we are all concerned about our environment.

So, I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] that I am willing to accept this amendment, if he feels the same.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

First, I want to express to him my acknowledgment of the fact that even prior to coming to this body, he had an outstanding record in terms of environmental laws which he enacted during the time he served in the California legislature.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. I am quite aware of, and I am sure that other Members of this body are quite aware of, your concerns and your distinguished record in that area.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. I also want to say that in terms of the Durbin amendment, on its merits, I support fully the amendment, and I am pleased to join with the chairman in the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say to my friend from California, I did not suggest that your record on the environment is at issue here. I do suggest that this provision of the bill of which you are the chairman is at issue here, and I think it is a very important one. And though the gentleman may have an exemplary record, I do not question that you do, I do believe that this amendment is shortsighted, and I believe what it attempts to do really is not in the best interests of protecting our environment.

I hope the gentleman does not take that personally. It is a political difference between us, and the gentleman from California suggested at the outset that he may support my amendment, and I thank him for that. I welcome him aboard.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to say that filling out a form does not do an awful lot necessarily for the environment, but that really is not the point. Indeed, it is my judgment that in this country and often in this body, our very positive work on behalf of the environment has become swept up in the polarization of the entire place. We work best in this subject area when the House comes together and recognizes that all of us care about the air, all of us care about clean water. Hand in hand, working together, we can take this issue out of the hands of the shrill voices, the extremes on the one hand who want to do absolutely nothing, and the extremes on the other hand that would like to use this for some population or no-growth policy of their own.

The environment is most critical to all of our existence, and working together, separate from partisanship, is the most helpful step that I could imagine we could take. I encourage the gentleman to help us participate in that direction.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and I would say that if I misinterpreted the gentleman's position, it may have been because of the vote in the committee. When my amendment came up before the committee, there was not a single Republican supporting the amendment which I have brought to the floor today. It was not a totally partisan rollcall, because some Democrats opposed my position, but not a single Republican supported my position in committee.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I would suggest to the gentleman that even in committee, if we reserve partisan rhetoric, we get different kinds of results.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that I will reserve all the rhetoric necessary in order to achieve the

results that we are talking about today.

I would just like to say in closing, and I think the gentleman has indicated that he is going to be supportive of this amendment, that we have several things that should be taken into consideration.

There are responsible businesses in this country which support community right-to-know. There are responsible businesses in this country which support the Toxic Release Inventory. When one can have the head of Dow Chemical Co. say of this law that mandatory disclosure has done more than all other legislation put together in getting companies to voluntarily reduce emissions of toxic chemicals, we know this program works. This program should be funded.

We also have comments from Monsanto, and this is an interesting comment: The law is having an incredible effect on industries to reduce emissions. There is not a chief executive officer around who wants to be the biggest polluter in his State. We know that if disclosure is out there, it works.

I hope that my colleague from California and my colleague from Ohio will not only agree to this amendment, but also do their best to preserve this when it comes to conference. This is an important program, important not only for the EPA, but more important for families and for the workers and for the communities who rely upon it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to speak in favor of the amendment offered to restore the funding for the Toxic Release Inventory.

I really believe our constituents and our families and our workers have a right to know what toxic releases are being released into the environment. Some 10 years ago, in reflecting upon what the gentleman from California said, we in Massachusetts adopted a program of right-to-know that passed and has been implemented, and since that time there has been a reduction of millions of tons of toxic chemicals which previously had been emitted into the atmosphere and into the streams. In many instances, the companies have been able to find ways that are cheaper and better, both for the environment and for their company operations to function.

So I certainly support this amendment, and I am glad that the gentleman from California is going to accept it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Durbin amendment. This amendment is about individual rights and Government of the People. This amendment may provide funding for the EPA, but its really about funding the greatest source of environmental protection we have—an informed citizenry.

The right to know provision was passed in my State of Massachusetts by referendum. The people decided they wanted it—and they got it. But today this Congress is saying that we know better. That it might be bad for business. That its better to keep people in the dark. Well, what justice Brandeis said back in 1913 is just as true today: sunlight is the best disinfectant.

Right to know simply says that the factory down the street ought to be neighborly. Just like a good neighbor puts up a beware of the dog sign, a good neighboring factory ought to inform its neighbors just what's coming out of the smokestack.

Imagine—just yesterday we all agreed that people ought to have the right to know what's in their drinking water, but today this House says they do not have the right to know which chemicals their kids are breathing in their own backyards.

The freedom of speech requires the freedom of information. Rather than causing unnecessary alarm about the unknown—let's allow people to make informed assessments.

Is it too much to ask for industry to be a good corporate citizen? This bill eliminates industry's personal responsibility.

This public disclosure calls for corporations to have some public accountability. This amendment says that corporations have a duty not only to respond to their shareholders—but also to their workers and neighbors.

Furthermore, many companies would be the first to admit that such accounting often leads to their discovering trouble spots and focusing their attention on that which might be otherwise ignored. I believe that most corporations want to be able to address community concerns.

These funds are for Outreach, Data Quality, and Training in the Community Right to Know Program. Companies want this so that the citizenry can make informed statements without relying on the unknown which can often lead to unwarranted mass hysteria.

Often the Right To Know Program has led to corporations voluntarily reducing emissions, often saving money, and exceeding Federal standards.

I urge my colleagues to support the public's right to know.

Mr. DURBIN. Could I ask the Chair if there is any time remaining that has not been yielded back beyond the 45 seconds of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining of the 5 minutes. There are still 5 minutes unallocated.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I intend to use my time.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I had not intended that we have this discussion since we were going to accept the amendment. We obviously are going forward with discussion. So I think it is important to say in response to my colleague that EPA is now moving into phase 3 of their implementation of TRI. Part of this phase is the expansion of the TRI to several more industries and hundreds of additional substances.

□ 1315

The reporting requirements and cost to business for this will be enormous. However, the committee's action to reduce TRI by \$1.5 million was not intended to affect this issue.

The reduction was taken to prohibit EPA from moving into the collection of toxic use data which is also part of their phase 3 plans. As we stated in this year's report, in last year's report, and in the 1996 conference report, collection of toxic use data is not authorized by law. The authorizing committees of the House and the Senate agree on this position.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, since the chairman, the ranking member and others have all accepted this, I just want to thank them for that. I do believe this is a very important amendment.

I just want to give an example from my State to show that this is not only important to the community at large but also for businesses, because in New Jersey the information from the toxic release inventory has actually been used in order for companies to streamline their permitting process. In cases where we have had, say, 30 permits that had to be granted to a company, sometimes now there is only one because of the information that has been provided. So it is not only good government, if you will, from the point of view of the right to know and the community's right to know, but also for business's right to know because oftentimes they can use that information also to their advantage in terms of streamlining the permitting process.

I just wanted to again thank the gentleman from Illinois for introducing this. I think that every effort that we make to increase right to know is important to this Congress and to the public in general.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments at this point?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment 39 to a portion of the bill not yet read. I have talked to both the chairman and the ranking member to accommodate their schedules.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. ROEMER: In the item relating to "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$75,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the committee of today, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and a Member in opposition will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments. One amendment would be to totally eliminate the funding, which is about \$2 billion annually for the space station. I have not called that amendment up.

this amendment that I have called up would simply let us save about \$75 million out of the \$2 billion annually appropriated to the space station in order to have the space station pay some of its fair share of deficit reduction.

Around this place in the U.S. Congress, everybody has some very neat and flowery speeches about how we are going to get to a zero budget, how we are going to balance the budget for the American people, which would give them the single best tax cut possible. That helps them with their mortgage rates, that helps them with their interest payments on their car, that helps them have more confidence that in a bipartisan way we can accomplish some things around the U.S. Congress. Balancing the budget is certainly one of my highest priorities.

However, the space station has been absolutely insulated from any of the pain and sacrifice. The NASA budget continues to go down and will go down from about \$18 or \$19 billion several years ago to, sometime after the turn of the century, go down to about \$11 or \$12 billion.

Many good things that NASA accomplishes, the personnel at NASA are doing some wonderful work on Galileo and Clementine and the Hubble, these projects are getting squeezed, they are getting rescheduled, they are getting eliminated, they are being delayed. A host of different good programs that we might be doing in NASA are being put on the back burner or canceled because Space Station is continually protected and insulated from any kind of cut, from any kind of pain, from any kind of sacrifice.

Why is that? One might even say the Space Station is doing a great job, they should not get any kind of cut. Well, the space station was first designed in 1984 to cost \$8 billion. My colleagues might ask me, how much is that space station today? GAO estimates about \$90 billion—\$8 billion to \$90 billion, and we are trying to balance the budget in the next 6 years.

Maybe one might say we are getting great science out of the space station. No, the scientific objectives on the space station have gone from about \$8 billion in 1984, including platforms to study the environmental problems on the Earth, platforms to study space, and a docking station to repair broken satellites. It cannot do any of that any-

more. Now all it can do is help us study the gravitational effects on men and women in space. For \$90 billion? And all it can do is help us study the gravitational effects on men and women in space. For \$90 billion? And Congress does not want to cut 3 percent of that \$2 billion annual appropriation?

Come on, Mr. Chairman. If we are going to get to a balanced budget, if we are going to do it in a bipartisan and in a fair manner, space station should be on the table for a \$75 million, 3 percent cut out of its budget.

One might ask, too, NASA in doing many good things is also cooperating with the Russians on this program. Are the Russians paying their fair share on the Space Station? No. We send our tax dollars to Russia to help them do their work on the Space Station. We will send them \$100 million out of the NASA budget this year, \$100 million of hardworking taxpayer money next year.

This all goes straight from the United States taxpayer over to Russia for them to do what they should be doing for their participation in what is so-called international space station. It seems to me it is a U.S. space station when we are sending our money around the world to buy and coerce international cooperation.

The Russians in the last few months have indicated that they might want to renegotiate the contract. That could cost the U.S. taxpayers even more money in terms of scheduling delays and whether or not this hardware that they make and produce and manufacture is going to fit together with our hardware.

Mr. Chairman, for many reasons, for good science, for sound and fair deficit reduction, all I am asking my colleagues to do is to vote for a 3 percent reduction in the space station budget.

Finally, we hear from some that the space station is economic and world leadership for us, that it is the crowning jewel of economic and world leadership for the United States of America.

I think what we should be looking at to determine if the United States is actually the leader in the world, actually the best country in the world, which we are, it is not whether we can build a \$90 billion space station which is \$82 billion over budget. It is how we get to a balanced budget in a fair manner, and can we do that in a bipartisan way. It is how we treat our children, where 20 to 25 percent of our children are being born into poverty in the United States of America. It is how we educate our children, and whether our children have access to student loans. That is going to determine world leadership, not a space station that has moved from \$8 billion in cost to \$90 billion, and then nobody wants to cut even 3 percent from that \$90 billion budget.

So I would encourage my colleagues, I would encourage the distinguished chairman from California, I would hope he would accept this amendment of a 3-percent cut in a \$2 billion annual ap-

propriation. I am not offering the elimination of the space station amendment, Mr. Chairman, because we have had this vote. We had this vote on elimination a few weeks ago. The House has spoken on that particular matter.

We actually offered this amendment as well, too, and we were defeated on this particular matter. But that does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think that this is the right thing to do in order to get to a balanced budget, and in order to get shared sacrifice, and in order to get good science and to protect NASA from itself. I think that we should see some pain and sacrifice, and not see the rest of the NASA budget squeezed and eliminate good programs that are working very, very successfully and being implemented by the hardworking men and women at NASA.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. My colleague from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] suggests that he does not have this amendment to kill the space station or to even do serious damage to manned space flight or serious damage to NASA's mission. Nonetheless, with great consistency my colleague has demonstrated opposition to the fundamental work that NASA is doing and especially man's venture in space.

In the past, we have had these discussions within our subcommittee. We have talked a lot on the floor about the difficulty of these competing accounts, having housing competing with money against veterans' medical care and against EPA and, indeed, competing with NASA. When dollars get tighter and tighter, it is extremely tough competition. In the past the committee even made the decision to eliminate a station, for example.

What my colleague fails to recognize is the general public knows often a little better than we know, either in committee or on the floor. For when that occurred in the past, literally Members, many of whom were not very active in terms of the committee work here, came to the floor in support of man's mission in space. They provided an amendment on the floor to return money in funding for the space station in the face of committee opposition. The public's will was heard by sizable margins, and moneys were put back into this very bill in order to make sure that we continue with what is a part of the American pioneer spirit.

There is no question that the public supports our work of man's presence in

space. The gentleman's relatively small amendment would not have very much effect but it would significantly impact the upgrades and maintenance of space shuttle. It would significantly affect the flights of space shuttle. We need to have funds available to make sure as we go forward with this work, we do it with all of the equipment that is necessary.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. I would say to the gentleman, being on the Science Committee, the Science Committee that authorizes many of these same programs that the distinguished gentleman from California works on, what we are worried about, quite frankly, is precisely that fact, that when we continue to insulate and protect the space station from any kind of cut, we have seen devastating cuts in the space shuttle program and we are very concerned.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROEMER. Would the gentleman engage in dialogue here. We are very worried about the safety of the shuttle.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California controls the time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. This amendment addresses \$75 million and does not eliminate all the funding for space station. But clearly the House has spoken in that connection and it almost is in a separate category. We have on a bipartisan basis struck an agreement that provides very significantly broad-based support for an annual amount for space station. We are going forward with that. We have international agreements that take us forward with that. But this amendment addresses the shuttle specifically and in my judgment could in a very significant way impair the process and the work that we are doing there.

□ 1330

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Members to recognize what this amendment is in terms of its real purpose; that is, to undermine the mission of NASA, to undermine man's presence in space and, indeed, it would undermine what has been the past will of the House as it reflects the will of the American people for us to continue on this pioneering effort in space.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say in response to the gentleman, I would be happy to yield some of my time to the gentleman to engage him in a debate about the space shuttle safety. That is precisely one of the reasons why we are interested in seeing that the space station have some of the cut put to their program, rather than continue to decimate the shuttle safety program, science programs in the NASA account, see cancellation of other programs

take place within the NASA budget. We are seeing the NASA budget go down from 15 and 15 and 17 billion to about 11 or 12 billion in the next century. And the space station is a 16-ounce Texas steak that is being jammed into a sardine can of a shrinking and squeezed NASA budget.

Now, I am very worried about what that does to space shuttle safety. The shuttle, we are very concerned about it. We have had a couple NASA former employees say they are very concerned about it. We had a resignation at NASA, saying one of the reasons, he said that one of the things he was very concerned about was shuttle safety. I am very concerned about shuttle safety.

I would also say to the gentleman, this amendment is not anti-NASA. It is anti-space-station. I do not like the space station. But I think NASA does some wonderful things in other areas. Marie Antoinette once said let them eat cake. I think what we say in protecting the space station from any kind of cut is let NASA eat crumbs. They do not get anything else, and the space station gets everything.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to protect NASA. This is not to let the space station cannibalize the rest of the NASA budget.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I think I have said my piece on this particular amendment. I feel very strongly about it. I sincerely respect the gentleman from California. He and I agree on a host of different issues. But I think that this will really endanger the safety of the shuttle if the space station continues to cannibalize other programs. I think that the space station should have its fair share of deficit reduction and this is 3 percent in terms of a cut. I also think that if this is really international leadership, we should not be paying the Russians \$100 million a year for their participation. Let them pay rubles and let them do their fair share, not have hard-working taxpayers in Indiana send \$100 million a year over to Russia.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. chairman, far be it from me to stand and defend the Russians' role in this international partnership. We asked them to participate with us and we sought the partnership as much as anybody. We have allies in Europe who are very much involved and committed to this partnership. Canada, the same. The Russians, for example, do contribute some 250,000 pounds of hardware to this project. That is a lot of rubles.

In the meantime, there is not any doubt in my mind that the vision of America of man in space very much is intrigued with man's presence in space by way of a space station. Much of the public support for the work of NASA would indeed be on a very thinly based glacier of ice if it were not for that vision of man in space.

Space station is a very important part of our international partnership

that affects peace, but it also is fundamental to America's support for this kind of scientific as well as space activity. I urge a very strong no vote to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Roemer amendment to cut \$75 million from the Space Station Program. I support the concept of space exploration, and in better fiscal times would support the space station, but the time is now, Mr. Chairman, and the space station raises a question of priorities.

We are all in agreement that Federal dollars need to be stretched farther and work harder. The only question is which programs we choose to fund and which we choose to cut or eliminate. The United States can no longer afford to fund a budget-busting project which has run out of control.

Mr. Chairman, the VA-HUD appropriations bill before us provides \$2.1 billion for the Alpha Space Station for fiscal year 1997. This money is in addition to the \$16.5 billion taxpayers have already spent since 1984. The General Accounting Office [GAO] indicates that the final bill for the space station will be in excess of \$94 billion, a 1,075 percent increase from the original \$8 billion price tag.

How are we to pay for the space station? The Republican majority has passed a budget bill which freezes NIH funding until 2002 at \$11.9 billion per year. The total NASA budget for fiscal year 1997 is nearly \$20 billion. What does it say about our national values that we prioritize space exploration over medical research? Mr. Chairman, the question is simple: Can we afford a \$94 billion project at this time?

We still have too many people without adequate housing, food, and medical care to be funding soda fountains for astronauts. This Congress cannot pay for space exploration when so many more pressing needs remain unmet here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support the Roemer amendment to reduce funding for space station alpha. I hope that the day will come when we will be able to fund a space station, but not at the expense of our poor, our sick, our elderly, and our children. It is clear, Mr. Chairman, that if we choose to look at the stars, we must first make sure we have our feet firmly on the ground.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to engage in a colloquy with the chairman.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join in a colloquy with my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, as you know, for the past several years, NASA has been proposing a number of various plans to consolidate research support aircraft from various NASA centers around the country to the Dryden Flight Research Center in California. Since 1993, the agency has conducted 12

different financial and management analyses of these consolidation proposals and still has not been able to show convincingly that the consolidation is going to save NASA money or that it is programmatically wise.

In fact, NASA's own inspector general, the agency's last line of defense against questionable policies, has repeatedly warned that the proposed consolidation is "neither cost effective nor programmatically sound."

Just 3 weeks ago, on June 4, the IG recommended in a widely circulated draft report that, "NASA should re-evaluate its decision to implement the current aircraft consolidation plan because it is not cost effective."

Mr. Chairman, in the June 4 draft report, the IG has estimated that it will take 72 years to break even on the aircraft consolidation plan, even though the agency believes that it can save money on the plan. That, of course, does not even take into account the catastrophic impact on the agency's research or the scientific community that it helps support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for his thoughts.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding and involving me in this colloquy. I hope my colleagues, know just how intensely the gentleman from Ohio has worked on this matter. Indeed, he has insisted that it be at the top of the subcommittee's priority list. Although there is not a lot of money involved, Mr. HOKE is doing a very effective job of making sure that we focus upon this important question to him and to his district.

The committee has been pushing NASA, to take a number of steps to help consolidate programs, to reduce personnel, to emphasize on efficiency in every possible way. The debate last year flowed around the potential of closing entire centers. This was really an effort to get everybody to pay attention to the need for efficiency in NASA and other Federal agencies.

In connection with that, NASA is responding to suggest that the aircraft consolidation proposal was a high priority for the agency in its zero-based review plan released in 1995. It is my intent that NASA and the NASA inspector general reach a meeting of the minds so they both would make the same recommendation with respect to these aircraft, regardless of the final finding.

The gentleman reports correctly on the preliminary work of the IG. The agency would then review the preliminary report and respond to it. Then the IG will come forth with a final report. I am willing to take a hard look at whatever the recommendation is and hope that we get a unanimous recommendation coming from all the sources involved.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the comments from the chair-

man, and I think, as you know, I certainly want consolidation plans to go forward that make sense, that make sense programmatically, that make sense financially. We all want our Government to work as efficiently as it possibly can. But we have to also take into account reports that show something very much to the contrary, and that is why I am delighted that the chairman is concerned to make sure that these things be harmonized.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to join him in expressing concern that the consolidation plan be a sound one which is truly cost effective and certainly that it be programmatically sound.

I have looked at this issue over many months and have been very concerned that programmatically it does not seem to pass the commonsense test. I am not an accountant. I am not a cost accountant, but I know that the comptroller of NASA has questioned the original premise that said consolidate all these aircraft at any particular single center. I also know of the IG's report, on an earlier occasion, who was asked then to go back and reexamine it. They reexamined it and again found that it is not cost effective from their analysis.

Like the chairman and everyone else, I look forward to seeing what NASA headquarters' reaction to the IG report is. But certainly I would hope that when all the evidence is in that we in the Congress will do that which is necessary, if it becomes necessary, to see that a sound judgment is ultimately made with this issue.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I would just say one thing with respect to the commonsense test as to the programmatic issue. I happen to have the privilege of living in what is known as the frost belt where one of these research planes does deicing research in northeastern Ohio. Somehow, somebody missed the point about sending deicing research aircraft to the middle of the California desert where it is going to be a very difficult challenge to find some ice to do the research on.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to lightly say we are just looking for some rain.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 67, a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California: On page 67, line 17, strike the number "\$2,200,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the number "\$2,201,200,000";

On page 67, line 18, strike the number "\$1,950,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the number "\$1,951,200,000"; and

On page 68, line 24, before the period add the following new proviso:

"Provided further, That \$1,200,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used by the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to conduct a health effects study of the Toms River Cancer cluster in the Toms River area in the State of New Jersey".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would question, is this the amendment of the gentleman from California in which there was a time agreement reached?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering on behalf of myself and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] is a relatively straightforward amendment and I believe is necessary to address a serious health problem in the Toms River area in the State of New Jersey.

This issue was brought to my attention by my very good friend from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and his three distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. It is my understanding that the entire New Jersey delegation representing both sides of the aisle is supporting the intent of this amendment.

The amendment will simply add \$1,200,000 of excess budget authority available under the committee's 602(b) allocation to the Hazardous Substance Superfund and then stipulate that these funds are to be used by the agency for toxic substance and disease registry to conduct a health effects study of the Toms River cancer cluster.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that in the committee report, we stipulate that certain studies be conducted by ATSDR using funds available to them. If we had all the necessary details relative to this matter prior to markup, I am confident that we would have included this provision in the report in a similar manner. It has not been our practice to stipulate these health studies in bill language, nevertheless, I am convinced that the health concerns in the Toms River area are so critical that it is absolutely necessary that we take this unusual action of including specific funds for this health study.

I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that my colleague, the gentleman from

New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], has been very effective in articulating the priority of this manner, and for that reason, not only do I bring it to the House's attention and ask for its support, I know of no opposition to the amendment and know of no other Members who are eager to speak on my side of the question.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

□ 1345

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and I commend him for bringing this amendment before the House.

In the context of an \$84 billion appropriations bill, \$1.2 million may seem insignificant, but this additional amount will make a big difference because it will provide critically needed funds to study a cancer cluster that has been discovered in the Toms River area of my State of New Jersey.

I requested this funding, together with the Congressmen from Toms River, the gentleman from New Jersey, JIM SAXTON, and the gentleman from New Jersey, CHRIS SMITH, and the gentleman from New Jersey, ROD FRELINGHUYSEN, who is New Jersey's Representative on the Committee on Appropriations.

Last year a study by the New Jersey department of health found that Ocean County, in which Toms River is located, had 54 cases of childhood brain and central nervous system cancers between 1979 and 1991. This represents 15 more cases of childhood brain and CNS cancers than were statistically expected. In Toms River alone, the rate was 49 percent higher than expected.

The Toms River area includes two Superfund sites which the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, known as ATSDR, has previously studied in conjunction with the New Jersey department of environmental protection and the Federal Environmental Protection Agency.

ATSDR has already tapped its fiscal year 1996 discretionary funds to respond directly to the increased incidence of childhood cancer, but it says it cannot complete a thorough, comprehensive study without the \$1.2 million provided by this amendment; and without a comprehensive study, we have no real hope of sorting out the factors that may be contributing to this tragic situation.

Mr. Chairman, this study must be done, not only for the sake of the children who are now afflicted but for the many who are not. We need to know, if it is at all possible, within the limits of our current scientific capabilities, what is causing the cancers in the Toms River area. If we can shed light on this mystery, it will have benefits nationwide because this kind of knowledge can help protect children elsewhere who may face similar risks.

The Lewis amendment will finance an action plan that has been developed

by the State and the Federal governments and that will be participated in by a volunteer committee headed by Mrs. Linda Gillick, whose own child, Michael, is a cancer victim. This additional funding will help ensure that every tool available to science is brought to bear to identify the cause of these cancers.

Mr. Chairman, no amount of money in the world can guarantee that we will find all the answers, but we must try. We cannot protect our children from a danger we do not understand.

I would like to salute the gentlemen from New Jersey, Congressman SAXTON, Congressman FRELINGHUYSEN, and Congressman SMITH, for their efforts, and I would again like to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for offering this amendment on our behalf. I urge all Members to support this critical amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] insist on his point of order?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, technically, the amendment is a violation of clause 2 of rule XXI because it seeks to earmark funding for an unauthorized program.

With the understanding of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] that the bill language will be deleted in conference and the issue addressed only in the statement of the managers, I will be pleased to withdraw my point of order.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would simply say his understanding is correct.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, based upon the representation of the chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] controls the time in support of the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I believe this is a very important provision on a bipartisan basis for the State of New Jersey. I used to represent Toms River, which was actually part of Dover township before the redistricting. Of course, now it is represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

I know the concerns of the people in the area with regard to this cancer cluster or the possibilities that exist in terms of the source of it. So I do believe that the funding to be made

available for this health analysis is really crucial not only to Toms River, but something that we need as a delegation in our State to see effected.

So I would like to join with my colleagues, the gentlemen from New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ZIMMER, and others, in support of the amendment and ask that I be considered a cosponsor of the amendment or however they are proceeding.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would like to express my personal appreciation to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the gentlemen from New Jersey, Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, on behalf of myself, but more on behalf of the constituents that I represent in the Toms River area.

If we can imagine for a minute being in a situation where an inordinate percentage or number of young people have developed brain cancer in a relatively small area among a population of people, it is a heart-wrenching experience for those families and, to a large extent, for me and my staff who have worked with these families and with the Whitman administration and commissioner of health, Lynn Fishman, from New Jersey.

Just briefly, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the people that I represent, I thank the gentleman very, very much for what he has done here to help us get a handle on this most important problem.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], my colleague from the committee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Lewis amendment and to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for offering this amendment and for his leadership and cooperation in working with the Members of Congress from New Jersey, Governor Christine Todd Whitman, and Commissioner of Health Lynn Fishman from New Jersey.

I would also like to thank my colleagues from New Jersey, Congressmen DICK ZIMMER, CHRIS SMITH, and JIM SAXTON, for working on this important issue and for bringing it to my and our committee's attention.

This amendment will for the first time provide the needed funding for the Toms River cancer cluster study. The funding will allow the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to begin to look at possible causes for the increased cancer rate around Toms River. We have a responsibility to the people of this area to find out what is causing these cases and this funding will help us find this out.

Mr. Chairman, again, I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS of this subcommittee, most particularly for his



leadership and his cooperation, and urge adoption of this amendment on behalf of all the citizens of New Jersey.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment at the desk dealing with page 77, a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of California: On page 77, beginning on line 1, strike the words "established for such rates as of June 1, 1996", and insert in lieu thereof the words, "authorized by the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994".

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is noncontroversial and essentially corrects the earlier action of the committee with respect to flood insurance rates. We had inadvertently included language which would freeze the flood rates in place on June 1, 1996, and did not realize this would greatly reduce the flexibility FEMA has to adjust rates up or down in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994.

This amendment merely restores the necessary flexibility needed by FEMA to operate this program successfully. I know of no opposition to this amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. This amendment has been cleared with us, and we have no objection to it.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts: Page 66, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "increased by \$2,000,000".

Page 82, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.

KENNEDY] will be recognized for 10 minutes and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of the committee and his staff for clarifying some of the issues pertaining to this amendment over the course of the last half hour or so. I appreciate the forbearance and the loud talking that occurred from time to time.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment was to deal with the issue of indoor air. Americans spend 90 percent of their time indoors and yet indoor air is a thousand times more polluted than outdoor air. Despite that fact and despite the fact that going back as far as the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Mr. Reilly, who was appointed, I believe by President Reagan, although it might have been President Bush, indicated during his time at the EPA that the No. 1 health problem that we face as a people in this country is the issue of indoor air pollution.

We spend literally billions and billions of dollars that is appropriated in this House to clean up outdoor air and yet we have not a single solitary regulation pertaining to the quality of the air we breathe indoors.

Indoor air causes a myriad of problems. We have seen vast increases in the outbreak of asthma, we see a continuing problem with regard to issues such as the quality of our air in schools. A number of Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle are very familiar with sick-building syndrome.

Even the EPA building here in Washington, DC, has had to be cleared out on a number of different occasions because of the quality of the air indoors. All of us are familiar with the problems of secondary tobacco smoke as well as radon, that is now, I believe, the second leading cause of cancer deaths in this country, second only to cigarette smoke.

The truth is that if we look at how much money we are spending on indoor air, it is a piddling amount in comparison to the size of the problem.

Now, it had come to my attention from the EPA itself that there was overall a reduction in spending this year as compared to years past on indoor air. So I understand, and I would appreciate it if the chairman might work with me on these numbers. As I understand, last year there was about \$17 million spent on indoor air pollution. This year, as I understand, there will be about \$18 million spent. There is an additional \$2 million that will go to the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, completing a total of about \$20 million.

That \$17 million that I quoted from last year's spending did not include the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance or it would have brought that up to \$19 million plus.

□ 1400

The point here is that the overall amount of funds that has been allocated for this account has some language that is included in the committee print, which suggests that, if there is a funding shortfall, the radon protection programs will be fully protected and that all other programs will have to deal with the funding shortfall that exists.

I think that is a serious potential problem. I hope to work with the chairman of the committee over the course of the next week or two to try and determine what the potential problem is.

My understanding is the chairman does in fact fully support full funding for the indoor air account that was contained in last year's budget and was requested in this year's budget.

Would the chairman engage in a colloquy so that I might understand his intention?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts. I must say that he and I share interest and concern about the impact and especially the potential health effects of indoor air quality problems.

The data that was just outlined. The dollar amounts appear to be essentially correct. We came close to spending \$18 million last year, and this year the proposal is in excess of \$20 million. It is a problem that is very real. We tried to confirm these dollar amounts with the budget officer as late as this morning. In the meantime we both know that an individual constituency, like the office that handles indoor air quality, may be more enthusiastic than another office at EPA regarding this.

At this point we do not really see an intense need for additional money other than that program within EPA's proposal and that which we have outlined in the bill. It is an important problem. I would suggest that the gentleman and I continue to communicate with one another. I am sure that we can make progress in that connection.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Let me just make clear that, as I understand the real problem here is that, yes, the funding has increased to the \$20 million that the gentleman suggests. What I am being told by the EPA in the last few minutes is that the reason why there is a difference in the numbers pertains to the inclusion of this Office of Enforcement and Compliance in this year's \$20 million versus last year's \$18 million and that that might offer some of the confusion.

The difficulty of course is that, if in fact there is a cut that is included in these numbers, that there is a bent in the language of the report that stipulates that the radon portion of the

funding will be fully protected. And yet all of these other accounts, including sick-building syndrome, including the issues pertaining to a range of other health problems, would have to have the lion's share of the cut.

I would appreciate if the chairman would be willing to work with us, if in fact the numbers do not add up, to work with us to make certain that we are allowing this flexibility to make sure that the funding goes to the programs that are in most need.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am very concerned that we make certain that we are not adversely affecting one program over another as we proceed in this process. But is has been my understanding that funding as proposed is adequate for indoor air quality.

It seems to be pretty clear that there is not a need for an 11-percent increase over the 1996 level. If, in the meantime, we want to make sure that we are providing adequate funding, if we can work together between now and conference, I am sure that we can be assured together that the numbers are correct and get this job done.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the chairman's willingness to work. I take that as a demonstration of his good faith to try to work out the difficulties.

The one issue that I would take issue with is the idea that this is an adequately funded program under any of these scenarios. I am sure the chairman would agree, given the pressures that he is under in order to deal with these four agencies and their needs, this is a very difficult choice for the gentleman to make. But the truth of the matter is that, when we look at the problem of indoor air pollution, \$20 million a year spent by the entire Federal Government to investigate it to try to come up with any rules and regulations, to try to come up with ways of mitigating the problem is not near enough.

This is a very serious health issue. It is one that I think in the overall context, even this new report that suggests that was done largely by Members of the gentleman's side of the aisle to determine where excess Government regulation and spending occur, indicates that the one area that we are not spending enough, and there are not significant enough regulations is in fact on indoor air. So I would look forward to working with the chairman over the course of the next few weeks.

Let me finish by thanking my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] who came to the floor to speak in favor of the amendment. Given the shellacking he gave me last night, it does my heart good to know that he was here with me this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PALLONE: Strike the last proviso under the heading HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the committee of today, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last Thursday a group of senior Republicans on the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure proclaimed that House Republicans are willing to put "our money where our mouths are" on the issue of Superfund reform. These same Republicans also said that they were putting more money into the program than the Democrats ever did.

Well, I do not think that is the case, Mr. Chairman. While Republicans say they are appropriating \$2.2 billion for Superfund in this bill, I think my colleagues should take a good, hard look at a provision on page 68 of this bill that sets aside \$861 million of that appropriation to pay for the Superfund reform. You see, the \$861 million is available only if Congress enacts future legislation to appropriate it. So in essence this is future spending that may or may not ever occur.

The amendment that myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] have simply strikes that contingency and would truly fund the Superfund Program at \$2.2 billion this year. Our amendment gives the Republicans the chance to make good on their promise. If extra Superfund money really does exist, it should be available immediately and for the purpose it was intended.

Mr. Chairman, if the money is really in the bill, then why should it be subject to a point of order. All we are saying is that if it is there, it should be used now for cleanups and not later. My fear also is that this money will only be available if Congress enacts a Superfund reform bill that allows the

money to be given back as rebates to polluters, which is one of the provisions in the Republican Superfund bill that has come before the Committee on Commerce. Mr. MARKEY is going to address this issue later so I will not discuss it now, but the bottom line is if this money is not available this year, then basically we are appropriating about \$55 million less than the President requested for the Superfund Program.

I would like to see the money spent this year. The EPA has already told me that they would use the additional money to begin 70 to 90 additional cleanups in communities across the country. They would expand the brownfields program, promote more voluntary cleanups and further fund Superfund administrative reforms. There are 107 sites still left on the national priority list, including 7 in my district. I should say, 9 in my district. And I know that Superfund is serious business, not only in New Jersey but also across the country.

I just want to believe my friends on the other side of the aisle when they say they are committed to funding this program at \$2.2 billion. If that is the case, here is your chance to prove it. Vote for our amendment. If you bring this point of order and you have it sustained, then you are admitting that the \$2.2 billion figure is not real, that it is a sham. And if this point of order is sustained and the money is not real, then I think you can figure out what that means for Republican Superfund reform proposals. We will not get the money. We will not have additional cleanups or the money is going to be available later as rebates to polluters which certainly is not something that is going to help either the taxpayers or the cause of Superfund reform.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I continue my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, as you know from previous discussions, as modified by the rule of H.R. 3666, this last proviso is, technically speaking, meaningless. The intent of preappropriating the \$861 million contingency on further legislation obviously left open the possibility of the authorizing committee's legislation triggering our preappropriation.

Unfortunately, the reinterpretation of what this language should look like to avoid a BA problem has resulted in

this required change rendering the whole proviso essentially without any meaning.

Nevertheless, the proviso still represents a commitment on the part of the committee and the majority to take the necessary appropriation step of providing this \$861 million as soon as the program is reformed and reauthorized by the authorizing committees. The money actually awaits in a special seaside in the budget resolution pending this reauthorization. The matter is not all illusory, as opponents would have us believe.

The Chairman, the committee stands ready, willing and able to proceed in an appropriations sense. We have been long waiting the reauthorization that would fix this broken program. We have begun a dialog with the administration regarding their suggested intent that they want to fix the program. If we find ourselves at a place where reasonable reauthorization takes place, we intend to fund this effort.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I join with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] in sponsoring this amendment to bring truth to the superfund section of the bill.

The Pallone-Borski-Markey amendment will get this bill to do what all the Republican press release machinery has said it does—provide an increase in funding for the Superfund Toxic Waste Cleanup Program.

While the Republican press releases say there is an increase in Superfund money, the bill doesn't say that.

For fiscal year 1997, the bill actually cuts funding below the 1996 level and 3.5 percent below the level requested by President Clinton.

Less money than last year—that's a cut.

The majority has talked about an additional \$861 million in the bill for Superfund. But the bill requires an additional appropriations act for the money to be spent.

The \$861 million in this bill is totally meaningless and misleading. This bill has \$1.3 billion for Superfund in 1997—and no more.

The Pallone-Borski-Markey amendment would remove the restrictions preventing the \$861 million from being used for toxic waste cleanup.

Adopt our amendment and there will be a real increase in money available for cleaning up toxic waste.

If the amendment is rejected and the bill is left as reported, there will be a cut in toxic waste cleanup money.

With the additional \$861 million, EPA projects that an additional 90 sites could be cleaned up in 1997.

The \$861 million that would be freed by our amendment would allow communities across the Nation to move forward with the cleanup of toxic wastesites.

Under the committee bill, the \$861 million would be kept in the Superfund trust fund to be used for cleanup only when a future appropriations bill allows it.

What are we waiting for? Why don't we use the money now to clean up toxic waste?

We may be waiting for one of the Republican Superfund proposals to come out of committee so the money can be used to pay polluters to clean up the messes they created.

That's all we've seen in the authorizing committees—one proposal after another to let polluters off the hook and reduce cleanup standards.

These proposals to pay polluters and reduce standards are opposed by the States, they're opposed by the communities who desperately want the cleanup and they are opposed by the administration.

If we're waiting for a chance to pay polluters, then we will never see the \$861 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Superfund Program needs reforms but not the kind that will reduce cleanup standards and allow polluters off the hook.

We can do a real reform bill that will eliminate the unfairness in the current Superfund Program with a fair share allocation system as we have proposed.

We can exempt the small businesses that only contributed small amounts of waste from Superfund liability.

We can exempt municipalities that transported household trash and limit the liability of those who operated landfills that accepted household trash.

We can get the smaller parties out of the system as quickly as possible.

We can place more emphasis on future land use when deciding on remedies and we can limit the preference to permanent treatment to hot spots only.

We can provide help to cities attempting to clean up their brownfield sites to attract economic development.

We can provide protection for innocent prospective purchasers and lenders so that development projects can proceed.

The adoption of all of these proposals to reform Superfund—which we have made—would produce a program with more fairness, less litigation, lower transaction costs, and faster cleanups.

Mr. Chairman, nobody wants real Superfund reform more than EPA Administrator Carol Browner.

These proposals for real superfund reform have been rejected, however, because of the unrestrained desire of the Republican majority to pay polluters and reduce cleanup standards.

Hard as it is to believe, the Republican proposals would actually create more litigation by allowing the reopening of every decision made since 1980. It would be a lawyer's dream.

Adoption of these proposals would mean the money in this bill would not be used for cleanup but would be used for payments to polluters and for even more transaction costs and litigation.

Nobody wants real Superfund reform more than EPA Administrator Carol Browner.

In 1994, she devoted many long, hard hours to forging a compromise reform package that was supported by industry, States, local governments, and the environmental community.

Charges that she is not serious about wanting reform are simply baseless and unfair.

Under this administration, the Superfund Program has worked better than it ever did in the past. More sites have been cleaned up in the past 3 years than were cleaned up in the 12 years of the previous administrations.

EPA is ready to move forward with cleanups—up to 90 cleanups can be funded if we give them the \$861 million.

Instead of talking about the \$861 million, let's put our money where our mouth is and

use the money for toxic waste cleanup. Then let's do real reform.

I urge support of the Pallone-Borski-Markey amendment to free the \$861 million. Instead of a preview of coming attractions that will only happen if another bill is passed, let's make it real money that can be used now.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act as amended. The Committee on Appropriations filed a subcommittee allocation for fiscal year 1997 on June 17, 1996 (H. Rept. 104-624). This amendment would provide a new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee allocation and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be ruled out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, again, as I said before, if the money is really in this bill, then why should it be subject to a point of order. All we are saying is that if it is really there, if the money is really there, it should be used now for cleanups and not later for some polluter slush fund which basically gives money back in rebates to polluters. As I said on page 60 of the committee report, it says that the committee is appropriating \$2.2 billion for Superfund in fiscal year 1997.

In addition, it claims that they are appropriating almost 861 million more than the President included in his budget. Our amendment simply strikes that contingency and would truly fund the Superfund Program at the 2.2 billion and have the money spent this year.

If the amendment is subject to a point of order, then the money really is not there after all and the Republicans are appropriating about 55 million less than the President requested. So I just wanted to make it clear that by bringing this point of order and having it sustained, they are admitting that the \$2.2 billion figure is basically a sham. They are admitting that they funded the program at \$55 million less than the President requested and that they have turned this appropriation process into something that we may never see.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY] and some of the others said last week that Republicans are willing to put their money where their mouths are on Superfund reform. If this point of order is sustained and the money is not real, then I think the bottom line means that the Republicans really do not intend to provide additional money for the Superfund Program and what

they are really up to is trying to provide this fund, this slush fund that ultimately will be used for rebates to polluters when the Superfund reform that they advocate is passed into law or comes up on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York, [Mr. BOEHLERT] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOEHLERT. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of the point of order.

The usually mild-mannered gentleman from New York is incensed by what my mild-mannered friend from New Jersey is saying. He is just at odds with the facts.

The budget resolution creates a Superfund reserve fund. This reserve fund allows the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to increase the committee allocations when the Superfund taxes are extended and the program is reformed. That is what we are all about. We want to reform a program that everyone agrees is broken.

It is deficit neutral, this fund, because it will come from the reauthorized Superfund business taxes. This bill sets the marker for the funding level that will be provided when these conditions are met. We are saying that we are committed, let me repeat that, we are saying that we are committed to fund a reformed Superfund at \$2.2 billion and will use the extension of the Superfund taxes for that purpose.

□ 1415

What we have said repeatedly from the beginning of this historic 104th Congress is that we want to reform Superfund. We have a plan; it is falling on deaf ears.

Mr. Chairman, I support the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI] seek to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BORSKI. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I urge that the point of order raised against this amendment be overruled. The Pallone-Borski-Markey amendment does not change any of the monetary figures in the bill. It simply strikes the very unusual language limiting the use of \$861 million, language that makes the \$861 million totally meaningless. If the \$861 million is real and will impact the budget, then our amendment will have no impact whatsoever on the budget. If this point of order is sustained, the ruling will support the contention that the \$861 million is meaningless. The \$861 million figure in this bill is the most meaningless thing I have seen on this House floor in 14 years.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is like a house of mirrors at an amusement park. First we pass a Budget Act, then we waive the Budget Act. Next we put \$861 million in the bill for Superfund, then we include language to make sure

that it will not be spent. Then we invoke the Budget Act to keep it from being spent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the point of order so that we can move forward with this amendment to fund the toxic waste cleanup program.

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

Mr. BORSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Again on the point of order, what I do not understand, listening to my friend from New York again, is that if in fact we need to have an authorization for the Superfund program and we need to have a—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear each Member on his own time. Members may not yield on a point of order.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, could I be recognized on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again hear the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Just very quickly, Mr. Chairman, again responding to the gentleman from New York. If we need a budget waiver, if we need the authorization for the Superfund Program or the reauthorization, and we need another appropriation, we have to go through that anyway in future Congresses. So there is nothing here. This is a totally unreal situation where they are suggesting that we will do this in the future if we can get it authorized, if we can get an appropriation and if we can get a budget waiver. It seems to me that in the next Congress, or whenever this comes up again, we would have to do all those things anyway to proceed.

So, there is nothing here. As my friend from Pennsylvania said, this is nothing really but a publicity effort or advertising effort to make it look like the Republican leadership is actually doing something. The reality is they are doing nothing on the Superfund Program, and, if anything, it may cause mischief and suggest that somehow, if this money does become available in the future, it might be used for some kind of rebate program, and that is my concern.

But I do not see that we are really doing anything here at all. This is just advertising promotion to make the Republicans feel that they, as my colleagues know, look good or appear that they are trying to do something when they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey proposes to strike from the bill the last proviso under the heading "Hazardous Substance Superfund." That proviso states that a specified increment of the amount ostensibly provided in that paragraph of the bill "shall become available for obligation only upon the enactment of future appropriations legislation that specifically makes these funds available for obligation."

The Chair is advised that the Committee on the Budget has analyzed this

proviso under scorekeeping rule 9 from the joint explanatory statement of managers on the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, entitled "Delay of obligations." That rule reads in part as follows:

If the authority to obligate is contingent upon the enactment of a subsequent appropriation, new budget authority and outlays will be scored with the subsequent appropriation.

Thus, pursuant to section 302(g) of the Budget Act, the Committee on the Budget estimates that the incremental amount of funding affected by this proviso is presently attributable to the "future appropriations legislation" and not to the pending appropriation bill. Consequently, to strike the proviso would cause the incremental amount of budget authority affected by the proviso to be attributed to the pending bill.

The Chair is further advised that the Committee on the Budget estimates that the bill, as perfected to this point, provides new discretionary budget authority in the approximate amount of \$64,327,000,000, and that the pertinent allocation of such budget authority for this bill under sections 302 and 602 of the Budget Act is \$64,354,000,000. Thus, an amendment providing new discretionary budget authority in an amount greater than \$27 million would breach the pertinent allocation, in violation of section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey would cause the pending bill to provide an additional \$861 million in new discretionary budget authority, it violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] be permitted to offer amendment number 10 to a portion of the bill not yet read and that the time be limited to 5 minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of California: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may be used for the National Center for Science Literacy, Education and Technology at the American Museum of National History.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BROWN of California. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], for allowing us this opportunity to take up the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. Chairman, before I unleash a flood of oratory with regard to my amendment, I want to say that I understand that my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the distinguished chair of the subcommittee, and my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], have indicated the possibility that they might consider accepting this amendment, and in light of this fact I will merely state that this amendment was aimed at eliminating an earmark contained in the language of the report having to do with an extremely meritorious museum project in the city of New York.

I have no objections whatsoever to the museum project. However, I spent the better part of the decade of the 1980's lecturing my Democratic friends on the Committee on Appropriations as to the value of authorizing programs of this sort in the appropriate legislation. I do not wish to spend the decade of the 1990's, assuming I live that long, lecturing my Republican friends with regard to the value of authorization. I would merely point out that the chairman of the authorizing committee, in this case the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], and I have historically agreed on the importance of authorization, that we have passed a NASA authorization bill which is in the Senate and is pending action in the Senate and that I am more than willing to work with the distinguished chairman and ranking member on this side and their corresponding Members on the Senate side to include in the authorizing bill in the Senate and within a few days of action, as I understand it, to include the appropriate language that would authorize a museum program.

I would say that I have separately introduced, and I hope I can get a few cosponsors, to make this a permanent authority for NASA to fund on a limited basis science museums which are appropriate to its role, and I will seek to move this bill forward if it is the will of the House to do so. In the meantime, I will do whatever I can, as I say, in cooperation with the gentleman to use an existing vehicle to authorize this program, and if it is so authorized, I will be an enthusiastic supporter of this particular program.

I would like to point out that this will be of no handicap to the New York museum. They have a \$300 million reserve fund which could easily finance the whole of what they propose. The interest on that trust fund alone could support the amount of the Federal contribution that they are asking for, and I, therefore, feel that this would not do any substantial damage to the progress of their project, which, as I have said,

I am an enthusiastic supporter of, and I appreciate the willingness of my good friends on the House Committee on Appropriations to consider the importance of due process with regard to authorization and the other matters that I have mentioned in connection with this program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment cosponsored by Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. MINGE of Minnesota, and Mr. NEUMANN of Wisconsin, to bar funding for one of a rather substantial number of earmarks contained in the report accompanying this appropriations bill. My amendment is a simple one: It is a limitation on NASA funding that would prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the American Museum of Natural History's National Center for Science Literacy, Education, and Technology. I would like to explain why I am offering this amendment.

The VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill is an important piece of legislation, and crafting a bill that can properly balance all the competing needs represented within it has always been a difficult task. Mr. LEWIS, the subcommittee chair, is to be commended on his efforts to strike a reasonable balance among the various priorities.

As you know, the VA-HUD-Independent Agencies bill contains funding for the bulk of the Nation's civilian scientific research budget, including such agencies such as NASA and the National Science Foundation. When the bill was marked up at subcommittee, I felt that the bill represented a serious attempt to balance competing scientific initiatives, although I also believed that overall funding—as well as funding for some specific research accounts—fell significantly below what was needed.

However, something happened at the full committee markup that compromised the good efforts that had been made in the bill. Specifically, an amendment was adopted to the report language that directed NASA to make a noncompetitive award of \$13 million out of existing funds to the American Museum of Natural History in New York to establish a "National Center for Science Literacy, Education, and Technology."

Is this a good idea? I really can't criticize the merits of the proposed project, nor can I praise them. The simple fact is that there is no basis for Congress to properly evaluate the project, because it was never requested by NASA, it was never brought before the authorizing committee for review, it has never been peer reviewed, and it was never offered for authorization when the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996 was considered by the House only a few weeks ago.

However, I would note parenthetically that the American Museum of Natural History's \$300 million endowment could finance the museum's entire \$130 million renovation program 2½ times over. In fact, the annual interest alone on that endowment could more than pay for the proposed Federal grant of \$13 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly not opposed to the promotion of science education and literacy. Indeed, museums and educational centers all over the country are beginning to focus on this very issue and are struggling to find innovative ways to fund these efforts. Thus, the American Museum of Natural History is not alone in their desire to obtain Federal funds. In past Congresses I have sponsored legislation to establish a competitively based grants

program for museums and educational institutions. I reintroduced this legislation yesterday. The problem I was trying to correct with that legislation was the rise in noncompetitive congressional science-related earmarks that was eroding the buying power of our science agencies as well as degrading the integrity of the peer review process.

Unfortunately, the funding that my amendment would remove represents a resurgence of the pernicious practice that members of authorizing committees have protested against in past years. I find it particularly ironic that we are seeing the resurgence of such earmarking in the midst of all the reform rhetoric emanating from the 104th Congress.

I would also note that concern over earmarks such as the one my amendment would remove is not partisan based. H.R. 3322, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1996, recently passed by the House, contains an anti earmarking provision, and at a 1994 Science Committee hearing on science earmarks, then ranking member and now Chairman WALKER stated: "The bottom line is that most earmarked projects are funded that way because they wouldn't be able to withstand the close scrutiny of peer review or even of authorization, and so therefore they do not represent the best that this nation knows how to do, and we ought not to be funding anything which is not our best effort with the limited resources that we have." [Hearing on Academic Earmarks, Vol. I, June 16, 1994, page 2]

I heartily concur with the assessment of the chairman of the Science Committee.

Finally, like so many other science-related earmarks, the one that my amendment seeks to eliminate is an earmark that would further erode the ability of the affected science agency—in this case NASA—to carry out its authorized science programs. Specifically, this earmark would take \$13 million from NASA's Mission to Planet Earth—a research program whose funding already has been cut by more than \$220 million in this appropriations bill—and would use it for a completely different activity. That is both bad budgeting and bad policy.

In sum, the earmark that my amendment seeks to remove is noncompetitive, unauthorized, lacking peer review, lacking Authorizing Committee review, and an additional lien on already seriously diminished NASA research funding.

Most of these problems could be easily and quickly removed by an amendment to either the fiscal year 1996 NASA authorization bill, still languishing in the Senate; the fiscal year 1997 NASA authorization bill recently marked up by the Senate Authorizing Committee, or the fiscal year 1997 omnibus civilian science authorization bill, likewise languishing in the Senate. I would hope that such an amendment would address the generic need identified in the legislation I reintroduced yesterday rather than simply aiding a single institution. I would be pleased to assist in such an effort.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to remove this earmark.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, the project that this amendment seeks to remove from this bill is an extremely important project. The American Museum of Natural History is raising a total of private funding and local public funding for \$135 million investment in a national center for science literacy. What they are going to do is to rebuild the Hayden Planetarium and create a brand-new planetarium with the most up-to-date resources, and not only is this going to be the best planetarium probably in the world, and that is all being done with local funds, but the national center for science literacy, which lists \$13 million for that fund, will make the resources, the scientific and educational resources of the museum, available to every classroom in the country, to every library in the country, to anyone who could hook into the Internet, to anyone with a computer and access.

So this \$13 million is not a local pork project for New York, it is to take a major investment being made by the New York City government and the New York State government and private philanthropy in New York, and this \$13 million will make the fruits of this investment available to everyone in the country. Not a dime of the Federal appropriation would go toward construction of anything in New York. All the Federal funds would go toward the development of the exhibits and the computer capability to make those exhibits available to every classroom, to every library in the country, and it is one of the most important investments we can make in scientific literacy in this country, and if we value our productivity and our competitiveness, we had better value scientific literacy.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope we do not do anything that will jeopardize this project today.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. The sponsors of the amendment are seeking to weed out unnecessary projects that have no value to the American people. I support their goal, but differ with them as to the value to the American people of this important program the sponsors wish to eliminate under this amendment. As I said, I share the goal of the sponsors of this amendment of cutting wasteful spending. That is why I have stood on this floor again and again in support of amendments to accomplish this important goal—that is why I have introduced amendments to eliminate funding for wasteful projects within my own Congressional district. But before supporting amendments that claim to cut funding for projects with no merit, we have a responsibility to study carefully the question of whether such programs may indeed have real value to the American people. I believe the education program this amendment seeks to eliminate truly does have value to millions of Americans nationwide, and we would be acting irresponsibly by eliminating these funds. The project is an extremely important project.

The American Museum of Natural History is raising private and public local funds for a \$135 million investment in a National Center for Science Literacy that will link one of the nation's most well-respected and virtually unparalleled exhibitions and resources with schools, families, science and technology centers throughout the Nation, including NASA's science education campaign. This project has the potential to make some of our Nation's most important achievements in science and research more accessible to schools and families, allowing taxpayers to utilize directly the fruits of their investment.

The funds in this bill for the literacy center is less than 10 percent of the total cost. Over half of the funds come from private donors and foundations with the balance being paid by New York City and New York State. This project strikes a balance between private and Federal money to benefit the greater good, the education of our Nation.

Not one dime of the Federal appropriation would go toward construction of any new buildings for the center. All of the Federal funds would go to develop exhibits and educational technology initiatives that will bring science to people across the Nation. This program is entirely consistent with the congressionally authorized Mission to Planet Earth, through which it is funded. NASA's Mission to Planet Earth states specifically that its mission is "to help translate knowledge about our own planet to the broader community, to schoolchildren and families, to the general public, to share NASA's knowledge and investments with more scientists, science and technology centers throughout the nation."

This science literacy center is an effort to make available the resources, science, research, educational, and exhibition resources to the American Museum, as it is known the world over, to as many parts of this country as possible. Already, the museum hosts over 3 million visitors from every State in this country and provides services to more than 500,000 schoolchildren annually—again, from all regions of this Nation. The national center's mission is to take science education further: to make the resources available at the museum to more Americans, and translate our Nation's Federal science investments for every American and for the current and future generations of our youth.

I want to read from a New York Times editorial in which they say of the proposed project, "it will also turn the already remarkable Museum of Natural History into one of the world's greatest scientific resources." Additionally, I want to read from a statement by Dr. E.O. Wilson, a Harvard professor, winner of two Pulitzer Prizes and named by Time magazine last week as one of the 20 most influential people in America. "An institution with such great strengths \* \* \* from its world class collections and library to its outstanding staff, is automatically in a position of leadership. It also has a responsibility to lead because of its \* \* \* historical importance of its collections."

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time or a small piece thereof.

First, I very much appreciate my colleague from California having this discussion with us. There is little question of the tremendous contribution

that has been made by the American Museum of Natural History in New York and particularly, in this case, its literacy center. As the chairman and our colleagues know, we are committed to making certain that the public have access to that which we develop and learn about as we proceed with our presence in space. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has suggested that we should not designate this program at this time. He has, in conversation with me, indicated that there is an authorization process potential in the other body. He knows full well that I intend to proceed as best I can as we go to discuss these things with the other body. In the meantime, I have indicated to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] that we are willing at this point to accept his amendment.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I can only express again my admiration for my distinguished colleague from California for his reasonableness and his statesmanship in this regard, and, as he indicated, I pledge my full support to get the funding for the museum through authorized channels, and I think that no hardship will be worked if we do that.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Brown amendment that would eliminate funding for this most important and worthwhile project. While I understand that my colleague from California offers this amendment with good intentions, I believe this project is a much needed investment in science education for this, and future generations.

Should the Hayden Planetarium renovation be completed, it will be one of the greatest planetariums in the world. The American Museum of Natural History opens its doors to over 3 million people a year from all over this Nation and abroad. Such a facility provides an opportunity for students and families not only from New York, but all over the country to participate and share in the knowledge and information gained by NASA research and technology.

Mr. Chairman, it is also important for my colleagues to know that 90 percent of the funding necessary to complete this project has been raised through a unique public/private partnership between the city of New York and a variety of public and private resources. The \$13 million provided in this legislation for the Hayden Planetarium only constitutes 10 percent of the total cost of this project.

I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment, as it would jeopardize this valuable project and deprive us all of the education and understanding such a learning center would provide.

□ 1430

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GEJDENSON

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 62.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 62 offered by Mr. GEJDENSON: Page 87, after line 17, insert the following:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
OFFICE OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Consumer Affairs, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,811,000, to be derived from amounts provided in this Act for "National Aeronautics and Space Administration—Human space flight": *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that Office may accept and deposit to this account, during fiscal year 1997, gifts for the purpose of defraying its costs of printing, publishing, and distributing consumer information and educational materials; may expend up to \$1,110,000 of those gifts for those purposes, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated; and the balance shall remain available for expenditure for such purposes to the extent authorized in subsequent appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading may be made available for any other activities within the Department of Health and Human Services.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the committee of today, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] will be recognized for 10 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the chairman who, in cooperation, raised this issue. It is clear under the present rules that we are unable to offer this amendment. I will withdraw it shortly.

I wanted to make sure that my colleagues understood that this bill eliminates the Office of Consumer Affairs. It is the only consumer advocate at the Federal level. It was started by President Kennedy. President Nixon appointed Elizabeth Dole as the deputy director during the Nixon years. It receives 10,000 calls per month and provides a valuable service to Americans who have consumer problems.

When we look at its review, it is supported by both consumer groups and by corporations, because it often works to work these things out without litigation. It operates with a staff of 13 people, and Money magazine investigated and showed that most States are actually cutting back on programs that assist consumers. They found that nearly

50 percent of the attorney general offices and State, county, and city consumer affairs offices experienced dramatic cuts in recent years. We can be sure that with a crisis at both the State and local level, this will not be picked up at the State and local level.

We have here a critical aid to citizens, to average citizens. The program, again, is supported by MCI, Ford, MasterCard, the Direct Marketing Association, and consumer organizations across America. It seems to me for 2 cents a household, consumers ought to have that additional voice in the executive branch.

I want to say that it is something we need to do. I would hope that we can reinstate the funding, or through the Senate, and again I thank the chairman for his cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut is withdrawn.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to be sure that I expressed my strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to remove funding for the National Center for Science Literacy, Education, and Technology at the American Museum of Natural History. I do so not merely as a New Yorker, but as someone who recognizes the need to enhance our knowledge—especially our young people's knowledge—of science and technology.

For more than a century, the American Museum of Natural History has been one of the world's preeminent institutions of scientific research and education. More than 3 million people from across our Nation and from around the world visit the museum every year. And the museum's research stations span the globe—from Long Island to China, from Arizona to Madagascar, from Georgia to Mongolia.

Why should the Federal Government spend \$13 million out of NASA's \$13.6 billion budget for this project? Well, the American Museum of Natural History is really the institution best suited to further the purposes of NASA's "Mission to Planet Earth" by telling the story of our planet—from the big bang, to the age of the dinosaurs, to global warming.

The resources and capabilities of the American Museum of Natural History are virtually unparalleled anywhere. The museum offers the largest natural history library in the Western Hemisphere, more than 30 million cultural artifacts, the world-renowned Hayden Planetarium, 200 research scientists in nine departments, and the experience that comes from having over 3 million visitors every year—including over 500,000 school children.

The funding contained in NASA's budget for this important scientific

and educational project is only 10 percent of its total cost. In fact, over half of the \$130 million needed to establish the national center have already been raised through a unique public/private partnership between the city of New York and numerous private foundations, individuals, and corporations.

Mr. Speaker, the national center will allow the American Museum of Natural History to translate ground-breaking science into exciting, real-life programs for millions of Americans—precisely one of the purposes of the Mission to Planet Earth.

This is far from a waste of Federal tax dollars. It is about providing a nominal amount of support for a program of the highest quality that will benefit millions of school children and enhance our competitiveness in the global economy.

I urge defeat of the Brown amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, even though we have accepted this amendment, let me say to the gentlewoman that my colleagues from New York especially have brought this museum to my attention. Between the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], in whose district this museum is located, they have educated me in a short time. It is a magnificent effort of private funding and the expanding of a very, very important commitment on the part of the people of New York. I am sure we can work with each other and attempt to continue to make progress in the weeks as well as the months ahead.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his support, and I look forward to working with him and my colleagues to ensure that this invaluable resource, not only to New York but to the country, can be supported by the Federal Government. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to do something to encourage the gentlewoman to thank me, also, because I am an enthusiastic supporter of museums. I have introduced legislation to include museums in the role of NASA and other scientific agencies. That legislation is currently pending. I hope some of the language in my bill can be included in the final conference on the NASA authorization bill for this year, so it will be clear that we intend to support museums, and to do so on a basis which is open, above-board, open to all good museums, and which can do as the gentlewoman says, can help to enlighten the public of the United States on the importance of scientific achievement. I pledge her my fullest cooperation in achieving that

goal within the earliest possible time-frame.

Mrs. LOWEY. I want to thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with him. I appreciate his support for this extraordinary institution. I know together we can be successful in providing Federal support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss with the chairman of the committee the need for a training program for chief fire officers at the U.S. Fire Academy. This training program will assure that chief officers are fully prepared before being thrust into disaster situations.

Currently there is no national training program available to chief fire officers. These officers are usually the first to arrive at a fire or a disaster, and their leadership is crucial to saving lives and property. Yet these officers receive little or no formal training. I have been working with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], chairman of the Congressional Fire Services Institute, to put this training program in place.

It is estimated that this program would only cost \$400,000, and it seems to me that \$400,000 is a small price to pay in order to assure that chief fire officers receive the training that they need to protect the lives and property of American citizens.

There is a national consensus that this training is needed. In fact, petitions containing over 5,000 signatures supporting this program have been collected from all over the country. This training program is supported by leading firefighting publications, including Fire Engineering, Fire Chief, Firehouse, and the American Fire Journal.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the chairman if he would work with me to add report language at conference to direct the U.S. Fire Academy to develop this program and to offer the course as soon as possible. There are many lives at stake.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] that I appreciate her bringing this very important matter to our attention. I agree that it is also very important that chief officers, firefighters who take immediate charge of fires and disasters, receive the training they need to protect both the firefighters under their command and the lives and property of our citizens. I certainly agree that the U.S. Fire Academy should begin to develop a curriculum for this kind of training. Four hundred thousand dollars, it seems to me, even in these difficult times, is a modest price to pay to assure that chief officers are fully pre-

pared when they arrive at the site of disasters, where property damage alone can cost much more than the figure under discussion.

I would say to the gentlewoman that I would be glad to work with her to ensure that the conference report directs FEMA to review this matter and to report their findings to the Congress no later than the first of next year. If appropriate, I will strongly urge the U.S. Fire Academy to develop a curriculum for this training and to begin to offer this training program as soon as possible.

Our chief fire officers should not be forced to learn the skills needed to take charge of a fire or disaster site on the job. We should assure that they are fully prepared well before they are faced with these circumstances, and I must say I appreciate deeply the gentlewoman bringing this to my attention.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor for me to serve with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership and I thank him for his support. I look forward to working with him on this language. I do believe this training will save many lives. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. BROWN of California.

The U.S. Government spends billions of dollars a year on science and technology, particularly for defense programs and NASA space exploration. Surely we can spend \$13 million to bring some of that technology home to the American people.

Especially for a project where 90 percent of the \$130 million required is coming from private and non-Federal sources. Let's not send the message to all these private contributors that the Federal Government is not willing to participate in the project that will make our Federal science and technology initiatives accessible to the citizens.

The American Museum of Natural History is the one institution that can attract this support because it is truly national in its scope, mission, and resources.

For more than 125 years, the American Museum of Natural History has been nourishing young minds with scientific enlightenment in a readily understandable form.

Three million people from all 50 States flock to the museum every year to learn about the cutting edge scientific research interpreted, explained, and performed by the museum's 200 scientists and leaders in their fields.

The landmark project—whose Federal funding this amendment would prevent—would greatly expand the range and the capabilities of the world-renowned Hayden Planetarium, and would bring more of its treasures home to all Americans.

The project calls for a new Sky Theater, a Hall of the Universe, a Hall of the Planet Earth, and a Hall of Life's Diversity.

And it will allow the museum's exhibitions to be visited not just by Americans who can afford a trip to New York, but by anyone with access to the World Wide Web at work, at home, at school.

Just imagine: real-time images from the Hubble Telescope will no longer just be avail-

able to Government bureaucrats and scientists at NASA headquarters in Houston. They'll be available in a user-friendly format to students, as well as other scientists and educators.

Mr. Chairman, for all that the American museum has done for scientific understanding in our country, the museum has never once come to the Federal Government for a major funding initiative.

Granting this modest request is the least we can do. Denying it would be a tragic setback and loss to scientific literacy in this Nation. I reluctantly urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by my friend, Mr. BROWN. Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I had been here, I would have risen reluctantly in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], and in support of a 10-percent, \$13 million Federal funding for the National Center for Science, Literacy, Education, and Technology at the Museum of Natural History. It was a mere 10-percent funding of a \$130 million project that would have expanded science and new technologies into the homes of millions of Americans through all types of fora, not only at the museum but through computers and through the Web. I regret that I was not here to speak in opposition to his amendment, and I am sorry that this has been struck from the budget.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of engaging the chairman of the committee in a colloquy. It is my understanding that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] also would like to enter into part of this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee again for the excellent environmental section of this bill. This is something I know the chairman has worked on very hard, and I appreciate that, following through on what he did in his days as a California legislator.

As we know, the House passed another excellent environmental bill yesterday, the Safe Drinking Water Act. That bill was passed by a voice vote and it authorized \$16 billion for the New York City watershed, which is the water supply for nearly 10 million Americans. The Senate version of the bill, which passed unanimously, includes \$15 million for the watershed. That money would implement a model agreement in which the watershed will be protected without imposing burdensome limits on development in my area, and without forcing the expenditure of \$8 billion on the part of the city of New York on a new filtration plant.

The program is a model because it relies on voluntary changes in land use policy to protect drinking water for the Nation's largest city. It is my understanding that the chairman is supportive of this agreement, and that funding the watershed agreement will be a priority in conference.

Is my understanding correct, Mr. Chairman?



□ 1445

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] that I am very aware of this commitment to this project, as well as his concern about environmental matters that affect the country, and especially New York. The gentleman has discussed many such items, including this watershed problem with me in some detail. I very much appreciate the gentleman bringing it to our attention.

There is little question that I informed the gentleman that dollars are mighty thin, and we are having great difficulty providing specific funding for individual projects. But between now and the time conference, I think we will better know about the availability of funds.

The watershed agreement is, as the gentleman suggested, a model that is widely supported in both Houses of the Congress. The committee and I will do everything possible to seek funding for the project in conference.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman very much for those comforting words, because we are talking about something that has broad implications affecting the water supply for 10 million people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], who has worked with me on this very important matter.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, [Mr. BOEHLERT], my outstanding colleague from New York who has truly been a leader on this issue. It has been an honor for me to work with the gentleman and to see this project actually become a reality.

I also want to thank the gentleman, because we know that for more than 150 years, Mr. Chairman, the residents of the New York metropolitan area have received their drinking water from reservoirs in upstate New York. This 2,000-square-mile watershed has the distinction of being the largest unfiltered surface drinking water supply in the entire Nation.

As my colleagues from New York State know, protecting the New York City watershed is absolutely critical, and it is simply a matter of dollars and cents. Why? Reserving the purity of the city's water system at its source in the upstate reservoirs will avoid the need to construct a filtration plant that would cost more than \$6 billion, I repeat, \$6 billion.

For too long, there was antagonism and mistrust between residents of the metropolitan area, who want to ensure the water's purity, and upstate residents, who rely on the land for their economic livelihood. It used to be that the interests of upstate residents were diametrically opposed to the interests of my constituents in Queens and Westchester County, but not anymore.

Late last year, the city and State of New York, the Environmental Protection Agency, and farmers and local officials from the watershed agreed to a landmark watershed protection program that will avoid the need for costly filtration while still safeguarding public health and allowing those who make a living off the land to continue to do so. If successful, this program promises to become a national model for locally driven, economically friendly environmental protection.

New York City alone has pledged to invest over \$1.2 billion over the next 15 years to implement the program, but a modest investment by the Federal Government is also needed.

Regrettably, the first installment of these funds has not been included in the EPA's budget for 1997. But I will withdraw my amendment. I will not offer my amendment, which would provide the \$15 million that is needed. I appreciate the leadership again of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and the willingness of our chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], to work with us to ensure that these vital funds will be provided.

So thank you again, thanks to our chairman, thank you to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT]. And I look forward to working with my colleagues on this vital issue for the entire region.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, my colleague was a little bit conservative when she suggested that the filtration plant would cost \$6 billion. As a matter of fact, we have had cost estimates as high as \$8 billion. In addition to that, it would cost \$350 million a year just for operation and maintenance.

We are getting smarter around this institution. What we are proposing is a modest expenditure to save billions of dollars. I am comforted by the chairman's good words, and I appreciate the gentlewoman's support.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as we are aware, the community of Cataldo on the Coeur d'Alene River, which is in the northern part of my Idaho district, is facing an impending disaster. Dangerous flooding this spring has already resulted in the area being listed as a Federal disaster area. But this Federal disaster designation, while helpful, has not ended the danger, nor has it ended the fear my constituents do face.

We are dealing with an old, but newly exacerbated problem. The steady build-up of rock and other deposits which has been worsening in recent years has been greatly accelerated as a result of the floods. This has caused unusually high water levels to rise even higher. This flooding, coupled with a leaking dike that the Army Corps of Engineers has determined is 2 feet too short is threatening the community of Cataldo. If next spring's floods are anything like this year's, and there are indications

that they may be even worse, this small community will be destroyed, and a major freeway, Interstate 90, will be cut off.

If I-90 is lost, Mr. Chairman, literally 10,000 vehicles it carries every day will have a roughly 200-mile detour around the closure. The economic impact on those highway users and on residents in surrounding areas will be devastating. But even worse, the loss of I-90 will make emergency evacuation extremely difficult and rescue efforts nearly impossible.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents are can-do, roll-up-your-sleeves kind of people, and they would like nothing better than to get in and fix that dike, raise it by 2 feet and fix it and make it right. But restrictive Federal regulations prohibit them from solving this problem on their own. In order to raise and reinforce its dike to Federal standards, Cataldo needs \$300,000. Tragically, there has been little success in finding the necessary funds, and we fear that fiscal year 1997 will simply be too late.

Mr. Chairman, the citizens of Cataldo are afraid for their property, their homes, and most importantly, their lives. May I reassure them that the Federal Emergency Management Agency will allocate needed funds from their fiscal year 1996 budget?

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH] that the citizens of Cataldo sound very much like the citizens of beautiful San Bernardino County. It is a great pleasure for me to enter into this discussion with the gentlewoman. I very much appreciate her bringing to my attention and to the committee's attention this very important issue. As in this case, human lives, property, and an important interstate highway could be protected with a relatively small expenditure. It certainly bears further review.

While I am not sure if allocating these funds is within FEMA's authority, some people are trying to limit the authority of my subcommittee. In the meantime, it very much involves serious potential property damage and threat to human life. I will examine the possibility and try to help exercise every option we have available.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate that consideration and so do the people of Cataldo.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 240, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 276]

AYES—183

Allard  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Boehler  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Deal  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehrlich  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Flanagan  
Foley

NOES—240

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bishop  
Blumenauer  
Blute  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)

Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cummings  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums

Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gehardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Goss  
Green (TX)  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hobson  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hyde  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)

Becerra  
Browder  
Coleman  
Fields (TX)

NOT VOTING—10

Ford  
Lincoln  
McDade  
Peterson (FL)

□ 1512

Mr. MOLLOHAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PARKER changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, today we will conclude consideration of H.R. 3666, a bill to appropriate fiscal year 1997 funds to the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other independent agencies.

□ 1515

Mr. Chairman, it is with these other independent agencies that I would like to address this issue today.

At the close of consideration of H.R. 3666, we, as Members of the House of Representatives, will be asked to cast one single vote on this entire package of funding for agencies that are wholly unrelated. This is absolutely unfair.

Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shays  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Trafiacant  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Walsh  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates

H.R. 3666 includes not only funds for VA and HUD, but funding for AmeriCorps and the Selective Service System, the EPA and OSTP, and CEQ, and FEMA, and GSA, and NASA, and NSF, and CDFI, and other minor agencies that sound like alphabet soup.

I want to be very clear here, Mr. Chairman, I support veterans' programs. We owe our vets a debt of gratitude that more money can never repay, and I have supported some of the other programs, too.

But it is precisely because I believe we need to keep our promises to our veterans who served so valiantly that I am supporting this bill today.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think it is a fraud on the American people to force their Representatives in Congress, Representatives who are supposed to be watching their tax dollars, to cast one single vote on all these various agencies. How can we justify including the veterans of our Armed Forces in the same measure as AmeriCorps, EPA and the like? It is fundamentally unfair to pit our veterans, whom I support, against EPA and AmeriCorps programs, of which I have serious reservations.

I want my constituents to know that when I cast my vote today in favor of H.R. 3666, it is for my veterans, not a vote for AmeriCorps and EPA.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we reexamine our appropriations process to inject more germaneness and fairness into our ability to represent our constituents.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FIELDS OF LOUISIANA

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana:

Page 61, line 14, after each of the two dollar amounts, insert the following: ("increased by \$3,500,000").

Page 61, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$178,500,000)".

Page 61, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$89,000,000)".

Page 62, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$60,000,000)".

Page 62, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$4,500,000)".

Page 62, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$11,500,000)".

Page 63, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 63, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 74, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$178,500,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] and a member opposed will each control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increased funding of the National and Community Service Programs by \$178.5 million above its level in the bill. It raises it to \$543.5 million for fiscal year 1997. It provides \$28.5 million for administrative services, \$129 million for national service trust account for educational awards, \$261 million for grants under the national service trust program. It also provides \$6 million for Points of Light Foundation, \$22 million for the Civilian Community Corps. It provides \$53 million for school- and community-based service learning programs across the country. It provides \$37 million for quality and innovative activities. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it provides \$7 million for audits and other evaluations of the program itself.

Each of these programs provides our Nation with one thing that we lack most, and that is community involvement. This program is a network of community-based programs which provides Americans with results-driven programs. In exchange for a year or 2 years of hard work, AmeriCorps members earn education awards to finance their way through college, graduate school, vocational training or to help pay back student loans.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, during a time that many young people are defaulting on their student loans, there could not be a better program than the National Service Program to give individuals an opportunity to earn their way through college and not only earn their way through college and graduate school but give them an opportunity once they finish college and graduate school. They can in fact be a part of one of these national service programs and pay for their educational enhancement.

More of our youth should be able to earn a college education by helping in the community, so we receive a twofold effort. One, we give an opportunity to a young person to earn their way through college, and we also help many facets of our community at the same time. In my State of Louisiana, there are over a million people who participate in this program. The exact number, Mr. Chairman, is 1.2 million persons involved in the National Service Program. That only costs the Federal Government about \$6.20. We have allocated to the State of Louisiana about \$7.8 million. Some of the programs that the individuals participate in: the Delta Service Program, with 50 participants who help find affordable housing

for low-income residents, facilitate independent living for home-bound individuals, and tutor children on literacy skills. Those are great programs that have taken place in my State, and those programs are taking place all across the country.

I tender this amendment to the Members of this House as a friendly amendment to simply bring national service funding up to the level that it was so that more young people can participate in a very worthwhile program.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS]. The amendment, as he has said, would add \$178.5 million to the Corporation for National and Community Service, with an offset in the FEMA disaster relief account. The difficulty with this is obvious to those members who have been following the appropriations process. There is a lot of controversy that swirls around this program. There is a need for careful reconsideration as well as evaluation. There are a number of amendments before us that would reduce the spending for AmeriCorps.

Recognizing that we will have a number of votes in connection with AmeriCorps funding, the passage of this amendment would be in and of itself a budget-buster. It does not match the outlay requirements and is potentially subject to a point of order.

Unfortunately, the offset that is proposed by my colleague, Mr. FIELDS is FEMA. That is, he suggests we could take this money from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, an account that seems to be everybody's favorite account. FEMA is everybody's favorite account when they have a disaster in their district and their State and they need some help. FEMA is also everybody's favorite account when they see some money sitting there that is not spent yet and they want to tap it for one of their favorite programs that may affect their district or their State.

Indeed, when we had our major budget conference in which we put five Appropriations Committee bills together and sent them to the President, there was a need for a big offset, roughly \$1 billion. The administration and Congress went to FEMA, took away its money and used it as an offset to fund other spending priorities. Eventually we have got to pay the piper for past and future disasters.

FEMA needs these funds. There are disasters and obligations outstanding out there, and indeed America should keep its commitment to those people who faced those disaster circumstances. So because of that, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman, and I want the gentleman to know that I get no great pride out of taking money out of FEMA. I simply had to take it somewhere because the bill has to be budget neutral, as the gentleman knows.

But I do think, when it comes to our kids, when it comes to giving kids an opportunity to earn their way through college, that is something very positive that we should do everything we can to do that. This is only \$170 some million and I do appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I, like the gentleman from Louisiana, certainly appreciate the remarks of the chairman, but what I might add is that this National Service Corps allows for us to serve the disasters of broken life. So this is quite, I think, appropriate that we invest in AmeriCorps and invest in the National Service Corps to remedy the ravages of life in our urban communities, in our rural communities, and that is what this organization does.

There is not a place that I have gone that I have not seen the works of the National Service Corps. They get things done. In Houston, TX, they get things done. They work with Habitat for Humanity. They build homes for people who do not have homes. They work with youth that do not have the kinds of role models that they need to have, and at the same time, as we are here on the floor of the U.S. Congress, acknowledging the importance of responsibility, that is teaching our young people responsibility, as well.

This National Service Corps goes into communities; it does not take over communities. It embraces communities. It builds them up. It picks them up. It gives them new hope that things can be done. What are we doing in the 21st century if we are not reinvesting in our youth?

Mr. Chairman, there was a report that just was reported that said we are backhanded in our solutions. We build prisons, but we do not provide for at-risk youth. The National Service Corps brings talented youth together who themselves may have been at risk but yet they are now at the stage of going to college, and they can go into these communities that are hopeless, that are broken, that do not see a way out and they can build them up and make them whole again.

This is a good program. This takes care of lives, the disasters of life, which I think is so very important.

I would ask my colleagues to join the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS]

in supporting AmeriCorps with this additional funding which only brings it equal to last year's funding. So I do not want anyone to think that we are going beyond. Fiscal responsibility is important, but investment in our youth, in our future in this country is equally important.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that we support this amendment and remember it is important to fix broken lives as well as broken communities.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to have a little discussion with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] for just a moment.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much where my colleague is coming from, and I just want to make a couple of points here.

First, let me point to the State of Texas, the State of the gentlewoman who just spoke. I want to mention that since 1988 there have been a number of disasters for which we have appropriated and obligated funds. In the State of Texas since that time, there have been 15 major disasters. The total projections of costs are \$305,366,000. Of that, \$298 million has already been obligated to address very serious problems in which FEMA was asked to respond.

In Louisiana there have been eight major disasters, \$77,891,000; \$62 million of that has been obligated and the balance is in the offing. Very serious needs. Louisiana has not had a major disaster of late, but who knows what happens around the corner.

So FEMA becomes the quick whipping boy or the quick source when we have difficult problems in one sense, but then we look to it as a source for our favorite programs as well.

Let me suggest to the gentleman that we have just recently had a vote in which we were successful relative to the program for which she seeks to increase funding. We have a number of amendments before us that would reduce that spending. If we go forward with this amendment and have a vote that ends up being in the negative, it could provide considerable incentive in terms of those other amendments that remain before us.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman to consider that as he decides whether to take this amendment to a vote or not.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I just want to echo the same comment the gentleman has just made. I think the author of the amendment should realize that we have just been able to defeat an amendment which would have taken all of the money out of AmeriCorps. We won, but we did not win by such a margin that four or five other people who have amendments to

reduce funding in AmeriCorps have not been dissuaded from offering their amendments.

I would think in light of that, the gentleman from Louisiana having made his point here, that he would consider what the chairman has said in terms of realizing that this is not the type of amendment to take all the way to a vote. I think the gentleman has made his point, it is a good point. This is certainly an excellent program, but we have to consider all the circumstances here and we have to remember that last year when this bill came in, it was zeroed out. There was no funding.

Of course after a veto of the bill, we did put \$400 million in for AmeriCorps, and in this bill there is \$365 million. So I think the chairman has gone a long way in trying to work out funding for this program in a House where there are some people who do not want this program.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member of this committee, and as I said to the ranking member, and let me just say to Members of the House, I do not have any plans to take a vote on this amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman, the chairman, in all honesty, for his hard work in this effort. I really thank the gentleman for his efforts.

I come from the school of thought that we have to do all that we can do to improve opportunities for higher education in this country, and I know both gentlemen, particularly this gentleman and the chairman, have worked hard to provide that opportunity for young people.

We have too many young people who graduate from college in this country who will leave a college or a medical school or some graduate school with over \$100,000 worth of debt. If they have that opportunity to work their way through college, work their way through graduate school, or even have the opportunity to work in community programs to pay back their loans, that is the point that this gentleman and the gentlewoman from Texas had made and is making.

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

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take a minute and commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the kind of leadership he has offered in this House in terms of education and scholarship, particularly of young people; and in terms of the TRIO program, which he has been a real leader on here in the House. He is to be commended for the amendment which he has offered here today and the principle which lies behind it. I appreciate it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's comments with respect to FEMA and certainly with respect to the great State of Texas. My comments are not in any way to suggest that FEMA is not both worthy and well needed in times of need, and I acknowledge that we have been forced in this time of fiscal responsibility to look in places where we would not want to look.

So to my FEMA employees and those that may need FEMA ultimately, let me say this is not directed and intended to undermine, but it is a choice. I do thank both the gentleman, who is chairman, and the ranking member for their leadership, and I thank my colleague from Louisiana.

Understand that I leave Members with the thought that there are disasters of life that I believe, if we look at the record of the National Service Corps, that they have been able to amend and fix. I recognize that we are certainly at a better place than we were before, but this is to offer opportunities for us to fix broken lives, that these young people participate in doing, and helping them reinvest in their lives as well.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I must say to the gentlewoman that I am sure many of her constituents would remember in just as crystal clear a fashion the needs that they had when the disasters faced them personally that involved FEMA's work.

And they have been very responsive to Texas. To presume that time and time again we can tap their account without having to pay the price eventually and have dollars not available when another kind of disaster affects either her State or Louisiana or my State of California could be a very big mistake.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and in closing I want to lastly thank the chairman and thank the ranking member for their work in this effort.

I can only say that I know how to count and I know where the votes are, but I would like to say to the Members of this House that even in disasters, and I understand FEMA's budget, but whenever there is a national disaster and the moneys are not there in the FEMA's budget, the chairman knows as well as the ranking member knows and every Member of this House knows that this Congress has the right and the obligation to go back to the Federal war chest and appropriate additional funds.

So while I understand and respect the gentleman's argument about FEMA, I wish not to take the money from FEMA, but the amendment has to be budget neutral.

I think I have made the point, Mr. Chairman, that there are a lot of young

people across this country who should have the opportunity to go to college. They are caught in the middle. Their parents make a little too much money to qualify for a student loan or a grant but they do not make enough money to send them to college. National service is a program for the future, and this Congress should be totally committed to it.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so to announce for my colleagues our plan as to how we are going to proceed. It is my intention to proceed out of order with the Solomon amendment No. 49, then proceed with the regular order of reading. I believe there are only two amendments left in title III. We will then be on title IV, the last title of the bill, and will try to move as quickly as possible on this title.

We do have a number of amendments left. If Members would restrain themselves, not just in terms of time but maybe consider eliminating amendments where there is duplication, it would expedite the work of the House. I am sure all our colleagues would appreciate that effort.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to a portion of the bill not yet read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 95, after line 21, insert the following new sections:

SEC. 422. (a) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING ROTC ACCESS TO CAMPUS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided by contract or by grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to an institution of higher education when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the institution (or any subelement thereof) has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that prohibits, or in effect prevents—

(1) the maintaining, establishing, or operation of a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps (in accordance with section 654 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable Federal laws) at the institution (or subelement); or

(2) a student at the institution (or subelement) from enrolling in a unit of the Senior Reserve Officer Training Corps at another institution of higher education.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation established in subsection (a) shall not apply to an institution of higher education when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the institution (or subelement) has ceased the policy or practice described in such subsection; or

(2) the institution has a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

SEC. 423. (a) DENIAL OF FUNDS FOR PREVENTING FEDERAL MILITARY RECRUITING ON CAMPUS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be provided by contract or grant (including a grant of funds to be available for student aid) to any institution of higher education when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that the institution (or any subelement thereof) has a policy or practice (regardless of when implemented) that prohibits, or in effect prevents—

(1) entry to campuses, or access to students (who are 17 years of age or older) on campuses, for purposes of Federal military recruiting; or

(2) access to the following information pertaining to students (who are 17 years of age or older) for purposes of Federal military recruiting, student names, addresses, telephone listings, dates and places of birth, levels of education, degrees received, prior military experience, and the most recent previous educational institutions enrolled in by the students.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The limitation established in subsection (a) shall not apply to an institution of higher education when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) the institution (or subelement) has ceased the policy or practice described in such subsection; or

(2) the institution has a longstanding policy of pacifism based on historical religious affiliation.

SEC. 424. None of the funds made available in this Act may be obligated or expended to enter into or renew a contract with an entity when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that—

(1) such entity is otherwise a contractor with the United States and is subject to the requirement in section 4212(d) of title 38, United States Code, regarding submission of an annual report to the Secretary of Labor concerning employment of certain veterans; and

(2) such entity has not submitted a report as required by that section for the most recent year for which such requirement was applicable to such entity.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago we were talking about national service. Let me tell Members what real national service is. That is what my amendment deals with. It talks to volunteer national service in the most honorable career in this country today, and that is service in the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

The provisions in the amendment that I am offering before us now with the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] has passed this House several times and should be familiar to Members, so I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, in many places across the country military recruiters are being denied access to educational facilities, preventing recruiters from explaining the honorable benefits of an honorable career in our Armed Forces of the United States to our young people. Likewise, ROTC units have been kicked off of several campuses around the country.

This amendment today would simply prevent any funds appropriated in this

act from going into institutions of higher learning which prevent military recruiting on their campuses or have an anti-ROTC policy.

Mr. Chairman, these institutions that are receiving Federal taxpayer money just cannot be able to then turn their back on the young people who defend this country. It is simple common sense and fairness, and that is why this language has already become the law of the land for Defense Department funds and passed the House by voice vote last month in the science authorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, recruiting is the key to our all-voluntary force, which has been such a spectacular success. Recruiters have been able to enlist such promising volunteers for our Armed Forces by going into high schools and to colleges, by informing young people of the increased opportunities that an honorable military career can provide, such as the Sonny Montgomery peacetime GI bill, which can let them earn up to \$25,000, even \$30,000 towards that education. That is why we need this amendment.

Last, a third of part of the amendment would also deny contracts or grants to institutions that are not in compliance with the law; that they submit an annual report on veterans hiring practices to the Department of Labor. In the same vein, this is simple common sense and fairness to the people who defend our country.

Mr. Chairman, all we are doing here is asking for compliance with existing law. This particular language was also passed by voice vote on the Defense appropriations bill just 2 weeks ago.

Having said all that, I urge Members to vote for my amendment to the gentleman from California [Mr. POMBO] and I are offering right now.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, the cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I too will be brief.

This amendment has passed the House on several previous occasions. As little as a few weeks ago this amendment passed the House. This is an issue of fairness. In our universities and colleges across the country, if Federal tax dollars are good enough to put into those universities, then they should not deny ROTC on their campuses or recruiters entrance onto those campuses.

I think in this new age of political correctness at times we have overstepped our bounds, and this is one instance where many of our universities and colleges have truly overstepped their bounds. They have forced ROTC students off campus, they are forcing recruiters off campus, and at the same time they have their hand out for Federal grants and Federal research dollars, and I believe that that is unfair.

I believe that this amendment is one way of curing that problem and it is

something that is much needed in our country today, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for bringing up this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, and I urge support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other Members wishing to be heard on the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries; \$22,265,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That where station allowance has been authorized by the Department of the Army for officers of the Army serving the Army at certain foreign stations, the same allowance shall be authorized for officers of the Armed Forces assigned to the Commission while serving at the same foreign stations, and this appropriation is hereby made available for the payment of such allowance: *Provided further*, That when traveling on business of the Commission, officers of the Armed Forces serving as members or as Secretary of the Commission may be reimbursed for expenses as provided for civilian members of the Commission: *Provided further*, That the Commission shall reimburse other Government agencies, including the Armed Forces, for salary, pay, and allowances of personnel assigned to it.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL  
INSTITUTIONS  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL  
INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For grants, loans, and technical assistance to qualifying community development lenders, and administrative expenses of the Fund, \$45,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998, of which \$8,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to \$800,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That not more than \$19,400,000 of the funds made available under this heading may be used for programs and activities authorized in section 114 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994.

CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, 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, purchase of

nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$42,500,000.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY  
SERVICE

NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS  
OPERATING EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (referred to in the matter under this heading as the "Corporation") in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (referred to in the matter under this heading as the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), \$365,000,000, of which \$265,000,000 shall be available for obligation from September 1, 1997, through September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That not more than \$25,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses authorized under section 501(a)(4) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12671(a)(4)): *Provided further*, That not more than \$2,500 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not more than \$40,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, shall be transferred to the National Service Trust account for educational awards authorized under subtitle D of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12601 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$201,000,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be available for grants under the National Service Trust program authorized under subtitle C of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12571 et seq.) (relating to activities including the Americorps program): *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,000,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be made available for the Points of Light Foundation for activities authorized under title III of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12661 et seq.): *Provided further*, That no funds shall be available for national service programs run by Federal agencies authorized under section 121(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 12571(b)): *Provided further*, That to the maximum extent feasible, funds appropriated in the preceding proviso shall be provided in a manner that is consistent with the recommendations of peer review panels in order to ensure that priority is given to programs that demonstrate quality, innovation, replicability, and sustainability: *Provided further*, That not more than \$17,500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for the Civilian Community Corps authorized under subtitle E of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12611 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$41,500,000 shall be available for school-based and community-based service-learning programs authorized under subtitle B of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12521 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$30,000,000 shall be available for quality and innovation activities authorized under subtitle H of title I of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12853 et seq.): *Provided further*, That not more than \$5,000,000 shall be available for audits and other evaluations authorized under section 179 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 12639): *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation, or from funds otherwise made available to the Corporation, shall be used to pay for personnel compensation and benefits, travel, or any other administrative expense for the Board of Directors, the Office of the Chief Executive Officer, the Office of the Managing Director, the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, the Office of National and Community Service Programs, the Civilian Community Corps, or any field office or staff of the Corporation working on the National and Community Service or Civilian Community Corps programs: *Provided further*, That to the maxi-

imum extent practicable, the Corporation shall increase significantly the level of matching funds and in-kind contributions provided by the private sector, shall expand significantly the number of educational awards provided under subtitle D of title I, and shall reduce the total Federal costs per participant in all programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA: In the item relating to "CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE—NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES"—

(1) after the sixth dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$30,000,000)"; and

(2) strike the tenth proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last week I informed the House of two very disturbing examples of waste in the AmeriCorps Program. The first was the \$13 million spent on training and technical assistance contracts with such organizations as the AFL-CIO and the new Multicultural Institute.

□ 1545

Both of those were funded for \$400,000 each. The other was the opening of the new AmeriCorps Leadership Training Center overlooking the San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge. This amendment seeks to strike the line-item appropriation which funds what I consider wasteful spending and put the money in the pockets of local and national charities around the country.

This amendment moves \$30 million back into the direction and the priorities for this program, a program that I voted for 3 years ago. This amendment moves money away from Washington bureaucracy, Washington bureaucrats, and moves it directly back to local charities, individuals, and young people in our communities.

Let us talk about these two examples. The Presidio. What is the Presidio Leadership Center? It is nothing more than magical bureaucrats telling local charities, charities like Big Brothers, Big Sisters, you need the Federal Government in order to find a shared purpose or to develop new leaders.

This is a myth. Private charities have operated for years without training provided by the magical bureaucrats. I am sure they will continue to do so long after AmeriCorps and its magical bureaucrats are gone. Remember, AmeriCorps is the organization that cannot even balance its books.

The real danger here is that the training at the Presidio contributes to the deterioration of the identity of local and national charities and replaces it with a Federal cookie-cutter look and a Federal way of operating. This is destructive to the goodwill of many, if not of all, of these charities. It is destructive of the goodwill these charities have earned in the communities in which they serve.

Furthermore, the costs of housing magical bureaucrats at the Presidio are very high. Staff on site of the Presidio have noted that they expected to train only 300 people in 1996. For that they need a budget of \$1.1 million, this equals a cost of approximately \$3,300 per trainee, not including the cost of transportation or lodging. The Washington office of AmeriCorps disputes this figure and expects costs to average almost \$900 per member, again excluding the cost of transportation.

Either way, in my opinion, this is an awfully expensive means of training volunteers and their leaders. There is a better way to spend this money. There is a better way that we should do it. This is by moving it to local volunteers.

Why are the costs so high? Well, according to the GSA, San Francisco is not the bargain basement place to rent facilities. Rentable space in San Francisco is almost twice as expensive as Midwestern cities.

In fact, the rate paid by AmeriCorps for this space, while lower than the allowable amount, is still substantial. Additionally, since grantees are responsible to pay for the cost of getting to the Presidio, its coastal location makes for an expensive trip for the vast majority of AmeriCorps members. It would appear that this site was chosen by magical bureaucrats for its beautiful location and not for its cost or proximity to local charities.

This is a fact even AmeriCorps is beginning to see. According to Harris Wofford, the corporation is considering closing the Presidio Leadership Center in line with its reinvention program. A document provided to me last week by Mr. Wofford stated:

Given the current investment in reinventing government, the Corporation for National Service is exploring the possibility of whether the services provided by the Presidio Leadership Center could be done more cost-effectively by an outside provider by privatizing the current operations.

In short, the Presidio Leadership Center could not pass the reinventing-Government test, and even the corporation is beginning to see that it should be closed. When AmeriCorps started, it was intended to be a catalyst for volunteers at the local level. It was not intended to try to become a national training center. It does not have the capabilities. It does not have the skills to fulfill that mission. Restore AmeriCorps back to the intent and the direction that we put in place.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Who wishes to control the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield one-half of that time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the subcommittee, and that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me the time.

I rise in opposition to the amendment eliminating funding for AmeriCorps Presidio Leadership Center.

The AmeriCorps Program reaps many benefits for local communities. The leadership center ensures that national service leaders administering national service programs receive quality training, leadership development, and environmental technical assistance to train corps members to provide services in communities such as tutoring and conflict resolution, environmental clean-up, and improving community service and other community services.

The Presidio Leadership Center exclusively trains only individuals and program staff associated with the Corporation for National Service, program directors of Learn and Serve America, the National Senior Service Corps, and the AmeriCorps Program. While it may use training techniques developed by corporate trainers, the learning center does not conduct training for any corporate clients.

In the interest of time, Mr. Chairman, I may have to put some of my statement in the RECORD. I did want to say the cost for rental at the Presidio is 26 percent less than the current GSA approved rate for San Francisco.

I would like to address the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], the author of the amendment, to say that so much confidence do people have in the Presidio Leadership Center that I would be willing to put on the record language that would say, provided further that the corporation shall submit to the subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the House Committee on Appropriations no later than 6 months from the date of enactment of this act a plan to ensure that the corporation will not directly operate the Presidio Leadership Center, that there would be an effort to pri-

vate the funding of the Presidio Leadership Center and the corporation would no longer be operating it.

Would the gentleman be receptive to that idea?

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, later on this afternoon I will have an amendment specifically dealing with the Presidio. At that point in time, I would be very willing to incorporate that language into the amendment. Perhaps we could have a dialog between now and then, if necessary, to put that language into the amendment at that time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, is this not the gentleman's amendment on the Presidio Leadership Center?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, this amendment includes the Presidio Training Center but also includes significant other funds used by the corporation in training, including contracts with the AFL-CIO and a number of other agencies.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman would consider first of all supporting the National Service and AmeriCorps but specifically in terms of Presidio Leadership Center, when we get to that particular amendment, the language that I have just stated.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA]. The amendment would transfer the \$30 million earmarked for quality and innovative activities to the \$201 million earmarked for AmeriCorps grants. If this amendment is adopted, there would be no need for the series of amendments involving number 16, 17, 19, and 20, because this amendment would terminate all quality and innovative activities.

It reduces those accounts further than any of the other amendments. Innovative and demonstration grants help to build the ethic of service among AmeriCorps programs, and persons of every age who participate in the program. Disability grants, these grants assist programs to enroll participants with disabilities and to accommodate their participation.

Mr. Chairman, there are people who have questions about AmeriCorps; however, AmeriCorps has not had adequate time to be evaluated. There are some very positive results as well as questions developing on the horizon.

I want a bill. Yet, I really believe I will not get a bill signed into law if this amendment and others like it were to be passed. I must say that if we have a bill that does not include quality and innovative grants, I personally would be very disconcerted by this level of funding. Clearly, at a level of \$365 million in this total program, there is no

reason to add funds for AmeriCorps grants. The various programs are well balanced. So, I would oppose my colleague's amendment.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to these amendments to cut back on AmeriCorps. Let me just tell my colleagues a personal story.

In 1960, when President Kennedy got elected, I was a young college student. He introduced the concept that young Americans could serve this country by serving in the Peace Corps. I and 60 other Members of Congress now serving joined the Peace Corps all at different times and had this incredible experience. That cost this country probably about \$18,000 for 2 years experience. I think everybody will recognize that on the 35th anniversary of the Peace Corps that this country has gotten out a lot more than it has put in.

I think AmeriCorps serves the same purpose in this country and certainly it has gotten even stronger support by the private sector than Peace Corps ever had. AmeriCorps is getting private funding from General Electric Corp., from Tenneco Gas, from Nike Shoes, from Fannie Mae, and others because this program is out reaching the needs of this country and in places where all of the good programs that we in the Federal Government try to trickle down to the people, they still do not reach certain hard niche areas. AmeriCorps is doing that.

Part of AmeriCorps is certainly bringing together the attention of the private nonprofits in this country that we need to collaborate. I find that the AmeriCorps volunteers in our district are doing an incredible job and get complimented all the time. In fact, what they want is more and more.

It gets to the issue here then, as you get more sophisticated in your dealing with the management of AmeriCorps and the management of felt needs in the local communities, you are going to need these leadership training programs sufficient as offered at the Presidio in San Francisco. I think it would be a great damage to this country to even cut back on AmeriCorps, to cut back on the programs that are supporting AmeriCorps and, in fact, if anything this Congress ought to be increasing it, not making a political football out of it.

I ask that Members reject these amendments.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not cut AmeriCorps. My amendment moves spending from training 300 people at a cost of \$1.1 million at the Presidio or going through expensive training programs by different agencies, my amendment actually moves that into

block grants or moves it into the grant dollars, meaning that we will have 1,500 more young people earning dollars for college and higher education. That is where we are moving the dollars. We are moving it to the communities. We are moving it to the young kids. We are taking it away from the bureaucrats.

And to think that AmeriCorps is the place for innovation. Eighty-nine million Americans today volunteer on a regular basis. To believe that AmeriCorps, remember, this is the organization that does not even keep auditable books. This is the place that the rest of the charitable world is going to look to in terms of innovation and how to run quality programs. Give me a break. AmeriCorps should be looking to places like Habitat for Humanity, looking at places like the Salvation Army and saying, how do you get 89 million Americans to volunteer in your organizations?

Come on, we have been having charitable organizations in America long before AmeriCorps existed. AmeriCorps was intended to be a catalyst to facilitate these organizations, not to tell them how to do it.

□ 1600

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is correct.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 3¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], my colleague, that I see wanted to speak.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for that very gracious and bipartisan gesture.

First of all, I hate to do this to the gentleman, but I will take his time and rise in opposition to his amendment.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield but say to the gentleman, do not take up all my time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. That is not a surprise, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is a gentleman with that gesture.

I rise in opposition to the amendment for a couple reasons. First of all, it does not save a dime, it just simply moves \$30 million from one account to another account. Second, it micromanages the AmeriCorps Program, and it says:

We in Congress know exactly the way that you should be spending your money, we are going to tell you exactly what to do with an

innovative education training program that the Governors are running pretty darn well.

Governor Engler is doing welfare reform out of this program. Governor Romer is doing quality child-care providing out of this program. Governor Wilson is improving education mentoring through this program.

So innovative things are going on at the State level, and Thomas Jefferson said many, many years ago that we should allow our States to serve as laboratories for democracy and see what works best at the local level. That is precisely what is happening with this program now, from Republican and Democratic Governors, from mentoring children to reforming welfare.

I urge, even though the gentleman has granted me all this time, my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague that this may be perceived as micromanaging. It is micromanaging to the tune of \$30 million, it is micromanaging back to the direction of a program that I voted for 3 years ago that said we are going to focus these dollars at local programs, we are going to focus it on the young people, and we are going to try to make an impact at the grass-roots level, and we are also going to be a world-class organization. In too many places with this program we have consistently been disappointed. It is not a world-class organization. We are moving money into bureaucracies and buildings and bureaucrats in Washington. We want, I want, to have the impact at the local level.

I have got serious questions about this program after 3 years. But it is kind of like if we are going to do the program, let us move the money to the kids in the local agencies, and that is what it does. Let us not put it in the Presidio, let us not give it to the AFL-CIO. These people that are running these agencies at the local level are some of our most talented people, the people that are involved in the charitable organization are some of the most talented people at the local level. They work for Fortune 500 companies, they are successful entrepreneurs, they know how to manage, they have access to these training capabilities at the local level.

We do not need a redundant organization here in Washington or in San Francisco. When organizations at this level, when these people at the local level, are looking to enhance their capabilities and their skills, they are not going to come to the Corporation for National Service to see how they can improve their programs. They have got those skills at the local level.

Let us save this \$30 million, let us move it to where it can have a positive impact, and I think that that is the right place to go. This is what is characterized earlier today—this is not a



mean-spirited amendment. I believe that this is a constructive amendment to move dollars back to the direction where we wanted this program to be when we passed it in 1993.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I obviously will be very brief.

As my colleagues can tell, I am a great supporter of AmeriCorps. I think it is one of the greatest programs that we have done here in Congress, and I hope that we will give it strong support, increasing support.

The issue here is not AmeriCorps. It is about cost. And remember that it is not just a debate about cost, but it is a debate about value.

Defeat these amendments. It is not just the price of everything, but it is also the value of something. The AmeriCorps is a great value to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 456, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$2,000,000.

#### COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Veterans Appeals as authorized by 38 U.S.C. sections 7251-7292, \$9,229,000, of which \$634,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998, shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-227.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

##### CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$11,600,000, to remain available until expended.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development ac-

tivities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; 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; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$540,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, 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, \$1,703,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1998.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$28,500,000.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$107,220,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That EPA is authorized to establish and construct a consolidated research facility at Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, at a maximum total construction cost of \$232,000,000, and to obligate such monies as are made available by this Act for this purpose: *Provided further*, That EPA is authorized to construct such facility through multi-year contracts incrementally funded through appropriations hereafter made available for this project: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the previous provisos, for monies obligated pursuant to this authority, EPA may not obligate monies in excess of those provided in advance in annual appropriations, and such contracts shall clearly provide for this limitation.

#### HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111 (c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; not to exceed \$2,200,000,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of \$1,950,000,000 as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101-

508, and \$250,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended by Public Law 101-508: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That \$11,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 111(m) of CERCLA or any other provision of law, not to exceed \$59,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available to the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to carry out activities described in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of CERCLA and section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986: *Provided further*, That \$35,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to the "Science and technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 1997: *Provided further*, That \$861,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall become available for obligation only upon the enactment of future appropriations legislation that specifically makes these funds available for obligation.

#### LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$46,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no more than \$7,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That \$577,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 1997.

#### OIL SPILL RESPONSE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$15,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$8,000,000 of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$2,768,207,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,800,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for State revolving funds to support water infrastructure financing; \$100,000,000 for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; \$50,000,000 for grants to the State of Texas, which shall be matched by an equal amount of State funds from State resources, for the purpose of improving wastewater treatment for colonias; \$15,000,000 for grants to the State of Alaska subject to an appropriate

cost share as determined by the Administrator, to address wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; \$129,000,000 for making grants for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities and the development of groundwater in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the Report accompanying this Act; and \$674,207,000 for grants to States and federally recognized tribes for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104-134: *Provided*, That, from funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator may make grants to federally recognized Indian governments for the development of multi-media environmental programs: *Provided further*, That of the \$1,800,000,000 for capitalization grants for State revolving funds to support water infrastructure financing, \$450,000,000 shall be for drinking water State revolving funds, but if no drinking water State revolving fund legislation is enacted by June 1, 1997, these funds shall immediately be available for making capitalization grants under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended.

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

There is hereby established in the Treasury a franchise fund pilot to be known as the "Working capital fund", as authorized by section 403 of Public Law 103-356, to be available as provided in such section for expenses and equipment necessary for the maintenance and operation of such administrative services as the Administrator determines may be performed more advantageously as central services: *Provided*, That any inventories, equipment, and other assets pertaining to the services to be provided by such fund, either on hand or on order, less the related liabilities or unpaid obligations, and any appropriations made hereafter for the purpose of providing capital, shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be paid in advance from funds available to the Agency and other Federal agencies for which such centralized services are performed, at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including accrued leave, depreciation of fund plant and equipment, amortization of automated data processing (ADP) software and systems (either acquired or donated), and an amount necessary to maintain a reasonable operating reserve, as determined by the Administrator: *Provided further*, That such fund shall provide services on a competitive basis: *Provided further*, That an amount not to exceed four percent of the total annual income to such fund may be retained in the fund for fiscal year 1997 and each fiscal year thereafter, to remain available until expended, to be used for the acquisition of capital equipment and for the improvement and implementation of Agency financial management, ADP, and other support systems: *Provided further*, That no later than thirty days after the end of each fiscal year amounts in excess of this reserve limitation shall be transferred to the Treasury: *Provided further*, That such franchise fund pilot shall terminate pursuant to section 403(f) of Public Law 103-356.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act to the Environmental Protection Agency for any account, program or project may be transferred to Science and Technology for necessary research activities, subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Report accompanying this Act.

#### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

##### OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$4,932,000.

##### COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, \$2,250,000.

##### FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$1,320,000,000, and, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 5203, to become available for obligation on September 30, 1997, and remain available until expended.

##### DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, \$1,385,000, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$25,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$548,000.

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343); uniforms, or allowances therefor, 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; expenses of attendance of co-operating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$168,000,000.

##### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$4,533,000.

##### EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security

Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404-405), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, \$209,101,000.

##### EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

To carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77, as amended, \$100,000,000: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed three and one-half percent of the total appropriation.

##### NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, and the National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994, not to exceed \$20,981,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed \$78,464,000 for flood mitigation, including up to \$20,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of the National Flood Insurance Act, which amount shall be available until September 30, 1998. In fiscal year 1997, no funds in excess of (1) \$47,000,000 for operating expenses, (2) \$335,680,000 for agents' commissions and taxes, and (3) \$35,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations. For fiscal year 1997, flood insurance rates shall not exceed the level established for such rates as of June 1, 1996.

##### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For the establishment of a working capital fund for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operations of such administrative services as the Director determines may be performed more advantageously as central services: *Provided*, That any inventories, equipment, and other assets pertaining to the services to be provided by such fund, either on hand or on order, less the related liabilities or unpaid obligations, and any appropriations made hereafter for the purpose of providing capital, shall be used to capitalize such fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments from applicable appropriations and funds of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, other Federal agencies, and other sources authorized by law for which such centralized services are performed, including supplies, materials, and services, at rates that will return in full all expenses of operation, including accrued leave, depreciation of fund plant and equipment, amortization of automated data processing (ADP) software and systems (either acquired or donated), and an amount necessary to maintain a reasonable operating reserve as determined by the Director: *Provided further*, That income of such fund may be retained, to remain available until expended, for purposes of the fund: *Provided further*, That fees for services shall be established by the Director at a level to cover the total estimated costs of providing such services, such fees to be deposited in the fund shall remain available until expended for purposes of the fund: *Provided further*, That such fund shall terminate in a manner consistent with section 403(f) of Public Law 103-356.

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

The Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall promulgate through rulemaking a methodology for assessment and collection of fees to be assessed and collected beginning in fiscal year 1997 applicable to persons subject to the Federal Emergency Management Agency's radiological emergency preparedness regulations. The aggregate charges assessed pursuant to this section during fiscal year 1997 shall approximate, but not be less than, 100 per centum of

the amounts anticipated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be obligated for its radiological emergency preparedness program for such fiscal year. The methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable, and shall reflect the full amount of costs of providing radiological emergency planning, preparedness, response and associated services. Such fees shall be assessed in a manner that reflects the use of agency resources for classes of regulated persons and the administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts. Assessment and collection of such fees are only authorized during fiscal year 1997.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION  
CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$2,260,000, to be deposited into the Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues and collections deposited into the fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of \$7,500,000. Administrative expenses of the Consumer Information Center in fiscal year 1997 shall not exceed \$2,602,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this fund during fiscal year 1997 in excess of \$7,500,000 shall remain in the fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Consumer Information Center may accept and deposit to this account, during fiscal year 1997, gifts for the purpose of defraying its costs of printing, publishing, and distributing consumer information and educational material; may expend up to \$1,100,000 of those gifts for those purposes, in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated; and the balance shall remain available for expenditure for such purpose to the extent authorized in subsequent appropriations Acts.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE  
ADMINISTRATION  
HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of human space flight research and development activities, including research, development, operations, and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$5,362,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and technology research and development activities, including research, development, operations, and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, and modification of real and personal property, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$5,662,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998. Chapter VII of Public Law 104-6 is amended

under the heading, "National Aeronautics and Space Administration" by replacing "September 30, 1997" with "September 30, 1998" and "1996" with "1997".

MISSION SUPPORT

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out mission support for human space flight programs and science, aeronautical, and technology programs, including research operations and support; space communications activities including operations, production and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; travel expenses; purchase, lease charter, maintenance, and operation of mission and administrative aircraft; not to exceed \$35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase (not to exceed 33 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$2,562,200,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$17,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Human space flight", "Science, aeronautics and technology", or "Mission support" by this appropriations Act, when (1) any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities as authorized by law, or (2) amounts are provided for full-funding for the Tracking and Data Relay Satellite (TDRS) replenishment program, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated in "Mission support" pursuant to the authorization for repair, rehabilitation and modification of facilities, minor construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, and facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Human space flight", "Science, aeronautics and technology", or "Mission support" by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1999.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Mission support" and "Office of Inspector General", amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 1997 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, cost associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION  
CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY

During fiscal year 1997, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions, as authorized by the National Credit Union Central Liquidity Facility Act (12 U.S.C. 1795), shall not exceed \$600,000,000; *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility in fiscal year

1997 shall not exceed \$560,000; *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000, together with amounts of principal and interest on loans repaid, to be available until expended, is available for loans to community development credit unions.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION  
RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880-1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; \$2,422,000,000, of which not to exceed \$226,000,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: In the item relating to "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$9,110,000)".

In the item relating to "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$9,110,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the Committee of today, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, just 3 weeks ago the House voted by a 70-vote margin not to increase the salaries and expense account of the National Science Foundation by \$9.1 million to a total of \$134.3 million. Unfortunately, the VA-HUD bill that we have before us now defies that specific House vote and puts the money into the salary and expense account despite the House determination.

What this amendment does is merely conforms the NSF salaries and expense account to the House-passed authorization level and moves the freed-up money, the \$9.1 million into the NSF research account where it is authorized. In other words, it takes the money out of bureaucracy where the money is not authorized and puts it

into university research where it has been authorized.

The reason for doing this is because the administration has been playing election-year politics with this account. If my colleagues can look on this chart, the administration actually takes salaries and expenses up in 1997 and then drops them off a cliff out to the year 2000, and the fact is it will cost, under the administration's plan, several hundred jobs at NSF, according to a letter that I have recently received from the NSF director.

The President proposes to increase the National Science Foundation S&E account in fiscal 1997, then cut it by \$11 million in fiscal 1998 down to \$118 million and then another \$11 million in fiscal 1999 to \$107 million, and then another \$6 million in the year 2000 to a level of \$101 million.

In the meantime, what we intend to do in our proposal is to reduce the S&E account from \$127 million in fiscal 1996 to \$120 million in fiscal year 1997.

Furthermore, our plan then calls for level funding until the year 2000, and our plan allows NSF to make the proper gradual steps to maintain efficiency. Our plan would not have the drastic cuts represented in the administration plans between the years 1998 and the year 2000. Over the same time frame our plan provides \$34 million more for salaries and expenses than does the President's plan. The additional \$34 million in our overall budget plan buys a lot more morale.

Our science authorization bill adopted the S&E account numbers used in the budget resolution for \$120 million. Ironically, the administration was quick to point to our authorization bill and the impact that it would have on NSF. However, when we asked for the same analysis applied to the President's numbers, suddenly that was not available.

I would like to include a record at this point of our exchange of letters on that matter.

□ 1615

By confirming the NSF S&E account to the House-passed authorization level, we can increase the NSF account by \$9 million. The research account supports all aspects of science to promote discovery, integration, dissemination, and employment of new knowledge to society. The research account funds a broad range of fundamental research activities, including awards for individuals and small groups of investigators, research centers, national user facilities such as the super-computing centers, the national astronomy centers, and the academic research fleet. Also, the research account supports activities such as the international scientific partnerships and the research and logistics in the Arctic and Antarctic regions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It increases science funding and reduces bureaucracy. It makes the VA-HUD bill

consistent with the House-passed authorization. It adds no budget authority and reduces budget outlays.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield half of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, and that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member of the Committee on Science.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The amendment will harm what is widely recognized as an efficient and well run Federal agency that has the vital role of supporting basic research and education.

With NSF, we have the unusual situation of a Federal agency that is the inverse of a bloated bureaucracy. For the past 10 years, as its workload has doubled, the agency had held its staffing level constant, while learning to work smarter.

NSF has moved aggressively to streamline the proposal review process, for example, by moving toward electronic proposal submission and review. Paper has been reduced and the interactions between external reviewers and NSF staff has been made more effective.

Despite the record of holding down administrative costs and the evident progress NSF has made to improve the efficiency of its internal operations, the amendment seeks to punish the agency by cutting its budget for salaries and administrative expenses by nearly 6 percent relative to the fiscal year 1996 appropriations level. But the actual impact of the amendment on personnel is worse—closer to a 9 percent cut—because fixed expenses, such as building rent and utility costs, cannot be reduced.

This proposal has not been advanced on the basis of any evidence whatsoever that suggests that NSF is squan-

dering resources or has an excess of staff. The cut is proposed in the absence of any supporting facts, without any convincing rationale, and in fact, contrary to available evidence on the efficiency and effectiveness of NSF in administering its programs.

What other Federal agency operates on 4 percent of its total budget and has a better record for administrative efficiency? Because NSF is a lean organization with little management flab, the cut that would be imposed by the amendment will translate into slashing staff positions by as much as 10 percent and in turn reduce the ability of the agency to carry out its responsibilities.

The amendment cuts the internal operating budget for NSF and shifts the funds to the account for research grant support. That is, it increases the research budget for NSF while simultaneously degrading the ability of the agency to administer the extra funds. The losers will be the researchers at universities and colleges throughout the Nation who rely on NSF for support. If this amendment succeeds, they can expect delays in proposal reviews and awards.

The bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee provides the appropriate and necessary funding for NSF's internal operations. It will provide only a 1.5 percent increase above the fiscal year 1996 appropriations level for salaries and administrative expenses—hardly a lavish increase.

But by providing this funding, the bill as reported will help ensure that NSF continues to effectively manage its research programs and will avoid significant demoralization of one of the Federal Government's most effective and dedicated cadre of employees.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this ill-considered and harmful amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, following the comments of my colleague, the gentleman from California, GEORGE BROWN, I would like to repeat one of the points that he made. The National Science Foundation's operating expenses are approximately 4 percent of the agency's budget. That is a figure that compares quite favorably with the 10 percent in overhead costs, which is the norm for nonprofit research foundations. Beyond that, it probably competes very well with a broad cross-section of other Federal Government programs as well as agencies.

The argument that taking this action merely reflects the actions planned for fiscal year 1998 by the administration is sending the wrong message is it relates to these percentages. Congress has already supported the Foundation and its efforts to promote sound science research. We should take this opportunity to show that we continue to support the Foundation and will not let the administration compromise the operations of the agency by reducing its capacity to conduct merit-based reviews of proposals prior to awarding grants.

Fundamental to the merit-based review process is an adequate staff to prepare documents and abstracts for use by peer panels. Reducing the staff by up to 10 percent, as is likely under this proposal, would hinder the operations of the organization and place the peer review process in jeopardy.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Walker amendment. I want to say first, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research of the Committee on Science, with direct authorization and jurisdiction over the National Science Foundation, that I believe it is a well-run agency. They have their problems internally, like every other agency does, including the Congress, of course, but their overall reputation under director Neal Lane is very good.

Nevertheless, I want to point out two things about the Walker amendment. First, I understand, of course, that the National Science Foundation would rather have the administration's recommendations for the salaries and expense account than it would like to have the authorizing committee, the Committee on Science's recommendations. This is because for the first year, the year we are debating right now, the administration recommends an increase in funding on that account, while the Committee on Science recommends a decrease.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly cannot blame anybody for preferring an increase over a decrease. But the point is it does not stop there. The point is that after the first year, after the fiscal year we are debating now, fiscal year 1997, look what happens to the salaries and expense account of the National Science Foundation under the administration's proposal. It drops precipitously, until after the first year the proposal from the administration for this very account falls below the Committee on Science recommendation. The Committee on Science recommendation does indeed go down, but then it is level to the year 2000. The administration's proposal goes down and keeps going down, year after year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that even if this reduction takes place, the National Science Foundation ought to be able to find ways, other than laying off personnel, to cut its overhead. But I would point out that if we are creating really such a disaster for the National Science Foundation, then it is off the Richter scale what the administration will do to the National Science Foundation if their complete budget recommendations are followed.

So I believe that in the long run, the National Science Foundation is better off in this account under the chairman's amendment than under the administration's.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out one other thing. That is that certainly every agency is facing tight budgets here. Every agency would like to have greater funds, but every agency must tighten its belt as we seek to balance the budget. It seems to me that \$9 million is better put into the account that does actual research funding, which is the purpose of the National Science Foundation, and they find other ways to cut their overhead.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself a minute.

Mr. Chairman, a reduction of \$9 million from the level in this bill could require a reduction of up to 120 FTE's, and would hinder the management and operation of NSF's programs and its merit review decisionmaking process, the distinguishing characteristic of NSF's mission.

Staff cuts and other reductions would significantly impede the quality, timeliness, and effectiveness of important research and education programs, and would have a negative effect on the agency's ability to serve the science community and the public. This is contrary to everything we are trying to do to make Government work better and to serve the public more effectively.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this amendment. I recognize the point that has been made by others, that the National Science Foundation employees are loyal, they are hard-working, and it would be improper and not good practice to pass the amendment and reduce the amount available for salaries and expenses. That is true of many areas of Government.

I am very familiar with the National Science Foundation. Indeed, I can verify that these are very good employees. They are loyal employees and they work very, very hard. But we are in a time where we are facing a \$5 trillion national debt. We are facing interest payments of \$300 billion per year. We have to tighten the belt. The question is, where is the belt going to be tightened?

When it comes to the National Science Foundation, are we going to tighten the belt in grants or are we going to tighten it in administration? Those are issues we struggled with in the Committee on Science. We reached the conclusion that we should tighten the belt in a number of areas, but certainly also in the administrative expenses, salaries. It is a difficult decision, but it was one that was made in the committee and that was adopted by the House as a whole.

The question before us now is whether we are going to stick with that deci-

sion, whether we are going to follow the authorization that was made by the Committee on Science and the House, or whether we are going to change gears here and shift to another approach based on the Committee on Appropriations' recommendation. I believe it is very important for us to stick with the authorization that was passed out of the Committee on Science and through the full House, and not switch at this point. We want to stay with the previous decision, and pass an appropriation that matches the authorization.

At issue here is more than just where the money is going. At issue is the role of the authorization committees. I believe we have to be consistent and stay with the recommendation we decided on earlier.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 1¼ minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the argument made against this amendment coming from those who have spoken suggests that the NSF is a well-run agency. Indeed, the NSF has been a well-run agency, but the problem is that NSF is going to have to face the need for budget reductions. The question is, does it come out of the hide of research or does it come out of the hide of administration?

We have suggested that we can in fact eliminate one directorate at NSF and save the kinds of money we are talking about saving, and put NSF on the track toward the kinds of personnel that can be sustained over a long period of time while we balance the budget.

The pattern that is suggested by the approach of the Committee on Appropriations is what Neal Lane has told me in a letter will result in a reduction from 1,200 full-time equivalent employees at the present time to 800 people in the year 2000. That is what will destroy the NSF. So we suggested it is time now to begin the process of changing NSF to a better administrative structure. That is what we do. That is what the House has endorsed.

At the same time, we put more money into the universities and into the localities across the country; take the power out of Washington and put the power back out in the country; make certain that the money is spent for research, not for bureaucracy. That is what we will do in this amendment. This amendment will permit us to begin the reform of NSF, to get a better administrative structure there, to have less expense for administration and more money for basic research. I think that is the right route to go.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few more good words about the National Science Foundation.

Basically, the message I want to communicate to Members here is that the Committee on Appropriations has done a better job of facing up to the needs of our science establishment in this country than, in my opinion, the authorizing committee has done. I do not often say this, because I, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] does, have a very high opinion for the work of the authorizing committee. So when I say it in this connection, I hope it will carry a little bit of extra weight.

The fact of the matter is that since the early 1980's the NSF budget has tripled, the workload doubled, and its staffing levels have actually declined and they will continue to decline. The charts that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has shown show two different rates of decline, and the gentleman thinks that that portion of the chart which reflects his views as to the rate of decline is the best.

I happen to disagree with that. I think in this situation the rate of decline which is mandated by almost any effort to balance the budget is best reflected by the President's own budget over this period of time, which in my opinion will provide additional funding.

Now, it would be a normal situation that we would not propose a drastic cut in an agency's staffing level when that agency is known to be extremely efficient and have probably the best record of overhead costs or operating costs of any agency in the Government. One would expect that there would be something egregious about the way the agency is being conducted to warrant that kind of a drastic cut. But this is not the case with the National Science Foundation. I know of nothing said here that speaks to the issue of their efficiency in an adverse fashion.

So I ask my colleagues to vote to support the Committee Appropriations in this case and reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 456, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT

For necessary expenses of major construction projects pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$612,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services and headquarters relocation; \$134,310,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1997 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$4,690,000, to remain available until September 30, 1998.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

##### PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101-8107), \$50,000,000.

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101-4118 for civilian employees; and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$22,930,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

#### TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation

has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefore in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefore set forth in the estimates in the same proportion.

SEC. 402. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 403. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811-1831).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 405. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made, or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between his domicile and his place of employment, with the exception of any officer or employee authorized such transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344 or 5 U.S.C. 7905.

SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall

reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 408. None of the funds in this Act may be used, directly or through grants, to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for Level IV of the Executive Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 409. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 410. Except as otherwise provided under existing law or under an existing Executive order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection, and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within twenty-four months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 411. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), for a contract for services unless such executive agency (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder, and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared, and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 412. Except as otherwise provided in section 406, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 413. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 414. None of the funds appropriated in title I of this Act shall be used to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than \$300,000 unless the Secretary submits, in writing, a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress and a period of 30 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 415. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any

contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 416. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21.

SEC. 417. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1997 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 418. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 419. Such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of the Office of Consumer Affairs shall be made available from funds appropriated to the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 420. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 1997 for such corporation or agency except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 421. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to pay the salaries of personnel who approve a contract for the purchase, lease, or acquisition in any manner of supercomputing equipment or services after a preliminary determination, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1673b, or final determination, as defined in 19 U.S.C. 1673d, by the Department of Commerce that an organization providing such supercomputing equipment or services has offered such product at other than fair value.

Mr. LEWIS of California (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title IV through page 95, line 21, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUMP

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STUMP: Page 95, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. . The amount provided in title I for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical care" is hereby increased by, the amount provided in title I for "Departmental Administration—General operating expenses" is hereby increased by, and the total of the amounts of budget authority provided in this Act for payments not required by law for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997 (other than any amount of budget authority provided in title I and any such amount provided in title III for the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Court of Veterans Appeals, or Cemeterial Expenses, Army), is hereby reduced by, \$40,000,000, \$17,000,000, and 0.40 percent, respectively.

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

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering today is co-authored with my good friend and ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], and also by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. Chairman, we offer this amendment with great regard for the difficulty of assembling the annual appropriation bill for departments and agencies as diverse as those in H.R. 3666.

The amendment is very straightforward and addresses two areas of funding in the bill we are concerned about—VA medical care and the general operating expenses for the Veterans Benefits Administration.

The effect of this amendment would be to increase VA medical care funding by \$40 million and increase the general operating expenses for the Veterans Benefits Administration by \$17 million over the amounts currently provided in the bill.

The increase in VA medical care would be consistent with the House Budget Resolution.

It would also provide the VA with the potential for increasing the number of outpatient visits at hospitals experiencing substantial workload increase due to seasonal, as well as permanent migration of veterans;

Beginning to address the nearly \$1 billion backlog in medical equipment purchases through expanded sharing with the private sector on capital costs and operation of expensive high-tech medical equipment; and

Establishing a limited number of community based clinics in areas with increased veteran population.

The increase in the amendment for the Veterans Benefits Administration will help prevent funding from falling to levels which would negatively impact the current backlog in claims processing.

The President's budget request already cuts 624 positions out of the benefit claims processing staff. Currently, 373,505 claims are backlogged at VA regional offices around the country.

Original compensation claims decisions are taking 151 days, while original pension claims are taking 88 days.

Appealing a claim through the Board of Veterans Appeals currently averages 641 days and the appeals backlog now stands at nearly 60,000 cases. The VA has indicated that the additional \$20 million reduction in this bill would add 50,000 cases to the current claims backlog.

This amendment is supported by the following veterans service organizations: the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS (American Veterans of WWII, Korea and Vietnam), Vietnam Veterans of America, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Non-Commissioned Officers Association.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge Members to support the Stump-Montgomery-Solomon amendment.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Stump-Montgomery-Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the increased funding for veterans health care contained in this bill really is not enough. For years funding for the medical care account could not keep pace with the increase in medical inflation. To be fair to the committees, we have been getting about a 5- to 6-percent increase for medical care. In our hospitals it takes 10 percent to really cover these hospitals and take care of the inflation.

Even though this bill is at the level requested by the administration, it would lead to a reduction, Mr. Chairman, of over 5,000 employees in the VA health care system in 1997. These 5,000 employees are presently working, providing health care and helping the veterans and their families.

Mr. Chairman, adding \$40 million to the VA medical care account will not restore all of the employees who are being cut, but it will help some of them.

We also ought to provide at least the amount requested for the Veterans Benefits Administration. We had a hearing last week at our committee at which we discussed the delays in processing claims for benefits, and a number of my colleagues on the floor today have mentioned that veterans' claims do not get processed quickly.

It now takes 154 days to process a claim for compensation, and veterans would like to see this cut in half. Even with the additional \$17 million which the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] is recommending, the Veterans Benefits Administration projects a loss of 600 employees, nearly 5 percent of the work force. If we cannot at least meet the administration's request, current delays in deciding claims will probably get worse.

I appreciate the support of our colleagues on this amendment, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] have worked with the chairman and the ranking minority, and I

certainly hope they will accept this amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just a few words on behalf of the amendment. The first thing I want to do is just to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and certainly the ranking member for the great job that they have done on this particular bill.

This bill takes in not only the Department of Veterans Affairs, but the housing and all of the other independent agencies, and I do not think I would want their job, because when they are given the overall caps and the allocations to mete out these moneys, they just do not go that far. So again, I want to commend them for the great job they have done.

We have a problem, though. One problem is that President Clinton has said that he will veto this bill for, among other things, the fact that it does not have quite enough funding for the Veterans' Administration. Specifically he mentioned the hospital health care, medical care delivery system.

This amendment does provide \$40 million for that, and another \$17 million, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has outlined, and I will not get into that. But the truth of the matter is that we have two reasons why we need to support this amendment.

One is that we depend on an all-voluntary military in our country today, and the people that are attracted to the military have to know that that medical care delivery system is going to be there. That is an earned benefit; it is a part of the contract that we make in enticing them to join the military today. They have to know it is going to be there tomorrow, 20 years from now, 40 years from now.

The other reason is because we have such an aging veterans population. I had a meeting in Saratoga Springs just last Monday with all of the veterans. We were talking about the funding that we have in this bill for the Saratoga National Veterans Cemetery. It is the only one within hundreds of miles for any these veterans around the Albany capital district area. All of these veterans that were there, almost every one of them, some of them were from the Korean war, but most from World War II, ages between 72 and 77 years of age, and those people need help.

This small amendment here will go a long way toward not only sending a message and letting the President know that he no longer can veto this bill because of a lack of funding for the Veterans' Administration, but it will go a long way toward satisfying the concerns that our veteran population have.

So I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and our ranking member over here for the outstanding job that they have done.

I hope my colleagues will accept the amendment. I know they have had a terrible job in trying to work this out. But the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] will find a way; he is the kind of guy that can do it. So I wish him luck.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have learned over time that when we present an amendment or a bill on the floor that involves funding for veterans medical care, the House is going to pass that amendment regardless of what the amendment does. As we have gone through this process over the last year-and-a-half, every one of the accounts in this bill have been asked to reduce their rates of growth. But every time we have had a discussion relative to restraining areas of growth in the veterans accounts, to say the least, the House has indicated that, these programs are a sacred cow to Members on both sides of the aisle.

This Member has spent a great deal of time since assuming this chairmanship attempting to evaluate the past history of veterans programs, what the veterans authorizing committee has done for veterans, and the responses of the Committee on Appropriations.

The one thing that I would like to suggest to the membership as well as to others who are listening, it is most disconcerting to me that we seem to be very proud of the funding levels provided to veteran programs. We pound our chests and tell our constituents how great we are, and yet seemingly, many of us have failed to try to measure effectively how these funds are being used out there in the hospitals where the veterans are supposedly being served.

I must tell you, we treat veterans like sacred cows on the House floor and sometimes they are treated like cattle out there where the service is delivered, and it is time that we changed that, and the authorizing committees as well as the appropriations committees should take a serious look at the way these services are being delivered. Oh, we are so proud, but I must say, I know of a veteran who slept in the hall of a hospital for 2 weeks in Los Angeles recently because he was just being ignored, despite the money that was provided. These stories drive this Member nuts. In the meantime, I must suggest that we do none of these things without pain.

This account has been treated differently than any other within our entire bill. And with this amendment, we go beyond the President's request which is already an increase of \$44 million, and add another \$40 million. But we take it from other accounts. Each of you have an interest in these accounts, so you should know exactly what this amendment does. It reduces \$79 million from HUD housing; that is, aged housing, disabled people, and the poorest of the poor. It reduces \$26 million from EPA, \$54 million from NASA.



It is a 0.4 percent across-the-board cut. Well, frankly, that is easy to do. You say it is a small amount, but every account should give, except very select accounts.

I would suggest to the Members that this across-the-board cut jeopardizes the amendment in the long term, for I believe the other body will look somewhat askance at this action. Indeed, the question of this general funding will be seriously attended to in the conference committee.

So while I have suggested to the authorizing committee I had other sources in mind to increase this account, they chose an across-the-board cut. I think the general membership should know that the authorizing committee chose this action rather than other specific tradeoffs that were feasible offsets.

□ 1645

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I want to congratulate my good friend BOB STUMP whom I served with many years ago on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, SONNY MONTGOMERY who has been a real stalwart on behalf of veterans, and Mr. SOLOMON for so many years who has always taken the case of our veterans. For years before I came to this body, I had a commitment to the veterans hospitals and the veterans delivery system in this country. I think this is an excellent amendment. I understand the frustrations of Mr. LEWIS. I share those same frustrations because as the former chairman of military construction, I have fought the battle about quality of life and helping our veterans. There is never enough money and never enough of a high priority for our veterans.

I want to congratulate everybody that has worked so hard on this amendment and I hope that it will pass overwhelmingly because it is a debt that we owe to our veterans and it is something that we do not do enough of. I congratulate everyone who had a part in this amendment. I thank the Members for bringing it to our attention.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] was concerned, and I understand what he said about some of the treatment at these VA hospitals.

We have the largest hospital system in the world, 171 hospitals, 234 outpatient clinics, and a number of nursing homes. The system cannot be run perfectly. At the Mayo Hospital and Johns Hopkins, they have a lot of problems also, the service is very complicated and problems develop.

But if they will come to the committee when they have these problems, to the gentleman, as I told Mr. LEWIS, we

will try to help him or her. We will get that man out of the hall. We will get him a bed. We are doing the best we can, we are making some improvements, and I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. HEFNER. I thank the gentleman. Certainly they are not without their faults and without their problems. Even our private hospitals sometimes have instances where they operate on the wrong foot or what have you. These things happen, but they are not unique. Our veterans hospitals, the people that work in those VA hospitals are so committed, they work long hours, they work for less pay in most cases, the doctors are committed.

I just commend the people that work in these health delivery systems, the hospitals. Again I want to thank the people that put together this amendment, and I hope that the committee will accept it. If they do not accept it, I hope it is passed overwhelmingly.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee on Appropriations. He brings to this floor a tough bill. It is a bill that has many other sections in it where we have had, because of the fiscal constraints, to cut very important programs affecting people. Housing is one specific example where earlier today we had an amendment, where people who are poor, who are disadvantaged, who are dependent upon public funds have had to suffer from these cuts.

In the area of the veterans, VA medical care was funded at the budget request, receiving an increase of \$444 million above 1996. Veterans were not shortchanged here at all. I do not think anyone ought to think that the amendment that is before us today was based upon or predicated upon the fact that veterans in this bill were in any way shortchanged.

At some point in time, we have to understand that we cannot just continue to increase the veterans budget at the expense of all the other Americans who are dependent upon other sections in this bill. I understand the predicament the chairman is in, and I understand what will happen in terms of this amendment. But I think that at some point in time we have to understand, and this comes from one who happens to be a veteran, that there are other Americans whom we have to treat in the same manner that we treat veterans.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stump-Solomon-Montgomery amendment to the fiscal year 1997 VA-HUD appropriations bill. The amendment, as we know, would add 40 million much needed dollars to the VA's medical care account. We all know that \$40 million will not solve

the funding problems being experienced by the VA. However, it will permit the VA to add to its flexibility in providing services such as community nursing home care and adult day care to our Nation's veterans, and it will allow the VA to continue to establish more access points in its further effort to bring VA care to the communities across the Nation right where the veteran is.

As chairman of the Hospitals and Health Care Subcommittee, I have seen over and over again how often our veterans have in fact been shortchanged. Our veterans are aging. As they get older, there are greater needs that they have. They experience more acute care needs. The cost of providing that health care is increasing every year. Yet we have seen over and over in the discretionary spending, the veterans taking a disproportionate amount of the cuts. And so earlier this year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the full committee in which SONNY MONTGOMERY for years was chairman, on which BOB STUMP is doing such a wonderful job, in its views and estimates to the Committee on the Budget, recommended a \$505 million increase in VA medical care. This increase of \$40 million will not get us there, but it will at least move us in that direction. It will get us closer to what the full committee recommended.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is a responsible amendment, and that it will move this spending bill in the direction of helping our veterans and meeting our commitment to our veterans. I strongly urge my colleagues to endorse the Stump-Solomon-Montgomery amendment to the VA-HUD and that we work toward this. Our veterans have always enjoyed strong bipartisan support. I am hopeful that that tradition will continue today.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I just want to say that from the perspective of the majority, and I believe the minority, it is our intention to accept this amendment and clearly it would receive a positive vote. I would just as soon not take too much time of the House as we go through these votes.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my enthusiastic support for the Stump-Montgomery-Solomon amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will increase the VA's medical care account by \$40 million. I would like to commend the bipartisan sponsors of this amendment for their recognition of the pressing need to maintain an adequately funded VA medical care account.

The bill that we are currently considering already provides a substantial increase in the medical care account over last year's funding level. It includes the budget request of the President of more than \$17 billion. This is \$444.5 million dollars more than the fiscal 1996 level. By passing this amendment, we are further strengthening our commitment to providing quality medical care for our Nation's veterans.

The need for adequate resources for veterans health care is nowhere more evident than in the congressional district that I represent. Located within New York's 19th District are two VA hospitals: the Castle Point Medical Center and the Franklin D. Roosevelt Medical Center. Both of these facilities are working to improve efficiency and extend the limited Federal resources they have, without compromising the quality of the health care provided to the veterans. Many of these reforms and changes are going to be difficult to adjust to, but many of them are also necessary to eliminate waste and maintain a viable and healthy VA health care system. Other reforms are still necessary to ensure the long-range stability of the system.

However, as this reform process moves forward, we must never lose sight of the fact that the freedom that our veterans have provided us and secured for our country did not come without a price. Accordingly, we must remember that providing health care for our veterans when they are in need, as they provided service when the Nation was in need, does not come without a price, either. It is a fundamental responsibility of our Government to see the adequate medical care is always provided to our veterans. This bill, improved by this amendment, will help to ensure that this responsibility is met.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will help the veterans in my district, my State, and the country as a whole. I strongly urge all Members to join with me and support its passage.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to indicate my strong support for the amendment to H.R. 3666 offered by VA Committee Chairman STUMP and our ranking member, SONNY MONTGOMERY.

Mr. Chairman, these days it is very difficult to put together an appropriation bill that will meet with agreement on both sides of the aisle, let alone with the other body and the White House. I congratulate Chairman LEWIS on a fine job overall, and hope he will be able to agree to Chairman STUMP's amendment.

As I understand, the amendment will add \$40 million to VA healthcare and \$17 to VA's benefit administration general operating expenses. This additional funding will go a long way to improve healthcare for our veterans. But, as chairman of the Veterans Compensation and Pension Subcommittee, I would be especially gratified to see improvements to processing times for VA claims as a result of the \$17 million increase.

Nobody has been a bigger watchdog of VA claims processing than I have been over the past couple of sessions. I am a firm supporter of making sure VA moves down the path of strategic planning and business process re-engineering. Veterans who depend on their benefits, whether its for education or compensation, should receive those benefits in a timely fashion. I encourage the VA to carefully prioritize these extra funds for the purpose of serving veterans through improved claims processing.

We owe a debt to our veterans. We can continue our commitment to honor them by actively working to reform and improve VA healthcare, compensation and benefits processes, among other programs. This additional funding will go a long way toward reinforcing our support for veterans and their families. And, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Stump-Montgomery amendment and H.R. 3666.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. THURMAN

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 69 offered by Mrs. THURMAN: Page 95, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. (a) PLAN FOR ALLOCATION OF HEALTH CARE RESOURCES BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall develop a plan for the allocation of health care resources (including personnel and funds) of the Department of Veterans Affairs among the health care facilities of the Department so as to ensure that veterans having similar economic status, similar eligibility priority, or similar medical conditions and who are eligible for medical care in those facilities have similar access to care in those facilities, regardless of the region of the United States in which they reside.

(2) The plan shall reflect, to the maximum extent possible, the Veterans Integrated Service Network, as well as the Resource Planning and Management System developed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to account for forecasts in expected workload and to ensure fairness to facilities that provide cost-efficient health care. The plan shall include procedures to identify reasons for variations in operating costs among similar facilities and ways to improve the allocation of resources among facilities so as to promote efficient use of resources and provision of quality health care.

(3) The Secretary shall prepare the plan in consultation with the Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) PLAN ELEMENTS.—The plan under subsection (a) shall set forth—

(1) milestones for achieving the goal referred to in the subsection; and

(2) a means of evaluating the success of the Secretary in meeting that goal through the plan.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit the plan developed under subsection (a) to Congress not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) PLAN IMPLEMENTATION.—the Secretary shall implement the plan developed under subsection (a) within 60 days of submitting it to Congress under subsection (b), unless within such period the Secretary notifies the appropriate committees of Congress that the plan will not be implemented, along with an explanation of why the plan will not be implemented.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest in this last debate, and I think there are very few people on this floor that do not support the amendment that our colleagues from Arizona and Mississippi have introduced, and has been accepted, giving an additional \$40 million to the VA system. However, and I am sure that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] knows this better than anybody, in Arizona he needs additional money because between the years of 1980 and 1990 more than 24 veterans came to Arizona per day.

But what I cannot understand in all of this conversation is why Congress,

when appropriating all of these extra resources, and maybe even somewhat based on the comments of Mr. LEWIS about the gentleman from Los Angeles, why are we not making sure that those resources are going to those States that need these dollars, rather than under the same funding formula that we have seen over the last 50 years to, in fact, some hospitals that have empty beds.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment today has four qualities that I think should compel this Congress to rise in unanimous support of it: It costs nothing. It eliminates wasteful spending. It is bipartisan in nature. And, most importantly, it is about equity for our Nation's veterans.

This amendment is identical to a bill that I introduced on April 25, H.R. 3346. This measure would require the VA to link the allocation of its resources to facility workloads, and is based on the resource planning and management system in which the VA has already invested a great deal of time and money. Moreover, this measure would require the VA to implement the plan within 60 days of submitting it to Congress.

Unfortunately, under the VA-HUD appropriations we are not going to be able to offer this amendment. I ask the chairman, and I beg the question, if not now, when?

I brought up this very same issue on the floor last year during the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD appropriations. Similar language was stripped from the Senate fiscal year 1996 bill in conference, and now it appears that we may go another year without implementing the basic, budget-neutral, cost-cutting measure that would benefit all veterans.

The VA recently released census data which shows that Florida's Fifth District has the highest veterans' population in the country. In fact, of the 10 highest-ranked congressional districts in veterans' populations, 7 are in Florida.

The migration of veterans continues a pattern that we have been seeing for years. For example, in my home State of Florida, between 1980 and 1990, more than 96 veterans came to Florida per day. This should come as no shock to States such as Georgia, Nevada, North Carolina, Alaska, Hawaii, and Virginia, because they also have seen similar growth.

Make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, I welcome them to Florida, these brave men and women who have courageously sacrificed so much for our country. However, I have been urging the VA for years to reallocate its resources based on the shift in veterans' population.

On June 6, Congress took a step in that direction and passed H.R. 3376, which requires the VA to develop a 5-year strategic plan for its health care system. While I supported this measure, it was a modest attempt to address the problem of the reallocation of health care resources.

Quite simply, H.R. 3376 does not go far enough because it does not compel the VA to enact it. If Congress does not compel the VA to enact such plans, they simply become more ineffectual studies.

I challenge each Member to go home to their districts and ask the veterans that they represent if the VA needs another study. For years the VA has studied the problem of resource allocation and, accordingly, developed the RPM system. While the aim of the 1994 measure was on target, the results continue to be unsatisfactory.

According to the GAO, and I quote:

Although the RPM lets the VA identify inequities in resource distribution, VA has, so far, chosen not to use the system to help ensure that resources are distributed more equitably.

Let me emphasize that Congress needs to do more than request additional resource allocation plans, and instead compel the VA to implement those in which they have already invested.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, under a previous agreement, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. But I would hope that in this debate, and as we have heard in the conversations that have taken place on this floor in previous amendments, I still hope that we do not lose sight. We can all talk about veterans' health care, but if the dollars are not going where the veterans are, we can all say we have done a great job, but if they are not following where those veterans are, then we have all done a disservice to those veterans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I was very hesitant to even reserve the point of order relative to the gentlewoman's proposed amendment, largely because I believe her amendment and this discussion is very important.

There is not any question that if we do not use the moneys we deliver with priority and properly to serve our Nation's veterans. I think she makes a very, very important point.

Since I have had this job, the Department has indicated that they are going to be responsive to our requests for similar prioritization.

□ 1700

I would urge the gentlewoman to keep her eye on this target, for it is an important one. I think it is very significant that Members who are not necessarily on this subcommittee put the needle in our side, as well as the Department's side, to make sure that we follow through in this process.

So while the gentlewoman suggests she is going to withdraw the amendment, nonetheless she has provided a

great service by providing this very important point to us.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice in my strongest support for linking future VA medical funding with the demographic shift in veterans' populations, as the Thurman amendment would do today. I would urge the chairman to work to include some version of the amendment in future VA authorizing and funding bills.

VA medical expenditures are determined largely by past expenditures, not by veterans populations. Veterans populations, like that in my home State of Nevada, are rapidly growing without any comparable increase in funding resources.

For example, Nevada has experienced the fastest growth of veterans in the Nation—with no other State in the country even close. Between 1980 and 1990, Nevada's veterans population grew an amazing 37 percent—or at an average rate of 13 veterans a day; while others like the District of Columbia have seen their veterans population drop by as much as 20 percent over the same period. Yet, the money does not follow the veterans.

This is not an equitable allocation of scarce resources.

Total VA expenditures in Nevada in fiscal year 1995 amounted to \$1,258 per veteran. This puts Nevada at the bottom of the scale. Many States that have been losing veterans get twice the funding per veteran, and some even more than that. This is patently unfair and I will continue to push for Congress to develop an equitable funding equation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for responding to our push last year to increase VA medical care funding to the President's request. Until Congress can allow veterans more choice in how they receive care, and until we can take care of the bloated bureaucracy, full-funding is a minimum level we must maintain to ensure our former warriors receive promised health care coverage.

Also, Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing the continued need to fully fund the State veterans home grant account. This year's level of \$47 million is \$7 million over the President's request. It is my hope that some of this grant can be used in southern Nevada to help build a critically needed home for our veteran population.

Representing a State with the fastest veteran population growth, the largest amount of veterans as a percentage of population, and one of only a handful of States without a veterans home, I can tell you that this will mean a great deal to Nevada veterans.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT: Page 95, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 422. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the

amount made available for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical Care"; increasing the amount made available for "Veterans Health Administration—Medical and Prosthetic Research"; reducing the amount made available for "Corporation for National and Community Service—National and Community Service Programs Operating Expenses"; and reducing the amount made available for "Corporation for National and Community Service—Office of Inspector General", by \$20,000,000, \$20,000,000, \$365,000,000, and \$2,000,000, respectively.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple, very straightforward. It asks for a very clear choice. We can either fund this so-called paid volunteer program called AmeriCorps or we can fund the veterans. It would transfer approximately \$20 million to the Veterans Health Administration medical care and \$20 million to VA medical and prosthetic research. The remaining would go toward deficit reduction.

Let us remember for just a moment the gulf war crisis. We had a crisis; our young men and women rose to the occasion. They answered the call. They volunteered their time, even their lives in some instances. We succeeded with victory. They came home. We declared them heroes. We had parades. But yet for many of them, for many of them, the war is not over. They still face gulf war syndrome. Instead of spending money on this higher priority, we are spending it on paid volunteers.

What is a volunteer, Mr. Chairman? Earlier today we heard that the American Heritage College Dictionary defines a volunteer as someone who does charitable or helpful work without pay. The stated purpose of the creation of the AmeriCorps in 1993, was to promote voluntarism in this country, particularly among young people. The problem with AmeriCorps is quite clear. It pays people to do something that millions of Americans already do without financial reward. An independent survey showed that in 1994, 89.2 million Americans, 18 and over, volunteered in some capacity for an average of 4.2 hours per week. They were not moved by the lure of a lucrative Government job, but instead by the true spirit of voluntarism and genuine service.

True volunteers are people, both young and old, who donate their time and energy and spirit to help others. AmeriCorps is not true voluntarism. According to a 1995 GAO audit, it was reported that it cost taxpayers about \$27,000 per year per recipient in AmeriCorps. Mr. Chairman, true volunteers do not expect to be paid \$15.65 an hour or receive health insurance or a stipend to go to college, as the average AmeriCorps volunteer does.

During 1993 and 1994, it was reported that 1,200 paid AmeriCorps volunteers worked at the Department of Agriculture, 525 work at the Interior Department, 210 at the Justice Department, 135 at EPA, and 60 at the National Endowment for the Arts. If that is not bad enough, Mr. Chairman, almost half of the money spent on

AmeriCorps ends up funding the Federal bureaucracy or paperwork, rather than in community service.

Mr. Chairman, while I respect the goals of these young men and women who are involved in AmeriCorps, I greatly admire the 89.2 million Americans who volunteer their time, energy, and their spirit without being paid. AmeriCorps may do worthy work, but can we really afford to pay volunteers to do volunteer work? Can we afford to teach our youth that voluntarism means getting paid over \$15 per hour? Do we really believe that the best way to help cultivate a new generation of true volunteers is by paying college students to do volunteer-type work? And do we really believe that this money cannot be better spent on the veterans?

Last week the Pentagon confirmed, Mr. Chairman, what many of us had believed, that some of our gulf war vets may have been exposed to nerve gas after the Army blew up an Iraqi ammunition depot that contained rockets armed with chemical agents.

The intent of my amendment would be to transfer \$40 million from AmeriCorps to the VA health care and research. I believe these accounts are underfunded in the committee's mark, especially in light of last week's revelation by the Pentagon. What Member does not believe we should not have a moral obligation of this Congress to do whatever we can to find out what is causing the ailments that have plagued nearly 10,000 of our courageous gulf war vets? If American soldiers were exposed to chemical agents, it is incumbent upon this Congress to allocate American tax dollars in a judicious and prudent manner.

We still have veterans who suffer from agent orange and even some that go back to problems that come out of the Korean conflict and World War II. So, Mr. Chairman, my amendment offers a simple choice for this House. Will we continue to fund the President's liberal experiment on how to kill the flame of real voluntarism in America, or will this House vote to allocate those precious dollars to the courageous men and women who are willing to volunteer their lives to protect our freedom?

My amendment would require that each Member of this House decide for themselves who will they support, this Nation's veterans or President Clinton's paid volunteers. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a commitment to both the true spirit of voluntarism and to our Nation's vets. I urge its adoption and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the House that we have had a number of amendments on the floor today that relate to the veterans. Right now as I understand it, the discussion between my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, we have kind of all concluded

that veterans' amendments have kind of the same fate in this place, so I am going to propose that we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BENTSEN

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENTSEN:

Page 95, after line 21 insert the following new section:

Sec. 422. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to issue, reissue, or renew any approval or authorization for any facility to store or dispose of polychlorinated biphenyls when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that there is in effect at the time of the issuance, reissuance, or renewal a rule authorizing any person to import into the customs territory of the United States for treatment or disposal any polychlorinated biphenyls, or polychlorinated biphenyl items, at concentrations of more than 50 part per million.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer my amendment to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from using any fund to allow the importation of PCB waste to be incinerated in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is a simple proposition that we should not be in the business of importing more hazardous waste into the United States. It is particularly disturbing that the Federal Government would agree to import PCB's when such a decision flies in the face of scientific evidence, our international trade agreements, and most importantly, our constituents' health and safety.

On March 18, 1996, the EPA issued a final rule allowing the importation of large quantities of polychlorinated biphenyls, reversing a ban that had been in place since 1980. PCB's are a dangerous class of chemicals used in electrical insulation and other products that cause adverse health effects, including cancer, reproductive damage, and birth defects. The March 18 rule gives a blanket authority to domestic waste incinerators to import PCB's with no new regulation or oversight by EPA. It is a bad idea and it is a fatally flawed rule.

We know from scientific research that PCB's accumulate in the environment and move toward the top of the food chain, contaminating fish, birds, and ultimately, humans. When incinerated, PCB's release dioxin, one of the most toxic chemicals known to man. As a result, PCB's are the only chemical that Congress identified for phase-out under the Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976. Since 1976, PCB's have not been manufactured in the United States.

With this ban in place, the amount of PCB's in the United States has steadily

decreased, but the range of health and environmental effect has not. Incinerators in Kansas, Utah, Pennsylvania and two sites in southeast Texas burn more than 800,000 tons of domestic PCB waste each year.

Let me be perfectly clear. My amendment does not intend to address the incineration of domestic PCB's; rather, I seek to halt the importation of PCB's for incineration. The EPA has failed to offer scientific data or analysis to justify a reversal of this ban. Their long-standing position has always been that PCB imports pose an unreasonable risk to health and safety.

On December 6, 1994, EPA emphasized that, and I quote: "The import of PCB's into the United States and the distribution of commerce of PCB's present an unreasonable risk of injury to human health and the environment."

Now, a year and a half later, the EPA has reversed itself with no new studies, no new research, and, no new reports that PCB's are anything less than a substantial risk to human health and the environment. It is difficult to understand why the EPA would change its position without any new scientific evidence.

This rule might be necessary if Canada and Mexico, the two countries expected to send us most of the PCB's, did not have facilities located within their borders to dispose of PCB waste. Both countries have facilities designed to handle PCB waste, and Mexico even exports some PCB waste to Europe for disposal.

I would also like to add that the Canadian disposal industry proposed EPA's rule and presented compelling evidence that Canada is fully capable of handling their own PCB waste, and Mexico even exports some PCB waste to Europe for disposal. EPA agreed with that view as late as December 1994 when they said and I quote: "EPA does not want to encourage the expansion of PCB's when there are feasible alternatives already in place."

In addition, EPA's new rule to allow the importation of PCB's also contradicts our international trade agreements. I believe in free trade but this issue is not about trade. It is about human health and the environment. We are not trying to erect a barrier to trade in order to protect the domestic PCB market. Congress long ago established that PCB's should not be considered for international trade on the ground of public health and safety. The GATT and the World Trade Organization expressly permit a ban on the importation of PCB's. Although the general objectives in NAFTA encourage open borders, the agreement clearly dictates that domestic laws and procedures should be given priority with regards to hazardous waste.

The United States should not unilaterally make this decision to allow the import of PCB waste, especially if international discussions are ongoing on how to address this problem. EPA is

□ 1715

currently involved in negotiations between the United States and our NAFTA partners, and the United Nations is preparing recommendations on the disposal and transport of hazardous waste including PCB's. We should continue these negotiations instead of moving unilaterally forward to set their course.

Ultimately, the United States has the potential to import over 230,000 more tons of PCB waste from Canada and Mexico and many more tons from other nations as far away as Japan and Europe. These countries do not accept our PCB waste, so I find it difficult to understand why we should accept theirs. The United States should not become the world's wastebasket, but this misguided EPA rule does just that.

As I mentioned before, PCB's are a known carcinogen that have been linked to cancer, birth defects, and other health problems in numerous studies. A report released by the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems concludes that emissions from incinerators are migrating long distances and contaminating the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the Members support the Bentsen amendment to ban the importation of PCB's. This does not address the domestic incineration, but it is something we should not be in the business of importing hazardous waste.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bentsen amendment, and I commend my colleague from Houston for his leadership on this important issue.

On March 15, the EPA issued a final rule to amend the Federal PCB regulations and allow the import of PCB waste for disposal in permitted facilities in the United States.

This rule allows the importation of foreign PCB waste for disposal in the United States.

The EPA has estimated that the United States disposal industry would receive \$50 to \$100 million annually if PCB's are imported into the United States from Canada and Mexico.

And where would PCB's be disposed? In Kansas, Utah, Pennsylvania, Port Arthur, TX, and Deer Park, TX.

Mr. BENTSEN's amendment would prohibit the EPA from using any funds to implement its final rule.

PCB's when incinerated release dioxin—one of the most toxic chemicals known.

Dioxin, as we all know, causes a wide range of adverse health effects and it accumulates in the environment.

The incineration of PCB's is recognized as a health hazard.

That's why the Congress designed a phaseout of domestic PCB manufacture in the Toxic Substance Control Act of 1976.

It is irresponsible to reverse ourselves now and I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, Representative BENTSEN, a proposal to put a moratorium on the importation of PCB's.

I speak particularly because a community in my district is struggling with this very issue. Not only is there a proposed dump site for PCB's, it is situated about 500 yards from a lake, which is, of course, connected, as all water is in Michigan, to the Great Lakes system.

For those not familiar with PCB's, these are not just garden variety carcinogens. In fact, PCB's are the only substance ever specifically banned by an act of the U.S. Congress. This happened under the Toxic Substance Control Act, section 6(e), enacted in 1976. And now we are on the verge of importing PCB's from other countries.

PCB's are a menace in many ways. They are a group of extremely toxic and long-lived chemicals formerly used as insulating materials in electrical transformers. They are known carcinogens. They disrupt the hormone system and cause reproductive and developmental damage. There have been estimates that a lot of the fertility costs in this country for people dealing with sterility comes from exposure to PCB's. Tumors, deformities, reproductive abnormalities and reduced survivorship are widespread in exposed fish, birds and mammal populations.

This is a terrible problem here in this country and, yes, we are working hard to find ways to deal with the materials that we have generated here within our own borders, but why would we want to open our borders to this kind of poison from all over the world, not just from Canada and Mexico? If we look at the rule, it is not limited to those two countries.

My understanding is that the only reason for doing this is to make the existing dump sites profitable, and, of course, this should not be the goal of the U.S. Government. The goal of the U.S. Government should be to keep its citizens safe. And to keep our citizens safe we should stand very clearly with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] in support of no longer importing PCB's.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in extraordinary sympathy with the goals that have been expressed by my colleagues from Texas and the previous speaker from Michigan. There is no question but that PCB's represent an enormous danger to the health and well-being of people in the United States and, yes, in Canada and in Mexico and other places in the world. But I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I understand the intent of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] to protect the environment and public health, and I share that goal; however, I believe that this amendment would

actually harm efforts to deal in an intelligent and economical and in an environmentally sound and friendly way with the problem posed by large quantities of PCB's in storage in North America.

Now, just as my friends from Texas have facilities in their districts which deal, I believe inappropriately, with PCB's, so in my district is there a company which recycles PCB-contaminated electrical equipment. This company can in most instances recycle 75 percent or more of the equipment material. This process saves an enormous amount of landfill space by allowing the reuse of the large carcasses of transformers and other electrical equipment. The recycling method also reduces by a significant amount the volume of materials that need to be incinerated.

With 24,000 metric tons of PCB-contaminated equipment in storage in Canada and the Great Lakes Basin area, a complete prohibition on importing will have a potential health risk for the United States citizens. Canada has only one permanent disposal facility and incinerator in the Province of Alberta, more than 2,000 miles away from the closest storage site. This means that those 24,000 metric tons of PCB-contaminated equipment will not be disposed of any time soon.

Canadian industries and United States companies operating there benefit from an additional disposal option: Recycling. Beyond this, the Great Lakes region benefits from the disposal rather than the continued storage of this material, and we all benefit in encouraging recycling rather than incineration of PCB's.

This company is currently working to develop a process that would completely neutralize PCB's, eliminating the need for incineration altogether. I will absolutely concede that that need still remains. But without the ability to access recyclable material from Canada and Mexico, this company, S.D. Myers, will be unable to continue that environmentally beneficial work and will be forced to lay off dozens of employees.

I raise this simply because of the importance that the U.S. EPA places on this particular technology. They point out that the concept that legitimate recycling of these materials is an option that should be available. Both costs and long-term liability can be significant issues, but they should not preclude someone from choosing proper recycling as the best value option for disposal. EPA promotes green technology, including recycling; however, in this instance the terms of the enforcement agreement were negotiated on the contracts that they had in place at the time. EPA generally does not require another Federal agency to dispose of PCB's using specific EPA-approved disposal technology.

And I emphasize this point in particular. On the issue of environmental

advantage of recycling PCB-contaminated material, recycling is preferred to landfilling or incineration. On this matter, we agree entirely.

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

Mr. SAWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that the gentleman and I have tried to work out our differences on this amendment. I think we are trying to head in the right direction. Unfortunately, we are at cross-purposes because of the PCB by-product. What they are doing with the transformers I think makes sense, except it still results in the importation of PCB's whether they are landfilled or incinerated, and the transport of that, which is the problem.

And it still comes back to our feeling that we should just not be importing that. We disagree with EPA on their analysis.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's desire to protect the health of citizens he represents. If his amendments passes, however, there would be some reduction in the activity of the facility in his district. However, the incineration of domestic PCB's, and perhaps those from our military posts overseas would continue. If the goal of his amendment is to stop the incineration of PCB's, then I firmly believe the fastest way to accomplish that is to allow companies like S.D. Myers to continue to develop the technologies that will make incineration obsolete.

I appreciate his willingness to discuss this technical issue with my office prior to the offering of this amendment on the floor, but in offering it in this way, it precludes the kind of option that requires careful consideration through the legislative process, and I therefore oppose his amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have a discussion with the gentleman in the well.

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

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity that the gentleman offers me. I had just really gotten to the end of the presentation I wanted to offer. I believe, however, to expand on the last point, that we have the opportunity to reach a congenial agreement on this matter, something that I have been working with EPA for the last 3 years to reach a responsible, environmentally sound accommodation on and one that I believe can be made to meet the needs of his district and many others across the United States if we have the time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me suggest to the gentleman, as well as the gentleman who is offering the amend-

ment, that this discussion and this issue reminds me very much of the low-level radioactive waste issue that is facing many of our States currently.

Years ago we in the Congress recognized the problem of accumulations of low-level radioactive waste in location after location around the country. So we sort of regionalized it and said that areas or States would create compacts where this could be accumulated. Then when we got to the point where there was such a site located, the local people became involved and nobody wanted something like this in their own backyard.

We have a PCB problem that is very real. We have to deal with it. Candidly, we are not going to particularly be successful opposing this amendment at this point, but it certainly is not helping us really get a handle on this important problem. In the final analysis, we have a responsibility to do that.

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

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying about not in our backyard or whatever. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, and I and others represent probably the largest petrochemical complex or one of the largest petrochemical complexes in the United States, and we appreciate the need for taking care of our own and we appreciate the need to take care of what is produced domestically in the United States. But what the issue here is, and it contradicts everything EPA has said up through 1994, they have consistently said we should not be importing PCB's.

All we are saying is let us not get into the business of importing hazardous waste. Let us deal with what is our own right now before we get into turning this into some bulge bracket market.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate both the gentlemen, particularly the gentleman from Ohio's comments recognizing this difficulty, and it is a policy problem that needs to be approved. I must say that at this point I do not see us dealing with it in a serious way, and I would hope as we go forward here that we do come together and find real solutions.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to raise a question with both of the gentlemen, but particularly with the gentleman from Ohio, Representative SAWYER.

I had an opportunity to speak with people from the Canadian government a couple of weeks ago on this issue and I was surprised to find, A, that the Canadian landfills are not at this point overutilized, and they have no problem with accommodating their PCBs generated in that country. Second, they

have not determined as a matter of public policy that they want to see their PCB waste leave.

So, in fact, are we not talking about allowing PCBs to come into the country as a way to accommodate those landfills already here in the country as opposed to necessarily trying to help out Canada or Mexico?

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

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from California. Our goal is not to accommodate any particular landfill, but rather to reduce in the Great Lakes region the enormous concentration of stored PCB's. Landfilling by most environmental accounts, including the EPA, is a decidedly inferior technology to the kinds that are involved in recycling. We are trying to improve the volume of those PCB's that can be recycled along with PCB-contaminated equipment rather than simply storing them there or landfilling them there or anywhere else.

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, in my district the dump is not yet created. The dump is not yet created, and the incoming waste is what will allow that to become profitable.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, at this point let me say that we do have a serious problem with PCB's, but also with a number of amendments remaining on this bill.

Let me say to the author of the amendment it is my intention to accept the amendment, and we will have some discussion, hopefully between now and the time we go to conference. There are some very serious difficulties remaining for the country, as well as, indeed, the world, but I would suggest that we accept the amendment and see if we can move forward.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate that and I would be more than happy to work with the chairman.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wanted to express my thanks to the gentleman for his concern and interest in this matter and that of the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman STOKES, and for the willingness of my friend from Texas to accommodate a variety of conflicting needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER) having assumed the chair, Mr. COMBEST, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 3666), 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, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REQUEST TO LIMIT FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3666, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3666 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 456, the bill be considered as read; and no amendment be in order except for the following amendments, which shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed:

An amendment offered by Mr. KOBLE for 60 minutes;

An amendment offered by Mr. GUTKNECHT for 20 minutes;

An amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas for 10 minutes;

An amendment offered by Mr. KINGSTON for 10 minutes;

An amendment offered by Mr. MARKEY for 40 minutes;

An amendment offered by Mr. ROEMER for 20 minutes;

An amendment offered by Mr. WELLER for 10 minutes; and

An amendment offered by Mr. ORTON for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from California?

□ 1730

Mr. BOEHLERT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how do we address the Boehlert amendment, which will serve as a substitute for the Markey amendment?

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it would not be in order.

If I could verbalize a minor little amendment to this list, at the point of the Markey amendment, with the exception of one amendment to the Markey amendment, within the time limit of 40 minutes by Mr. BOEHLERT.

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I will give the gentleman the time, if he would like. What the gentleman wants to do is eliminate all these limitations on time in order not to have this amendment come forward. If we eliminate all the limitations on time, surely we will get there eventually and the amendment will come forward anyway.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to agree to a unanimous-consent request which makes an amendment to the Markey amendment, being MARKEY, when the amendment has not even been shared with MARKEY as a way of ensuring that the unanimous-consent request could be done in an amicable way and in a bipartisan fashion seeking to resolve the issue. So I would ask if the gentleman could withhold briefly and the gentleman from New York perhaps could share the amendment since the Markey amendment is already well known.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would say the gentleman, I think, makes a very important point. And I frankly would love to see the amendment to the Markey amendment myself. Therefore, we are going to withhold on this list until that kind of courtesy is shown and we will return to this request for unanimous consent at another time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield under his reservation of objection, if we have the current iteration of the Markey amendment, it is a movable target. There have been so many adjustments in the past 24 hours, I am not sure what we are talking about in terms of the Markey amendment. I would be glad to share my amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we come back to this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California withdraws his unanimous-consent request.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 456 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3666.

□ 1733

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3666) 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 Sep-

tember 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Mr. COMBEST in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 7 offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOLBE: Strike Section 421 of the bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed, I ask unanimous consent that, while they are trying to work out the issue on the other amendments, that, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. OBEY] is in agreement, that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 60 minutes, with the time equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Minnesota. That is pursuant, I might add, to the agreement that we had agreed to earlier in the larger unanimous consent.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by laying out the background of this case. A few months ago, the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, which is a part of the National Science Foundation, began to consider bids for a new supercomputer. They had been using a Cray computer, and they went through the normal procurement process, the conclusion of which was a bid an unusual bid in the amount of money that was set—\$35 million—won by NEC. There is no dispute over the amount of dollars of this procurement. It is \$35 million. But to continue, in the RFP that was proposed, the question was posed—what could you do for \$35 million? Clearly the bid proposal from NEC, the Japanese company that makes supercomputers, was the best offer.

Following that decision or that initial bid proposal, this information was conveyed to the White House. It was also conveyed to the Department of Commerce.

The Department of Commerce then subsequently wrote a letter to the National Science Foundation in which they said they had investigated the matter and made a preliminary decision that there was clear dumping here. That is, NEC was selling this computer or the software for this computer, at well below cost.

As a result of that letter, even though it was simply a letter and nothing more, remember no formal investigation has ever been conducted into allegations of dumping, language was added in the subcommittee and retained by the full committee, which