

H.R. 2620 also provides \$4.2 billion in advanced appropriations for the Section 8 Housing Certificate Program, which will be counted against the levels established in next year's Budget Resolution. This advanced appropriation is on the list of permissible appropriations under section 201 of H. Con. Res. 84.

I am somewhat concerned about several purported "offsets" in this bill. The bill claims \$7 million from the repeal of a provision that was already signed into law. It claims another \$121 million in savings from a veterans-related provision that already passed the House. Obviously, these savings can only be used once.

As Chairman of the Budget Committee, I am obligated to report to the Congress on how the appropriations bills compare to the Budget Resolution. Under existing law, this bill is consistent with the Budget Resolution and does not violate the Budget Act.

Nevertheless, the existing process with respect to emergencies is broken and needs to be fixed. At the very least, both Congress and the President should set aside resources for emergencies and restrict the use of these resources for legitimate emergencies.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the House Science Committee I rise in strong support of the FY 2002 VA, HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. My good friends Chairman WALSH, and Ranking Minority Member MOLLOHAN have put together a bill that is very good for science, good for the space program, good for education, and good for the environment. That's a winning combination, one that's good for America. I thank them for their leadership.

Chairman WALSH shares my belief that basic research provides the foundation for economic growth and for the tremendous advances we have made in areas like biomedical research. The appropriation for the National Science Foundation contained within this bill reflects these beliefs. And the committee is to be commended for the 9 percent increase that he provided for the Foundation.

The bill also contains funding for the National Mathematics and Science Partnerships Program that was proposed by President Bush and that is authorized by my bill—H.R. 1858—that was unanimously reported out of the Science Committee. This program will bring colleges and universities and school districts together to form partnerships to improve the quality of elementary and secondary math and science education. Funding is also included to enable elementary and secondary teachers to participate in research projects conducted at State, Federal, and university labs.

I want to particularly thank the committee for including funding for the Noyce Scholarship Program. Named for the co-founder of Intel, this program provides scholarships to talented mathematics, science, and engineering students in exchange for a commitment to teach two years for each year of scholarship. I look forward to working closely with Chairman WALSH to retain this funding as the bill goes to conference.

The chairman is also to be commended for a bill that protects and expands NASA's scientific programs in Science, Aeronautics, and Technology while striking the right balance for the space station.

This bill sends a clear signal that Congress is not going to bail NASA out for its management failures. It also makes clear that we're willing to work with the Administration to iden-

tify additional resources to improve station capabilities, if we see the right management reforms and performance improvements at NASA. With that in mind, requiring the White House Office of Management and Budget to certify that NASA is containing its costs before obligating additional funds makes a lot of sense. Moreover, we should require the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy to certify that those additional funds will benefit the research effort.

Through careful fiscal management, we can ensure that the space station benefits science in the long run. The bill sets us on that path.

I particularly appreciate the committee's commitment to new space technology and its effort to bridge the gap between NASA and the Air Force. By directing additional funding into the Air Force Research Lab, the bill encourages NASA and the Air Force to pool their efforts on technologies that will benefit both agencies and the American people. Space based radar technology, for example, is vital to our national security, but also has immense applications in Earth science. A development program that reduces the cost of synthetic aperture radar technology will benefit both.

Similarly, the bistatic radar technology developed at Rome Research site has immense potential for upgrading our national launch range tracking capabilities at a low cost. By demonstrating this technology, we may finally break the logjam that has undermined our space launch competitiveness.

Let me turn for a moment to the budget for the Environmental Protection Agency. I appreciate the efforts of Chairman WALSH and his colleagues to provide a responsible budget to help meet the nation's environmental needs. On the whole, the bill is good news for EPA.

Clearly, many of us would prefer to see higher funding levels for some of the agency's programs, but the gentleman from New York has done an admirable job of balancing competing needs and working within difficult fiscal constraints.

As chairman of the Science Committee, I am particularly pleased the bill increases funding for the Science and Technology account from \$640 million in the budget request to \$680 million.

As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Congressional Water Infrastructure Caucus, I am pleased the bill rejects the proposed cut to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund but am disappointed it doesn't provide at least \$1.35 billion for the program. I appreciate the constraints facing the chairman but would encourage the committee to find a way to fund some of the important, water infrastructure and ecosystem restoration programs, such as the new sewer overflow control grants program and the reauthorized Clean Lakes program. I hope there are opportunities down the road to target assistance for such efforts.

I would also continue to note my concern with the Superfund program. The bill provides \$1.27 billion. The appropriators are doing their best under the circumstances. Congress needs to change the circumstances; comprehensive reform and, at a minimum, a reauthorization of the corporate environmental income tax—twelve one hundredths of a per cent (which expired on December 31, 1995) should be the next course of action.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill for science, a good bill for the space program, and a good

will for the environment. It aptly illustrates the tremendous leadership provided by my friend from New York, Chairman WALSH, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, 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, 2002

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in House Report 107-164 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2620

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation benefits to or on behalf of veterans and a pilot program for disability examinations as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, chapters 11, 13, 18, 51, 53, 55, and 61); pension benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 15, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 92 Stat. 2508); and burial benefits, emergency and other officers' retirement pay, adjusted-service credits and certificates, payment of premiums due on commercial life insurance policies guaranteed under the provisions of article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. 540 et seq.)

and for other benefits as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. 107, 1312, 1977, and 2106, chapters 23, 51, 53, 55, and 61; 50 U.S.C. App. 540-548; 43 Stat. 122, 123; 45 Stat. 735; 76 Stat. 1198), \$24,944,288,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$17,940,000 of the amount appropriated under this heading shall be reimbursed to "General operating expenses" and "Medical care" for necessary expenses in implementing those provisions authorized in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, and in the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1992 (38 U.S.C. chapters 51, 53, and 55), the funding source for which is specifically provided as the "Compensation and pensions" appropriation: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be earned on an actual qualifying patient basis, shall be reimbursed to "Medical facilities revolving fund" to augment the funding of individual medical facilities for nursing home care provided to pensioners as authorized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I really wanted to take this moment as we begin full consideration of this bill to thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLLOHAN), for their work and the improvements that we have been able to afford the citizens of our country in this fiscal year 2002 appropriation bill for the Veterans Administration, the Housing and Urban Development Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, NASA, and the National Science Foundation.

The bill has many good points. Certainly the National Science Foundation increase, the President asked for an increase, we provided over an 8 percent increase in this budget. And even in smaller programs, like the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, which has such a fine track record in communities across our country, a respectable increase. But I have to say that in other accounts this particular bill does not have adequate funding.

Other Members have talked about HUD's housing programs, and without question the reductions in public housing modernization, decreased by 15 percent; and community development block grants, every single community in this country affected by that cut by 6 percent; and homeless assistance down by nearly 9 percent. We still have not completely solved that problem across our country. The impact on Americans as a result of this underfunding of the HUD programs will be felt from coast to coast.

The bill eliminates the popular AmeriCorps program. HUD's Rural Housing and Economic Development programs have been eliminated. Empowerment zones, Enterprise communities, and the Public Housing Drug Elimination Grant Program I will talk about in a moment.

Now, I wanted to say a word about the Environmental Protection Agency, also a reduction, and as important as the reduction, the shift in responsibility for enforcement to the States. In the case of Ohio, my home State, The Washington Post reported just a couple

weeks ago "Nowhere are the problems cited by the EPA studies of State enforcement performance more in evidence than Ohio where so much backlog remains. During the past 2 years, 72 percent of Ohio's plants and refineries had violations of the Clean Water Act, a third of the plants were in violation of the Clean Air Act, and over a third of the factories were found to be operating with expired permits required under the Clean Water Act."

So we have to be conscious that as this bill is considered, there are serious imperfections that are contained within it.

Others have referenced the veterans portion of the budget. We hear lots about the greatest generation; books have been written, movies, and we are about to build the World War II memorial, one of the most important pieces of legislation I have ever sponsored here in this Congress. Yet the Veterans Medical Care budget, the budget that will actually go to care for those that the Nation says it cares so very much about, underfunded by nearly \$.5 billion over what the administration needs in order to accommodate the lines that are out there in hospital after hospital.

So as the bill moves forward, I really do look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member to perfect it.

And I just wanted to say a word about the amendment I will be offering later this afternoon, because I heard my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), come to the floor a little earlier and speak against the drug elimination program in public housing, and my friend and colleague from Ohio is a former FBI officer.

I was very surprised to hear that. But I have to tell him that perhaps the part of Ohio he represents is not like my own. But his position is going to hurt Cincinnati, it will hurt Dayton, it is going to hurt Toledo, it is going to hurt Steubenville, and it is going to hurt Lima, because in fact the drug elimination program goes to the very heart of communities where drug lords and this drug trade took control of people living under the most vulnerable of circumstances.

The local policing forces, sometimes out of sheer racism and sometimes out of the fact that when they wore a uniform they were not accepted inside those projects, did not patrol the projects. My colleagues can go across this country, in places like Chicago, where I personally visited, and see people on the roofs with repeating shotguns, with repeating rifles, at a certain time of day. If a drug deal was coming down on the street, a mother could not leave that project and go buy a bottle of milk because the drug lords were controlling the projects. Now, if we have not lived under that situation, we cannot appreciate what it really means.

But the amendment I will be offering will be to continue the drug elimi-

nation program in public housing at a level of \$175 million, unlike this bill which zeros it out. And, in fact, our amendment will actually cut the program by nearly half from what was existing last year.

But to do this across America is truly a serious mistake.

□ 1700

Crime has been going down in our country. Why should we do any less than President Reagan, the first President Bush and President Clinton?

Mr. Chairman, I again thank the chairman and ranking member and look forward to perfecting this bill as it moves along.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of readjustment and rehabilitation benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by law (38 U.S.C. chapters 21, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 39, 51, 53, 55, and 61), \$2,135,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenses for rehabilitation program services and assistance which the Secretary is authorized to provide under section 3104(a) of title 38, United States Code, other than under subsection (a)(1), (2), (5) and (11) of that section, shall be charged to this account.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, national service life insurance, servicemen's indemnities, service-disabled veterans insurance, and veterans mortgage life insurance as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 19; 70 Stat. 887; 72 Stat. 487, \$26,200,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS HOUSING BENEFIT PROGRAM FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the program, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, as amended: *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 during fiscal year 2002, within the resources available, not to exceed \$300,000 in gross obligations for direct loans are authorized for specially adapted housing loans.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, \$164,497,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

EDUCATION LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$1,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 3698, as amended: *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 \$3,400.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$64,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans, \$72,000, as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 31, as amended:

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 funds made available under this heading are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$3,301,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, \$274,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

NATIVE AMERICAN VETERAN HOUSING LOAN
PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter V, as amended, \$544,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "General operating expenses".

GUARANTEED TRANSITIONAL HOUSING LOANS
FOR HOMELESS VETERANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed transitional housing loan program authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 37, subchapter VI, not to exceed \$750,000 of the amounts appropriated by this Act for "General operating expenses" and "Medical care" may be expended.

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION
MEDICAL CARE

For necessary expenses for the maintenance and operation of hospitals, nursing homes, and domiciliary facilities; for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the department; and furnishing recreational facilities, supplies, and equipment; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries receiving care in the department; administrative expenses in support of planning, design, project management, real property acquisition and disposition, construction and renovation of any facility under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department; oversight, engineering and architectural activities not charged to project cost; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the department, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; aid to State homes as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 1741; administrative and legal expenses of the department for collecting and recovering amounts owed the department as authorized under 38 U.S.C. chapter 17, and the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. 2651 et seq., \$21,281,587,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$900,000,000 is for the equipment and land and structures object classifications only, which amount shall not become available for obligation until August 1, 2002, and shall remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$500,000,000 shall be available until September 30, 2003: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$3,000,000,000 shall be available for operations and maintenance expenses of medical facilities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct by contract a program of recovery audits for the fee basis and other medical services contracts with respect to payments for hospital care; and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302(b), amounts collected, by setoff or otherwise, as

the result of such audits shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, for the purposes for which funds are appropriated under this heading and the purposes of paying a contractor a percent of the amount collected as a result of an audit carried out by the contractor: *Provided further*, That all amounts so collected under the preceding proviso with respect to a designated health care region (as that term is defined in 38 U.S.C. 1729A(d)(2)) shall be allocated, net of payments to the contractor, to that region.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a series of amendments, and I ask unanimous consent they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. OBEY:

General Provisions

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 427. Paragraph (2) of section 1(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to reductions in rates after June 30, 2001), is amended by adding after the table the following:

"In the case of taxable years beginning during calendar year 2002, the preceding table shall be applied by substituting '39.1%' for '38.6%'."

Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration

In the paragraph "Medical Care", strike "\$21,281,587,000" and insert "\$21,581,587,000" in lieu thereof.

Department of Housing and Urban Development, Public Housing Capital Fund

In the paragraph entitled "Public Housing Capital Fund", strike "\$2,555,000,000" and insert "\$2,837,000,000" in lieu thereof.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

After the paragraph entitled "homeless Assistance Grants: insert the following new section:

"SHELTER PLUS CARE RENEWALS

"For the renewal on an annual basis or amendment of contracts funded under the Shelter Plus Care program, as authorized under subtitle F of Title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That each Shelter Plus Care project with an expiring contract shall be eligible for renewal only if the project is determined to be needed under the applicable continuum of care and meets appropriate program requirements and financial standards, as determined by the Secretary."

Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Programs and Management

In the paragraph entitled "Environmental Programs and Management", strike "\$2,014,799,000" and insert "\$2,021,799,000" in lieu thereof.

At the end of the paragraph entitled "Environmental Programs and Management", insert:

"*Provided further*, That the on-board staffing level of the Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assistance shall be maintained at not less than the level authorized for this Office as of December 31, 2000"

Corporation for National and Community Service

Strike the paragraph following the center head entitled "National and Community Service Programs, Operating Expenses" and insert the following new section:

"(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service (the

"Corporation") in carrying out programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (the "Act") (42 U.S.C. 12501 et seq.), \$311,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That not more than \$50,000,000, 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.).

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Is there objection to consideration of the amendments en bloc?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendment thereto be limited to 50 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. Chairman, let me explain what this amendment is all about.

I served in the legislature with a fellow by the name of Harvey Dueholm, who was a retired farmer, probably the single best legislator I ever knew. He had a number of pithy observations of life and politics in this country. One of the things he said regularly is that one of the problems with this country is all that too often the poor and the rich get the same amount of ice, but the poor get theirs in the wintertime.

That is certainly the case with respect to the tax bill which this Congress passed a number of weeks ago. To correct that, I am trying to offer this amendment today along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and let me explain what it is we are trying to do.

When the House voted on the tax bill, it voted on it separately before we even had a budget. That meant that, in effect, Members of this House were being shielded from the responsibility to make public choices about the trade-offs that were wrapped into that tax bill.

We were never allowed the opportunity to explain in explicit terms what the size of that tax bill meant in terms of our ability to, for instance, deal with long-term shortfalls in Social

Security, to deal with long-term shortfalls in Medicare, to deal with problems of short-funding in education or any other field.

I make no apology for the fact that I believe that it is more important for us to shore up Social Security than it is for us to give people a \$300 refund check.

I make no apology for my belief that it is more important for us to shore up Medicare long term than to provide a \$53,000 tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country.

I make no apology for the fact that I oppose the idea that we ought to cut in half the rate of increase we have had in Federal support for education over the past 5 years.

I make no apology for my belief that veterans are not receiving the health care they need in this country.

I make no apology for my concern about the lack of adequate shelter for some of the poorest children in this country.

I make no apology for the belief that we ought to have stronger environmental enforcement and that we ought to be willing to pay for it.

I think all of those priorities are a whale of a lot more important than providing the tax cut that we have provided to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in our society who make more than \$330,000 a year.

So what this amendment tries to do is to make this Congress finally make specific choices about specific tax cuts versus specific funding programs. It is my belief that there is nothing wrong with cutting in half the tax cut that goes to people who make more than \$330,000 a year so that we will have some money left on the table to provide what this amendment tries to provide, which is a \$300 million increase in funding for veterans' health care and the various increases that I described previously in my statement to this House.

We are going to be providing well over \$300 million in additional funds under this amendment for housing. We are going to be providing funds for Federal EPA enforcement to restore the positions that were cut for Federal enforcement. We are going to be restoring partially the funding for the Corporation for National Service. We pay for that by simply cutting in half the tax cut that was provided to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this society.

Mr. Chairman, I bet that at least two-thirds of the people in that top 1 percent, if asked, would say that they would rather that we provide adequate housing and adequate health care for veterans than to keep whole their new-found tax bonanza.

I have a sign on the wall of my office, and every time a group comes in asking for money, which is about 18 times a day, before they sit down and talk about what they want out of Uncle Sam, I make them read the sign on the wall which says this: "What is there that you want me to do for somebody

else that is more important than whatever it is you are going to ask me to do for you today?"

Mr. Chairman, I believe in a Judeo-Christian society. That is the fundamental question we ought to be asking ourselves. I believe if we ask that question of the folks who came in to lobby for those tax cuts for the most privileged people in this society that a whole lot of them would say, "We do not mind if you scaled our tax cut back just a little bit so you can provide to the least fortunate people in society or, in the case of veterans, to the people who decided that they would be willing to risk everything for somebody else."

Mr. Chairman, that is the choice that we are attempting to have the House make here today. I recognize that it is an unusual procedure because this is not in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I think doing the right thing is more important than jurisdictional dunghills.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in cosponsoring the amendment he is offering.

The Obey-Evans amendment will provide substantial increased funding for veterans' medical care and other important programs.

I urge my colleagues to support the Obey-Evans amendment to address the significant shortfalls in funding for veterans' health care in the committee's bill.

I believe a \$1.2 billion increase in veterans' medical care funding is fully justified. I have prepared an amendment to provide this increase.

There are many challenges that the VA will face in the near future. The VA must continue to honor its commitment to our most vulnerable veterans with the most serious disabilities. It must meet its growing infrastructure needs. Impending clinical staff shortages, including nurses, the VA's largest employee group, and the rising cost of gasoline plaguing areas around the country are among those challenges.

It is clear, however, that this House is not prepared to approve this \$1.2 billion increase today. An increase that will be provided by the Obey-Evans amendment is needed. Long before President George Bush promised Americans a tax cut, we made a commitment to honor those who served and

defended this Nation in its most dire hours. It is now our duty to make sure that our obligations are paid back to them. Our amendment will do this.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin offered in the full committee. It was considered out of order in the full committee, and he is without question on message. He stays on message. I recognize that. I congratulate him for that, but I think the message is wrong.

The message should be that the President had an agenda to bring to the Congress. He brought it to the Congress. We had debate on whether or not the American taxpayer was paying too much money. The debate was resolved by Congress. The House and Senate voted to cut the tax rates that individual taxpayers pay. The people who pay the most money got the largest tax cut, the people who pay the least amount of taxes got the least tax cut, and those who do not pay taxes did not get any tax cut. I think that is pretty logical, and people can understand that.

Mr. Chairman, what we are charged with doing today is the Congress's primary role, which is creating a budget and spending taxpayers' money. We have an allocation. It is the allocation provided to us by the budget resolution and the Committee on the Budget in consultation with the Committee on Appropriations which handed down our allocation, and we have to live with that. That is our allocation.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided funds for almost every one of the areas that the gentleman would otherwise supplement funds, and we think that the funding is right.

I will close by saying I think this is the right formula for spending in this bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

□ 1715

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey-Evans amendment. I do so because some of us said several months ago when we were debating the budget that we knew we were going to get to the point when we started talking about appropriations, there would be the same hue and cry because we knew then that you cannot get blood out of a turnip. We knew that a big tax cut would take away the possibility of providing the resources that we needed to care of the needs of our people.

And so here we are with one of the biggest debts that we have, and that is the debt that we owe our veterans, the debt that we owe the men and women who have given the last measure of everything that they had to give. Now we

come and tell them that there is no water at the well, that there is not enough money to provide the needed services.

People in my community right now are gearing up for public hearings next week to talk about which one of our veterans hospitals will get closed. Will it be the Lakeside? Will it be the West Side? Will it be Hines? Will it be beds eliminated? Will it be mental health services that they cannot get?

And so I join with those who say if we have any responsibility, Mr. Chairman, it is the responsibility to fully fund medical services for the Veterans Administration. For those men and women who have given so much, at least we can give them a little.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time and for bringing up an amendment that gets to the heart of everything that we have been talking about in Congress for the last couple of months.

Let me begin by citing three words: priorities, priorities, priorities. In the United States today, we have by far the most unequal distribution of wealth and income of any nation on Earth. The wealthiest 1 percent of the population owns more wealth than the bottom 95 percent. The gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider. The CEOs of major corporations now earn over 500 times what their workers earn. Yet a few months ago it was the wisdom of the President of the United States and a majority of the Members of Congress that the richest 1 percent, those people who have a minimum income of \$373,000 a year, need to have, over a 10-year period, hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks. That is what the President and the Congress said.

Some of us disagree. Some of us think that it is more important that we adequately fund education in this country so that every young person has the opportunity to succeed in this country. Some of us think that it is absurd that the average young person who graduates from college today ends up \$20,000 in debt because we have cut back, over the years, Federal aid to education.

Some of us think that it is absurd that 1 week after the President signed the tax bill and the huge tax breaks for the rich, that 1 week later people on his Social Security advisory committee suddenly announced that we may have to cut back on the cost of living allowance for people on Social Security. Tax breaks for billionaires, but we do not have enough money to adequately fund Social Security.

In my State and all over this country, home health care agencies are having a terrible time and have received

huge cuts in taking care of some of the oldest and most frail people in this country. Visiting nurses are unable now to do the job because this Congress, several years ago, savaged Medicare. We do not have enough money to take care of the old and the frail, but we do have enough money to provide huge tax breaks for billionaires.

In the United States today, we remain alone among industrialized nations in not having a strong prescription drug benefit program for our seniors. In Vermont and all over this country, elderly people do not know how they are going to pay for their prescription drugs. They are forced to choose between food and heat and their prescription drugs. We do not have enough money to provide strong prescription drug benefits. Let us support this important amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this measure, the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. I urge my colleagues to support the committee's funding in this measure.

This legislation does provide \$51.4 billion in funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs and that is an increase of \$4.3 billion over last year's level. Included in that amount is a total of \$21 billion for veterans health care. That is an increase of \$1.2 billion over fiscal year 2001 levels, matching the request in the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, as our veterans continue to age, they find themselves certainly in greater need of medical care with each passing year. While the increase for medical care does fall somewhat short of that advocated by some of the veterans service organizations in their annual budget reports, this amount is an historical increase. Moreover, it is refreshing to see the new administration demonstrate a commitment to ensuring that our veterans are going to receive adequate funding for health care. That element was sorely lacking in the prior administration which consistently submitted flat-lined budgets.

I would note, however, that unlike the last several years, some of these new funds need to find their way to the veterans networks up in the northeastern part of our country, particularly in New York. Due to the post-VERA formulas, the VISN which contains my congressional district remains the only one in the country which finds that its funding continues to be cut on an annual basis despite the increased funding nationally. That lack of funding takes place in spite of the fact that VISN 3 has a greater percentage of specialty care patients and otherwise unfunded mandates such as

hepatitis C vaccinations. We have had to rely on emergency transfers by the Secretary of the VA to make up for a portion of the difference.

Given that the new chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and I share the same vision, I am concerned that the arbitrary, capricious and flat-out discriminatory policy of the last few years in distributing the funds that are available should be corrected. I am requesting that the Committee on Appropriations reconsider the VA's funding allocation formula for VISN 3.

Given that, I note that H.R. 2620 does provide a badly needed 16 percent increase for the Veterans Benefits Administration to help mitigate the backlog in veterans' claims which has now resulted in multiyear delays in getting new compensation claims approved. Our veterans have served their country when called. It is unconscionable that many now pass away while waiting for that backlog of legitimate claims to be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for providing \$300 million for short-term repairs and improvements to our aging medical facilities that was in legislation passed by the House earlier this year, a total of \$371 million for VA medical research, and over \$100 million for veterans State extended-care facilities.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this measure is sound legislation. It provides adequate funding for so many areas in need and deserves the full support of our colleagues.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Rules was considering the form of the rule under which we would consider this appropriations measure, the gentleman from Wisconsin sought to have this amendment made in order. Unfortunately, it was not made in order.

Despite the fact that this amendment will not be voted on, I am pleased that the gentleman has offered it and was allowed to offer it. It is important because it puts into perspective the choices that we as a Congress have to make.

Not very many months ago, Mr. Chairman, this Congress passed a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. That simply means that \$1.6 trillion over the next 9 or 10 years has been taken out of general revenues for this country.

This amendment looks at that reality and it looks at what section of our population most benefited from that tax cut. In fact, the top 1 percent of income earners receive about 37.6 percent of that tax cut. It is that top 1 percent that was the greatest beneficiary of that \$1.6 trillion tax cut—those people who make an average of \$1.1 million a year. The Obey amendment looks at that reality and then

looks at the underfunding in this bill and says that this would be a fair way to correct this underfunding. It seems proportional to calibrate that tax cut to that top 1 percent a little bit. That generates enough revenues to fund some of these terribly underfunded accounts in this bill and leaves a little bit left over for some other bills.

That is what the Obey amendment does. It takes .5 percent of the tax cut for the top income earners, which \$1.3 billion (which gives you some estimation of how much money they are earning) and redirects it to some real people programs. That is a real priority and those are real choices and that is what this amendment does. It clearly identifies the problem areas in this bill.

With that \$1.3 trillion, the amendment would increase funding for veterans medical care. It would increase it by \$300 million. The amendment would also address the housing needs of low-income and disabled citizens. First, it would add \$282 million to the public housing capital grant account, bringing that account to just over \$2.8 billion, and while this remains below last year's funding, it does get it closer. Then funding would also be provided for shelter plus care grants. These grants combine low-cost housing with treatment and support services.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a good amendment. It takes money from where it can be afforded and gives it to those who need it most. I appreciate the gentleman offering it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for all of his hard work on this bill. I want to underscore to those listening that this is a \$4 billion increase in spending in VA-HUD.

Having listened to the arguments advanced by the other side of the aisle, it now becomes clear why Vice President Gore lost Arkansas and lost Tennessee, because he decided rather than advancing the ideas that can bring us together, they decide to fight the typical class warfare argument. Tax cuts for the rich has been repeated time and time again on this floor. They keep saying that 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans are getting the biggest advantage under the tax cut. But you will notice none of those on the other side of the aisle will tell you that a person, say, earning \$300,000 a year pays about \$120,000 in taxes.

□ 1730

They do not tell you the burden that that person carries to fulfill the bills we are passing on the floor today. I think the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) has done a phenomenal job in trying to meet the priority needs of this Nation. If you look throughout the bill you will see increasing in funding for AIDS programs, homeless programs, military and other vital missions of this country.

Now, if the other side of the aisle believes that this tax cut is such a bad idea, I urge them to rally their supporters together and get their supporters to remit their checks, their Treasury checks, back to the Treasury and allow them to spend it as they will. I doubt that one person will step forward and sign the back of their Treasury check, whether they make \$100,000, \$50,000 or \$20,000, so it can be spent in reckless abandon on this House floor.

I know this is going to be a fight about priorities, and I know this is going to be a fight about George Bush's tax cut, but, in my heart, I believe we can do both. I believe that a family trying to fit braces on their children's teeth needs a refund. I believe that people advancing an opportunity to maybe finally take a vacation need a refund. I believe people preparing to buy a washer-dryer could use a refund.

The other side wants to refund money to people who never paid the taxes because of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

I would suggest to Members, pay attention to this bill. Focus on the good things that it does. Recognize that there is \$4 billion of increased spending on priorities, and avoid the shrill rhetoric of the other side when they call this tax cut for the rich a reckless scheme.

We are balancing the budget. We are preserving Social Security. We are finally increasing, if you will, the contributions to that account to make it solvent. We are working on prescription drug coverage for the seniors. We are working on a number of issues that will make this country stronger. But we will never be strong as a Nation if we continue to try to beat each other up over silly sound bites designed for the next election, rather than the business on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment which will shave just a tiny bit of the tax cut to the top 1 percent of wealthy people in this country in order to provide more funding for veterans and for other essential needs.

But I want to make a larger point in reference to some of what I heard from the other side of the aisle. We are told by the Social Security Task Force that, after 2016, we will have to either raise taxes or cut benefits to pay for these Social Security bonds that will be redeemed then. Well, those will be about \$200 billion a year. The tax cut we passed a few days ago will be about \$400 billion a year at that time.

So do not tell us we cannot keep faith with our senior citizens to redeem our Social Security bonds and pay out the full benefits. It would only cost to do that half the cost of the tax cut you just gave to the richest people in our country, and, in effect, taking away, if you listen to the rhetoric of the Social Security Commission, from all the people that depend on Social Security.

It is not difficult. We do not have to raise taxes. We just have to be careful in what we do and not do the tax cut for the richest 1 percent, if we want to redeem all those Social Security bonds and pay all the benefits. We do not have to destroy Social Security in order to save it. We just have to not pass the Republican tax cuts.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to, first of all, express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for the very respectable job they have done in putting this bill together. I think that we all need to recognize that.

But the problem we have with this bill, which is a very real and serious and definite problem, is based upon the fact that the tools they had with which to operate were inadequate. The funding number that they were given is too low. The reason for that is the leadership here, at the request of the President, insisted on passing a massive tax cut before we had a budget, before priorities were established. That was a basic and fundamental mistake, and it is one for which we are going to pay dearly, not just this year but in every succeeding year over the course of the next decade.

How are we going to pay? We are going to pay by inadequate provision for those people who defended this country in some of the most difficult and darkest times in our history, our veterans. We are not providing adequately for their health care, and we are not providing adequately for the general maintenance that many of them need. We are not doing that because we do not have the resources in this bill.

We are not providing enough housing for people who need housing all across America. We have a \$20 billion housing deficit today that is not being adequately addressed, and we cannot address it because of the inadequate funding level in this bill.

People need housing. There are so many people in my district, I am sure, and in every district represented by every Member here, of people who cannot find adequate housing because housing is too expensive and their incomes are too low.

The gentleman from Florida was up here a little bit earlier in the context of this debate talking about questions that have been raised by his constituents concerning the relationship between toxic and hazardous waste and the exposure of people to toxic and hazardous waste and their health conditions, debilitating, declining health conditions. What is the relationship?

There is an unquestionable relationship between people who have been exposed to toxic and hazardous waste and decline in their health in forms of cancer, attacks of the endocrine system, in

developmental disabilities. And this bill, unfortunately, because it has an inadequate funding level, does not deal with the problem of enforcement of toxic and hazardous waste laws. Therefore, people in Florida and other places all across the country are being exposed to toxic and hazardous substances which are destroying their health.

There is not enough money in this bill to deal with the problems of drug control in public housing. We fund hundreds of millions of dollars to deal with the problem that we think we have in South America, sending money down there to kill South Americans, but we do not provide enough money to save the lives of Americans in public housing. The priorities are inadequate, and it is because of inadequate funding because of that tax bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not reduce the size of the tax cut for a single middle-income American. The only persons affected on the tax side by this amendment are people in the top 1 percent of earners in this country who make more than \$330,000 a year.

I am sure that they are all fine people. That is not the issue. I do believe that they can afford to have a slightly smaller tax cut. I do believe they do not need an entire \$53,000 tax cut, which is on average what they will receive under the tax package that was passed. I do not believe that they need that full tax cut as much as sick veterans need better medical care, or as much as low-income children need to get out of rat traps and into decent housing, or as much as we all need adequate enforcement of our laws to protect the environment.

I am amused by one of the previous speakers who talked about the tax rebate and who it ought to go to. This has nothing whatsoever to do with the tax rebate. People are going to get their tax rebates, although I would note I did get a complaint from a reporter in my district because his grandmother, who died a year and a half ago, did get a tax rebate in the mail, and the letter was labeled: Blank name, "deceased." With all due respect, I do not know many people whose last name is "deceased."

I would prefer to see to it that what tax rebates we do give go to live veterans in need of health care, go to the families of live children who need better housing, and go to those Americans who are sacrificing in order to provide national service in their own communities; and I make no apology for that.

I find it interesting that somehow people talk about class warfare. I think the middle class has already lost, if there has been a war, because the CBO shows that the top 1 percent of earners over the past 20 years has had their after-tax income rise by \$414,000, while the middle class has had their income rise over that same period, their after-tax income, by about \$3,400. Some victory for the middle class.

So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, if people think veterans are getting adequate health care, fine; oppose the amendment. If you think poor kids are getting adequate housing, fine; oppose the amendment. This issue is not whether you are for or against tax cuts. This is an issue of who you think has a greater need, who you think has a greater requirement for assistance from Uncle Sam.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I will be prepared to yield back the remainder of the time when the gentleman is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close the debate, and I will honor the gentleman's agreement that I will yield as soon as he does.

Mr. Chairman, this is a phony choice. We do not have additional funds available to us to spend, and we cannot in the process of creating this legislation amend any existing legislation, and that is what the gentleman has asked us to do.

The debate over tax cuts is over. In fact, the check is in the mail. These funds are not available to us to spend. We have an allocation. It is a substantial amount of money. The subcommittee has met for hundreds of hours in hearings and in planning to develop this bill, as a subcommittee and full committee. The bill passed the full committee on a voice vote. I think it has strong support within the Committee and within the Congress; and, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would reserve my point of order and ask Members to continue to support this bill as it stands after having made the choices that we have made.

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

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment directly amends existing law, and I would ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fully consistent with the rules of the House. The House would have had the opportunity to vote on it if the Committee on Rules had waived

the rules of the House in the same manner that they waived those rules for consideration of this bill as a whole. So I believe the amendment is consistent with the rules of the House. However, the manner in which those rules have been exercised I recognize has effectively blocked us from having this amendment come to a vote. I regret that, but I cannot do much about that.

□ 1745

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the National Estuary Program and for providing additional funds for the program in the VA-HUD appropriations bill; and I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

First, I would like to express my appreciation to the chairman and members of his subcommittee for their hard work and continued support of the National Estuary Program, NEP. Congress recognized the importance of preserving and enhancing coastal environments with the establishment of the National Estuary Program in 1987. The NEP's purpose is to facilitate State and local governments' participation in "Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans" for threatened and impaired estuaries.

While the NEP has been successful in developing these CCMPs, we have increased the number of estuaries in the National Estuary Program without matching funding. This has the necessary affect of slowing our progress in restoring these estuaries.

In my district, for example, in New Jersey, an NEP called Barnegat Bay exists. The Barnegat Bay watershed drains from a land area of approximately 550 square miles. Over 450,000 people live in the Barnegat Bay watershed. That population actually doubles in the summer as people flock to the New Jersey shore. The continued economic health of the Barnegat Bay watershed is dependent upon the continued health and the national beauty of its waters. The Barnegat Bay estuary is not only a vital component of New Jersey's tourist industry, but an important natural resource that supports populations of commercially and recreationally significant fish, as well as rare and endangered species.

The Environment Protection Agency plays a vital role and collaborates with other Federal agencies, State and local governments, nonprofit institutions, industries, and citizens to address these estuaries' environmental issues.

The NEP received \$20 million to develop its CCMPs. This is not enough to

fund the implementation of the CCMPs for now 28 estuaries. That is why we must increase funding for the National Estuary Program to protect these vital natural resources and support the efforts of the local communities to implement their CCMPs.

The Senate bill currently has \$25 million for the estuary program. I would urge the chairman to work with conferees of the Senate and House to increase the level of funding for the National Estuary Program.

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

Mr. SAXTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) for his pioneering efforts in developing this very important national program and for his continued efforts to ensure the National Estuary Program remains a strong program to protect our national estuaries for the future.

I agree that this program has been successful with developing and maintaining local government, nonprofit, industry, and volunteer support from within the States where these estuaries are located. That is why we have increased funding this year for this program to \$20 million, a \$2 million increase over last year. I would be glad to work with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey to assure that this very important program continues to protect and enhance our precious national estuaries.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

Page 7, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to submit this amendment to the VA-HUD Appropriations bill. This amendment would appropriate an additional \$1 million to the Veterans Health Administration.

I had another amendment that would come later, but I am not going to offer it in the interest of the time of all of the membership of this body, but I am determined to try and do something about the hypocrisy that sometimes abounds in this Congress.

I want to make it very clear that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the subcommittee; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee, have done the very best that they can within the budgetary boundaries under which they must operate.

The arguments that we are making do not go, in the final analysis, to class

warfare, they go to: What is it that motivates us as individuals to want to take care of the needs of this country? It is commonly said, "The mark of a great country is not what it does for those with the most, but for what it does for those with the least." This bill clearly does not do enough, having argued that the persons who have the responsibility of perpetrating it have done what they can, but it does not mean all of us did everything that we could.

Public housing is grossly underfunded in this bill. This underfunding harms the people who depend on Congress to help them live meaningful lives. Without it, many could be evicted from their homes and forced into the streets. Congress, this institution, I think, tends to forget that we are talking about real people, about real families; people who depend on all of us, all 435 here and the 100 in the other body, to do something about their problems, to look out for them and to work to ensure that their lives are not wasted away in degradation and poverty.

It is not an abstract issue of refunding a few hundred dollars to people who do not really need the money. Let me address the gentleman from Florida, my dear friend and colleague, that said that not many would send theirs back. I would send mine back in the morning if I knew that it was going to provide for veterans; if I knew that it was going to provide for public housing in this country that is desperately in deterioration and in need of assistance from all of us.

Let me give as an analogy what transpired in the great State of Florida that I am a fifth generation person from. Living there all of these years, we came to a point where we decided 2 years ago that we were going to give the taxpayers, me, my mama, everybody else in Florida, \$1 billion back, while our schools were deteriorating, while our election system was putrid, and while all of the circumstances surrounding those who are impoverished in our State were continuing to deteriorate. Ostensibly, each one of us was supposed to get \$260. I never got my check. What it was was hocus-pocus. It was a whole bunch of mysterious accounting; but yet, when the legislature convened this year, there was a \$1 billion shortfall, and still the schools are crumbling, still the schools are overcrowded. Yes, the poor are desperate.

The gentleman from Wisconsin was correct. None of us need not make an apology at all about caring, and every man and woman in this institution cares about veterans. But how did we address them? We did not address them. According to the major veterans' organizations, this bill provides less than one-half the amount that is considered necessary to ensure decent health care for our Nation's veterans.

Veterans put their lives on the line. We come down here and say that all the time. They put their lives on the

line for all of us; they left their families for us.

I traveled with my Republican colleagues very recently to Normandy and we stood there and saw what veterans have done on behalf of all of us, and there was not a man or woman among us, and it was a bipartisan group, that did not leave there teary-eyed, mindful that we were standing on the shoulders of those 9,000 people, including countless others, who gave us this right to come here and try to do something for everybody, not just for a handful of people in our country.

Yet, we are not willing to pay even half of what veterans should receive.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that this allocation of \$1 million was recently in a second or third analysis of the funds available. The Congressional Budget Office found approximately an additional \$1 million that had not been spent. The gentleman has proposed that we spend it in veterans' medical care. I cannot think of a better place to put this found money, so we will accept the amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). I thank the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, and maybe the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY); and I can use it on the 45th Street Veterans Administration Building.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in order to take time, because apparently I will again not have the opportunity, to speak on a matter of very, very critical importance to many of my constituents, and to constituents all across the country. We have tried for many years to have the Congress act on a particular measure of importance to our Nation's honor.

Before the war, my colleagues will recall that the Philippine Islands were a United States protectorate, a possession. It had been in this status for 42 years. When the war came about, President Roosevelt issued a military order on July 26, 1941, in which he invited the citizens of the Philippines to enlist in the Army and to join forces with the United States to fight the enemy. Nearly 200,000 Filipinos responded without hesitation to defend their homeland and to defend the flag of the United States.

From 1941 to 1945, thousands of Filipino soldiers fought alongside American soldiers. They fought in every major battle in that area. They endured years of captivity as prisoners.

They lost their lives defending our values and our sense of freedom.

Based upon the promises made to them by the United States Government, these veterans expected when the war ended that they would be treated the same as all other veterans of World War II. General McArthur reaffirmed that they would be treated like all other veterans.

Inexplicably, in 1946 the Congress broke that promise to the Filipino veterans by revoking their full benefits by passing Public Law 70-301. It is this act of Congress that we have been seeking for years to overturn. We have taken a few measured steps forward, but I rise today to call attention to this issue, because we should have included \$30 million to provide for the health care of these veterans. That is the least that they are entitled to.

So I would hope that in the course of consideration of this bill and others like it in this House and in our respective committees, that we will find it possible to accord these few thousand Filipino World War II veterans, who are still surviving, the benefits that they are entitled to have as veterans who fought with our American veterans in the World War II battlefields.

□ 1800

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman, over the past months and years to address what has become an important and divisive area in our district, and that is our national environmental policy on contaminated sediments and, specifically, EPA's policy on contaminated sediments in the Hudson River.

By now, many in Washington and throughout the East Coast have heard of this controversy. I happen to represent the district in which the proposed 40 miles of dredging would occur.

Let us remember, Mr. Chairman, the EPA, in the closing months of the Clinton administration, proposed a massive environmental dredging project that would drastically affect both the ecology of the Upper Hudson River and the economies of the communities along its banks. This is a decision that the vast majority of the people in the communities that I represent, who are directly impacted, are rightly concerned about and concerned about the long-term impacts of any project and the scientific basis for it.

As it is, for the past several years the committee report has directed the EPA with respect to its policies on contaminated sediments. Specifically, the committee report states, "For fiscal years 1999 through 2001, the Congress included specific direction to EPA regarding the Agency's ordering of dredging or other invasive sediment remediation technologies pending the National Academy of Sciences' completion of a study intended to address dredging, capping, source control, nat-

ural recovery, and disposal of contaminated sediment, and comparing the risks of each technology.

"The committee notes that this study has been completed and published, and to the greatest extent practicable, expects the Agency to adopt as part of its own sediment remediation strategies those guidelines as presented in the Academy report."

Mr. Chairman, it is critical. It is critically important that the EPA follow this direction and implement the NAS recommendations, which were highly critical of community outreach efforts with respect to its review of the Hudson River PCB contamination.

In fact, the NAS found the EPA community involvement process in the Hudson to be a failure. Mr. Chairman, with EPA's cooperation, the NAS recommendations will inject sound science into a policy on the Hudson River that has unfortunately been driven by other agendas.

I want to remind everyone looking at this issue why I am concerned about the EPA's dredging and landfilling proposals.

As background, the Hudson Valley residents, having twice now been lied to or misled by the EPA, are understandably concerned about the impact of the largest environmental dredging project in history on the ecology of the river and the negative impacts on the region's economy.

First, in 1997, the EPA was forced to reveal that it was conducting secret studies on the Hudson Valley farmland for siting of PCB landfills, after many months of deliberately deceiving the public as to the existence of those studies. They were looking, Mr. Chairman, effectively, by virtue of eminent domain proceedings, to take the valuable farmlands, the property, the homes of the residents that I represent.

After this revelation and subsequent congressional hearings, EPA officials committed to prevent this type of public deception from ever happening again.

Sadly, and secondly, questions continue to exist on the logistics of handling and disposing of 100,000 truckloads, 100,000 truckloads, of PCB-contaminated sediment and the disruption it would bring to the river.

When the EPA released its report and proposed remediation plan for the Upper Hudson on December 12, 2000, Administrator Carol Browner and other EPA officials broadly discussed the possibility of siting two hazardous waste dewatering facilities at Moreau and Albany, New York. EPA officials flatly denied that the EPA had gone far enough to propose additional sites for such handling facilities.

On February 5 of this year, responding to a Freedom of Information request by CEASE, a local grassroots organization, the EPA was forced to release an internal memo identifying 12 such sites that the EPA was looking at to create those facilities.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that, on the issues most sensitive to local residents

in this particular incident, the EPA's history indicates that its preferred policy is to hide from the public. This is a serious problem. It is important for my constituents in the 22nd Congressional District, and I think for all New Yorkers, to have confidence that the NAS scientific recommendations are properly considered.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD an editorial from today's Journal News located in downstate Westchester County, New York, that points out that "dredging would cause short-term elevations of PCB levels downriver. . . . It would damage marshlands, which might not be able to recover. And it might not, after all, thoroughly clean PCBs from the riverbed."

"With that much doubt still lingering about the safety and effectiveness of wholesale dredging, a limited approach sounds more like sensible prudence than a sellout."

Mr. Chairman, again I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) for his effort; and I would ask that all Members look at this issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to also draw the attention of the Members of this House to the Hudson River Superfund site. The Hudson River Superfund site is the largest Superfund site in the Nation. It runs for about 150 miles, from the Battery to the Federal dam at Troy.

It is a Federal Superfund site and a State Superfund site, for that matter, in New York because of the fact that the General Electric Company, over a period of several decades, dumped hundreds of tons of polychlorinated biphenyls into the Upper Hudson River above that dam. Most of these PCBs are now still concentrated in so-called hot spots or concentrations of PCBs in this location around Fort Edward and a number of other localities up above that dam.

This site is a hazardous waste site because PCBs are extraordinarily toxic. They are toxic in the sense that they are known to be cancerous in animals, and they are suspected to be and some would say known to be cancerous in humans, as well.

PCBs cause cancer. They also attack the endocrine system. That is the natural defense system of the body. It protects us against the invasion of disease. That endocrine system is attacked by PCBs. It makes it much more difficult for people to defend themselves against ailments and causes a whole array of sicknesses to exist in bodies that are exposed to these very toxic chemicals.

Furthermore, PCBs attack the developmental system, and they are known to cause low birthweight babies and to cause a deterioration in the intellectual ability of infants as the mothers have been exposed to PCBs. So, Mr. Chairman, that is just a given indication of the seriousness of this question.

For several decades, going back to in fact the late 1970s, both the State of New York and the Federal Government have examined this question. Over a period of time they have attempted to develop a solution for it. At no time, except within the last 8 years, has this been done in a very serious way.

However, over the course of the last 8 years, and particularly within the last 6 years, the Environmental Protection Agency has developed a plan to remediate much of the PCBs from the Hudson River in order to protect people, particularly those located up in the upper river but also those people who live in the lower river, from the damage that is caused by the presence of these PCBs in the river.

Let me say parenthetically, that damage, of course, has resounded throughout the ecological system of the Hudson River. Every form of life, from the tiniest biota to the largest animals at the top of the food chain, are affected with these PCBs; and anyone who eats any of the animals out of the river, any of the fish, chemicals, anything that comes out of the river, absorbs quantities of PCBs into their body.

The PCBs concentrate in the fatty tissues within the body. Those PCBs concentrated in the fatty tissues are passed on to infants by the lactating mothers of those infants, again giving an indication of the seriousness of this particular problem.

The EPA now has developed a plan to deal with this issue. That plan is to dredge the concentrations of PCBs, remove them from the river, and reduce very substantially the level of this problem and the damage it is causing to the environment and to human health.

Now, however, we receive indications from the new EPA in a new administration that once again we may be facing inordinate and irresponsible, unconscionable and unexplainable delays. It seems, it is rumored, that this EPA, under this new administrator in this new administration, is not going to follow through on the carefully developed plan formulated by the Clinton administration EPA, formulated by the scientists within the EPA, peer-reviewed by scientists outside of the EPA, and found to be sound in virtually every detail.

In spite of all that, this EPA under this administration, with this administrator, is backing away from the plan, we are told. How ironic that is when one considers that this EPA administrator, when she was the Governor of the State of New Jersey, repeatedly is on record saying that she favored dredging the PCBs out of the river. Now, apparently, she may be taking a different tune, apparently at the direction of the White House.

I hope that that is not the case. This is a serious problem, and it needs to be addressed intelligently and seriously.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership on the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies in putting together this bill.

As a scientist, I am especially heartened by the funding increase provided for the National Science Foundation. This bill funds NSF at \$4.8 billion, which is a 9 percent increase, \$414 million over the fiscal 2001 funding level.

By approving this funding increase for NSF, we in the House make clear our understanding that the type of basic research in science and engineering that is supported by NSF is vital, not only to our Nation's continued economic leadership, but to continued increases in our standard of living and, indeed, to the sustainability of that standard of living.

In recent years we in Congress have been committed to doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health by 2003. We are justifiably proud of that effort.

At the same time, we must also be aware that advances in the physical sciences, mathematics, computer science, and engineering are fundamental to the developments in medicine.

To give an example, the move to double the NIH budget is motivated largely by the desire to cure cancer, among other serious diseases. However, many of the tools used to diagnose and treat cancer, among them x-rays, MRIs, CAT scans, and radiation treatments, come from the world of physics.

Just yesterday I spoke to a research physician who pointed out that much of his research today would have been impossible just 15 years ago. The advanced tools that are now crucial to his work were developed just recently from work done in physics.

We in Congress should have the goal of doubling the budget of NSF over the next 5 years through 15 percent annual increases. Overall, scientific and technical progress requires a balance between all of the sciences, which requires that funding for NSF keep pace with the funding for NIH.

I applaud the chairman and his subcommittee for recognizing that fact by providing this substantial and well-justified funding increase for NSF in this bill.

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

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his remarks and for his leadership on all science issues in the House and for being a strong advocate for science.

The subcommittee is acutely aware of the need for vigorous basic research effort in this country, which starts with the work of the National Science Foundation. Too often we overlook the

importance of basic research in the sciences and in engineering also because its results are not always immediately applicable to tangible products. Breakthroughs in medical research, on the other hand, are more easily understood.

I would like to echo the gentleman from Michigan in saying that we would do well to recognize the diversity of scientific endeavors that contribute to medical advances. I find it telling that the recent very noteworthy success of the human genome project, for example, was built on cutting-edge research in computer science, chemistry and other subjects of the kind supported by NSF.

If the resources were available to us, the subcommittee would support an even greater increase in NSF funding than the 9 percent increase over fiscal year 2001 that is in the bill. We feel, nevertheless, that the increase is a strong start in guaranteeing that our Nation remains preeminent in basic research for years to come.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. CARSON OF INDIANA

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. CARSON of Indiana:

In title I, in the paragraph relating to "VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL CARE", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$16,200,000)".

In title I, in the paragraph relating to "DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$16,200,000)".

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, my amendment provides additional funds to the Department of Veterans Affairs Office of the Inspector General, and it will reap a manyfold return in cost savings and result in a greatly improved quality of health care for American veterans.

The Department of Veterans Affairs is the second largest executive branch agency. Yet this behemoth is monitored by an Office of Inspector General staffed at one of the lowest levels among all 29 statutory Inspector Generals when Inspector General staffing is compared to total agency employment.

□ 1815

The VA IG has a staff of 365 nationwide. If the VA office of the IG was staffed at just the average ratio among the 29 statutory Inspectors General, the staff would be 4,000 full-time employees. My amendment, Mr. Chairman, would provide funding for an additional 110 full-time staff on the IG's team and permit an acceleration of the IG's facility assessment program from its current 6-year cycle to a more reasonable 3-year cycle.

A migration from the 6-year cycle to the 3-year cycle would enhance the IG's

ability to determine the root causes of departmental management inefficiencies. With proactive oversight, the VA Office of the Inspector General can identify tremendous cost savings measures and assure that taxpayers' dollars are put to their best use. In the end, this will provide for smarter management, greater cost savings, and, most importantly, better, more accessible health care for our veterans. An accelerated proactive assessment cycle would likely yield savings or redirect funds to better use in the billion dollar range.

In fiscal year 2000, the VA OIG staffed 369 positions at a cost of \$45 million and was able to demonstrate solid performance results, including 338 arrests, 280 indictments, 247 convictions, 496 administrative sanctions, \$302 million in funds put to better use, \$11.4 million in dollar recoveries, and \$13.8 million in fines, penalties, restitution and civil judgments. These savings were realized under the 6-year assessment cycle, and a 3-year cycle would do so very much more.

Mr. Chairman, let me assure my colleagues that I have long fought and continue to fight for the enhancement of medical benefits for veterans. As we consider adopting this amendment, I assure all of my colleagues that, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I consider this a true value of effective oversight, and I ask for their support of this amendment. It is cost effective.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little surprised, quite frankly, at this amendment. I fully expected there would be more amendments adding additional funds to the already precious dollars that are in VA medical care, but this amendment would take \$16 million out of veterans medical care. This is money that goes toward surgical procedures, towards pharmaceutical drugs, towards nurses and doctors, heat and lights, and running these facilities. To hand over these funds to the Inspector General's office, to me, just does not make good sense. So I strongly oppose the amendment.

We have already provided the Inspector General with an increase of \$6 million over last year, a 15 percent increase from in their fiscal year 2001 budget. It is also a \$4 million increase over this year's budget submission. This amendment would result in close to a 50 percent increase in the budget. I suspect the Inspector General could not handle that much money, they could not put that many people on, and this money is dearly needed for veterans medical care. I would hate to jeopardize the health of our veterans by reducing this already substantial but certainly dear amount of money.

So I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further debate on the amendment?

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 2 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I respect very much the gentleman's argument in terms of the amendment that I offered, and I realize that on its face it does probably raise red herrings in terms of what I am doing; that I may be taking away medical benefits from veterans in favor of the Inspector General. But as I indicated in my opening remarks, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is cost effective and it will allow the expansion of Inspectors General to generate more money for the Veterans Administration.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we engage in further dialogue with the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and see if we cannot work out this situation in terms of advancing the idea that I have here in terms of trying to help the Veterans Administration.

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

Ms. CARSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentlewoman would be prepared to withdraw the amendment, we would be happy to sit down and discuss this with her at length, and with the authorizing committee, to see if we can address her concerns.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman has offered that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL CARE COLLECTIONS FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year in the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code, shall be transferred to "Medical care", to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

For necessary expenses in carrying out programs of medical and prosthetic research and development as authorized by 38 U.S.C. chapter 73, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003, \$371,000,000, plus reimbursements.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ:

In title I, in the paragraph under the heading "VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION—MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH", after

the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$24,000,000)".

In title III, under the heading "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$24,000,000)".

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the Republican manager, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the Democratic manager, my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

First, I would like to recognize both the chairman and the ranking minority member for their continued support for medical and prosthetic research in the Veterans Health Administration. It is in great measure due to their support and commitment that this bill has come to the floor with approximately \$20 million more than had been initially programmed for prosthetic research.

Dating back to the spring, when I first contacted them and their colleagues in the Committee on Appropriations, urging them to take the necessary step that we began last year when the chairman similarly approved my amendment to raise the funding of this very program, they have once again responded affirmatively to my request that we increase the funding for this extremely important research program.

Secondly, I would like to emphasize that this increase will assist the VA research program in achieving the stability necessary for successful research, one that can eventually achieve its full potential for finding cures and treatments for many chronic and terrible diseases. The VA research program is uniquely positioned to advance diagnosis and treatment for conditions that particularly affect veterans, including prostate cancer, diabetes, heart disease, Parkinson's disease, mental illnesses, spinal cord injury, and aging-related diseases. But I remind my colleagues that, ultimately, our Nation as a whole is the beneficiary of research conducted by the VA.

Mr. Chairman, this generous increase would not have been possible without the complete support of the chairman and the ranking member. I believe in their commitment to this program and trust they will work with the Senate in conference to secure up to the \$391 million for this program. I wish to note that our colleagues in the Senate have provided a \$40 million increase for this deserving program. I ask the chairman and the valued ranking member for their commitment to work with their Senate counterparts during conference to achieve the highest possible funding for the VA medical and prosthetic research program.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois for his advocacy in this area. The bill provides \$20 million over last year's funding level for VA research, plus \$30 million in construction funds specifically for research facility rehabilitation.

Because the Senate has provided a higher funding level for VA research in their bill, this account will be an issue in conference; and we will take into account the views and concerns of the gentleman from Illinois and the other Members who have expressed an interest in increasing funding for this important account as we move forward.

I thank the gentleman for his willingness to withdraw his amendment.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this issue to the attention of the full House, and I want the gentleman to know that it is certainly high on the priority list for the chairman. He added \$10 million in this account during the full committee, and we have just heard him express his real support for taking a strong look at it during conference.

I commend the gentleman for bringing it to our attention, and I understand he is going to withdraw his amendment, but I just want to assure him that both sides of the aisle are supportive and will support him in conference.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for all their work on this issue, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Are there any further amendments to this paragraph?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the administration of the medical, hospital, nursing home, domiciliary, construction, supply, and research activities, as authorized by law; administrative expenses in support of capital policy activities, \$66,731,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That technical and consulting services offered by the Facilities Management Field Service, including project management and real property administration (including leases, site acquisition and disposal activities directly supporting projects), shall be provided to Department of Veterans Affairs components only on a reimbursable basis.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Department of Veterans Affairs, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses in support of Department-wide cap-

ital planning, management and policy activities, uniforms or allowances therefor; not to exceed \$25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services, and the Department of Defense for the cost of overseas employee mail, \$1,195,728,000: *Provided*, That expenses for services and assistance authorized under 38 U.S.C. 3104(a)(1), (2), (5) and (11) that the Secretary determines are necessary to enable entitled veterans (1) to the maximum extent feasible, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment; or (2) to achieve maximum independence in daily living, shall be charged to this account: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, not to exceed \$60,000,000 shall be available for obligation until September 30, 2003: *Provided further*, That from the funds made available under this heading, the Veterans Benefits Administration may purchase up to four passenger motor vehicles for use in operations of that Administration in Manila, Philippines: *Provided further*, That travel expenses for this account shall not exceed \$15,665,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FOLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLEY:

In title I, in the paragraph relating to "DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

In title III, in the paragraph relating to "NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$92,000,000)".

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, the veterans benefits claim process in this country is a disaster. This disaster is not the fault of the dedicated employees of the VA or Mr. Anthony Principi, the new Secretary of Veterans Affairs, but rather the bulk of the blame lies with the years of neglect and lack of planning AND foresight.

When a typical veteran in my State has to wait an average of 171 days to get a response to a claim, no one can doubt that we have a serious problem. Would any of us expect to wait 171 days after filing a medical claim with our insurer before actually getting the check in the mail? No one would. No American would wait. Yet this is exactly what our national veterans have to face every time they file a benefit claim with the Veterans Administration.

What is worse is that, according to the administration's own budget, that 170-day wait may well exceed 270 days this year. That 100-day increase in the claims turnaround time is estimated by the administration even after the good chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), has increased by a \$128 million earmark in this bill to alleviate that problem. In fact, recently, in our supplemental bill, and I commend the gentleman from New York for aggressively pursuing this problem, he provided another \$19 million. So we are making progress.

But let no one be mistaken, this is a crisis. Veterans in my State and across

the country sometimes die before their health or other benefit claims can be processed.

□ 1830

These claims stem from veterans who feel they have been unjustly denied the benefits they are entitled to and deserve. For example, my State of Florida has only one processing facility currently operating with a 24,000 case backlog. The second largest State in the Union with veterans residing in the State and only one processing facility.

My amendment will add \$25 million to the VA general operating expense account for the express purpose of hiring and training additional claims processors. The increase would be offset by a similar amount from the National Science Foundation's \$3.6 billion research account which the VA-HUD appropriations bill, and I will add, has generously increased over last year's level by \$292 million.

The amendment is not aimed at lessening the good that the National Science Foundation does. But our rules require offsets, and this becomes a matter of priorities.

The Foley amendment uses the NSF's polar and antarctic research accounts as an offset. The base bill recommends \$3.6 billion for National Science Foundation research next year, an increase of over \$300 million. Taking \$25 million from the NSF's already increased account is far less significant than the additional claims processors that the VA could hire with this additional funding.

This is a meaningful amendment which will make a significant dent in the turnaround time for claims processing. This is a nationwide problem, one that Secretary Principi and I have talked about. He has personally stated this is his primary goal of fixing as new head of the VA. Let us give him the funding he needs.

The amendment is about priorities. One of the highest priorities should be taking care of those who fought the wars for us. Yes, these are interesting times, and these are aggressive bills which I believe seek to solve a lot of our country's problems. But at a time when our Vietnam vets and Korean vets and World War II vets and Desert Storm vets are being told to wait, we are increasing by \$300 million monies in accounts that probably could take a little bit of a reduction in order to satisfy and help those who have sacrificed.

Again, focus on where the amount of money comes from, the NSF's polar and antarctic research accounts as offsets.

I again thank the chairman and I do want to underscore the fact that his committee and his chairmanship has brought a lot of great benefits to veterans. I know help is on the way in a number of these other areas, but I would urge Congress to accept my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would remind my good friend and colleague from Florida that we are spending over \$51 billion in the veterans' accounts this year. The entire science budget for the National Science Foundation is under \$5 billion. That is a ten to one ratio. Obviously, one can see where our priorities are. They are on our veterans, on providing for their benefits, on providing for their health care, on providing for the administration that is a very important and significant portion of the Federal budget.

Fifty billion for veterans, less than 5 billion for research. We all know how important research is to the future of all Americans, including our veterans. Make no mistake about it, the investment that we are making in the National Science Foundation will resound also to the veterans as it will with all members of the American society. Besides, we have already increased this account by almost \$146 million, the President's request.

For the benefits administration alone we provided just under \$1 billion, \$955 million. We funded this bill at the President's request which was an increase of \$129 million over last year; \$148 million if we consider the supplemental funding we passed last week.

We have fully funded the VA's plan to hire 400 claims processors, continuing our commitment to improve the claims situation as we provided funds for 400 new claims processors just last year.

This is Secretary Principi's highest priority. He is focused on this. He is asking for resources. He has a plan. Let us let him implement that plan.

The VA cannot hire more people at this point. More money will not translate to more people. The budget request for NSF's request by the President was barely a 1 percent increase. We are doubling the National Institutes of Health. It does not make sense to double the National Institutes of Health without making dramatic increases also in the National Science Foundation. It is the basic science, the math, the physics that makes all of this possible, all of this research possible.

So we needed to make that increase, and we did. The subcommittee stepped up to the plate and provided a 9 percent increase. The amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) would cut nearly one-third of our increase out of that budget, a situation which I believe is absolutely the wrong thing to do.

The Nation's economy depends on the research conducted through NSF. I strongly oppose this amendment. These funds coming out of NSF will hurt the veteran just as much as if we cut them out of their own budget.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The bad news is the

gentleman states the problem correctly, that there are large delays waiting for these medical claims to be processed, to be considered. The good news, however, is that the chairman addressed the issue in this bill. It is contained in this bill.

The gentleman said let us give the Secretary the funding he needs. Well, the chairman gave him the funding he asked for, which I assume is the funding he needs. The President's request was fully funded at \$146 million, a \$146 million increase.

I think the gentleman should be pleased with the treatment of this problem in the bill, and it is being addressed aggressively last year with an increase of 400 new employees on task and 400 will be added as a result of this bill.

The offset the gentleman proposes is absolutely terrible. We have been working very hard during the last several years to increase NSF's funding. The gentleman takes it from the NSF increase and, by my computations, he is taking \$92 million, which is about a third of the increase that we are providing for NSF.

So, on the one hand, I think the gentleman raises a legitimate concern. It is being addressed in the bill, however; and he should be pleased with that. On the other hand, where he is taking the money it is particularly difficult because that is an account that we are trying to increase. It is very meritorious to increase, and the cut he takes from that is really a horrendous cut that would be taken to NSF.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise with some reluctance to oppose this amendment, and the reluctance is that it is offered by my good friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman is engaged in a noble cause, but I will oppose it precisely for the reason that has been specified before this evening: This amendment would decimate the National Science Foundation's budget, particularly in the area of polar research and the Antarctic.

We discussed just a few moments ago the work of the National Science Foundation and how necessary it is to fund it at a level to keep pace with the funding at the National Institutes of Health, because so much of the work at the NSF is related to the work of the NIH in its battle to fight various diseases such as cancer, diabetes and the many other diseases that they are engaged in fighting.

In addition, the National Science Foundation is engaged in many other areas of research. In regard to the polar and Antarctic research which the gentleman from Florida seeks to cut, it is a unique research program that tackles many problems which cannot be tackled anywhere else in the world. For example, these research funds re-

sulted in the first discovery of the ozone hole, which alerted our whole planet to the need to do something about chlorofluorocarbons and led to measures in both industry and government to end our very large use of chlorofluorocarbons; as a result we are beginning to see a shrinking of the ozone hole.

In addition, because of the unique position at the pole, this is an ideal spot for astronomy. From that position many stars can be viewed that cannot be seen well from other areas of our planet.

The amount that the gentleman is proposing to take out of this research budget is approximately one-third of the budget allocated for that work. That is a severe cut. We discussed earlier the small amount of the increase in the NSF budget compared to the NIH budget and discussed the need to seek a doubling of the NSF budget. We are not even close to doing that this year.

If we take even more money out, it would be a serious blow to the budget of the NSF and to the scientific work that is carried out at the National Science Foundation. All of us value that research and benefit from it very, very directly. If I had the time, I could spend an hour pointing out all of the benefits derived from the funds spent on the basic research done by the National Science Foundation.

For these reasons, I urge that we vote "no" on this particular amendment. I urge even more strongly that the sponsor withdraw the amendment. I think his effort to help veterans is noble, but his funding proposal would cause inestimable damage to the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the gentleman from Florida to withdraw his amendment so we do not engage in a vote which could be detrimental to the National Science Foundation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The gentleman from Florida proposes to reduce research funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF) by \$92 million and funding for the Department of Veteran Administration's (VA) General Operating Expenses account by \$25 million.

For fiscal year 2002, this appropriations bill adds \$4.3 billion to VA's fiscal year 2001 budget of \$47 billion, and increase of over 9.2 percent. That \$4.3 billion increase is nearly equal to NSF's entire budget. To this increase, the gentleman wishes to add \$25 million by taking \$92 million from NSF's significantly smaller appropriation.

Each year when the VA/HUD bill comes to the floor, amendments are offered that would strip NSF of funding to pay for other programs—some worthy, others not. I believe that this practice is shortsighted. This House has continually recognized the important role NSF and basic research have played in our Nation's economic and technological development.

NSF is the government's premier science agency. It supports cutting-edge research to answer fundamental questions within and

across scientific disciplines. This research has helped fuel new industries and jobs that have propelled economic prosperity and changed the way we live.

Maintaining the Nation's leadership in science will require keeping open the pipeline of new ideas and innovations that flow from fundamental research. NSF is the Federal Government's only agency dedicated to the support of education and fundamental research in all scientific disciplines, from physics and math to anthropology and zoology. Today's NSF-led research in nanotechnology, advanced materials, biotechnology, and information technology are laying the groundwork for the technologies of the future, and in the process training the scientists, engineers, and technology entrepreneurs of tomorrow.

While I agree with the Gentleman on the need to reduce the backlog of VA benefits claims, I do not think that cutting the funding of the Nation's premier science agency is the way to do this. Therefore, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose it as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida will be postponed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), in a colloquy regarding funding for Hispanic-Serving Institutions, known as HSI's, under the National Science Foundation Education and Human Resources Program.

There are over 200 HSI's throughout this country that are enrolling an ever-increasing number of Hispanic college students. Hispanics are now the second largest minority in the United States. Many of these students are the first generation Americans in their family to attend colleges or universities. We need to encourage them to complete their education and to enter fields like math, science and engineering, where our country is experiencing a severe shortage.

The National Science Foundation is charged with the responsibility of improving math, science and engineering education across the country. To do this, NSF provides several competitive grant programs for which schools can apply to train teachers, students and improve the quality of their math, science, engineering and technology programs. Past authorization language has required the NSF to target under-represented populations. However, to date, Hispanic-Serving Institutions have received less than 2 percent of the grant funding available.

Mr. Chairman, does the appropriations subcommittee chairman agree that the NSF should be targeting under-represented populations such as the HSI's?

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, first, let me thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing up this important issue.

As the gentleman knows, we have made every effort to increase the budget for the National Science Foundation to the highest level possible and spread those funds as broadly as possible among programs throughout the Foundation. In this context, the subcommittee has placed great emphasis on providing additional dollars for several programs emphasizing math, science and engineering education.

Generally speaking, we in the Foundation should do all that can be done to promote these programs at all educational institutions, but I certainly agree with the gentleman that a special effort should be made to target minority-serving institutions and in particular Hispanic-Serving Institutions for enhancement of these important programs.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Will the chairman work with me and the leadership of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus to develop report language urging the National Science Foundation to do more aggressive outreach and grant solicitation amongst HSI's so that more of them can improve their math and science programs to better educate Hispanic students?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to work with the gentleman from Texas and his Congressional Hispanic Caucus to find ways to make the grant programs funded under this bill more accessible to HSI's and to encourage the National Science Foundation to work to increase the number of HSI's participating in its grant programs.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); and I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

□ 1845

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the National Cemetery Administration for operations and maintenance, not otherwise provided for, including uniforms or allowances therefor; cemetery expenses as authorized by law; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for use in cemetery operations; and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$121,169,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$52,308,000.

CONSTRUCTION, MAJOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102, 8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, and 8122 of title 38, United States Code, including planning, ar-

chitectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, where the estimated cost of a project is \$4,000,000 or more or where funds for a project were made available in a previous major project appropriation, \$183,180,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be for costs associated with land acquisitions for national cemeteries in the vicinity of Sacramento, California; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; and Detroit, Michigan: *Provided*, That except for advance planning activities, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, and other capital asset management related activities, such as portfolio development and management activities, and investment strategy studies funded through the advance planning fund and the planning and design activities funded through the design fund and CARES funds, including needs assessments which may or may not lead to capital investments, none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used for any project which has not been approved by the Congress in the budgetary process: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this appropriation for fiscal year 2002, for each approved project shall be obligated: (1) by the awarding of a construction documents contract by September 30, 2002; and (2) by the awarding of a construction contract by September 30, 2003: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall promptly report in writing to the Committees on Appropriations any approved major construction project for which obligations are not incurred within the time limitations established under the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other account except the "Parking revolving fund", may be obligated for constructing, altering, extending, or improving a project which was approved in the budget process and funded in this account until one year after substantial completion and beneficial occupancy by the Department of Veterans Affairs of the project or any part thereof with respect to that part only.

FACILITY REHABILITATION FUND

For altering, improving, or rehabilitating facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, \$300,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading \$30,000,000 shall be only for projects authorized pursuant to section 2(b)(5) of H.R. 811 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 27, 2001; and \$270,000,000 shall be only for projects achieving the purposes authorized in sections 2(c)(1), (2), and (3) of H.R. 811 as passed by the House of Representatives on March 27, 2001: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for the construction of a new building unless a credible assessment, approved by the Secretary, demonstrates new construction would be more cost-effective than rehabilitating the existing building.

CONSTRUCTION, MINOR PROJECTS

For constructing, altering, extending, and improving any of the facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the Department of Veterans Affairs, including planning and assessments of needs which may lead to capital investments, architectural and engineering services, maintenance or guarantee period services costs associated with equipment guarantees provided under the project, services of claims analysts, offsite utility and storm drainage system construction costs, and site acquisition, or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 316, 2404, 2406, 8102,

8103, 8106, 8108, 8109, 8110, 8122, and 8162 of title 38, United States Code, where the estimated cost of a project is less than \$4,000,000, \$178,900,000, to remain available until expended, along with unobligated balances of previous "Construction, minor projects" appropriations which are hereby made available for any project where the estimated cost is less than \$4,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 shall be for Capital Asset Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) activities: *Provided*, That from amounts appropriated under this heading, additional amounts may be used for CARES activities upon notification of and approval by the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds in this account shall be available for: (1) repairs to any of the nonmedical facilities under the jurisdiction or for the use of the department which are necessary because of loss or damage caused by any natural disaster or catastrophe; and (2) temporary measures necessary to prevent or to minimize further loss by such causes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the HUD/VA Appropriation bill. I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee Mr. WALSH and ranking democrat Alan Molhan on the funding levels provided for veterans programs by the bill.

This bill provides a 16 percent increase in funds for the Veterans Benefits Administration. VA Secretary Principi proposes to use these funds to hire and train 900 additional employees to address the increased workload in the disability and education claims areas. The increased workload is a result of an increased number of claims and legislative changes to the adjudication process. Addressing this backlog is an urgent task which the Secretary has attempted to confront in a very forthright and open manner.

But, frankly, I am deeply concerned and dismayed about the blatantly unfair criticism that blames him and the Bush administration for a situation that clearly was the result of policies and practices in place before he became VA Secretary. I share his concern about partisan attacks that hold him accountable because this backlog has not yet been resolved. I say to those who would make such criticisms that they cannot absolve themselves of some of the responsibility. Congress passed the Veterans Claims Assistance Act last year and that Act alone required the VA to review over 50,000 disability decisions to assure compliance with that act. In addition, the two previous VA Secretaries had substantial opportunities to make the claims process more timely and responsive to veterans, yet Secretary Principi faced a backlog of over 500,000 disability claims and 130,000 education claims when he took office. Sec. Principi is a good and honorable man who cares deeply about veterans. He is responsive and an outstanding leader. The criticism of him is unjustified, unfair and unwarranted.

As I noted, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a 16 percent increase for the Veterans Benefits Administration. I cannot think of too many Departments that have seen a 16 percent increase in 1 year. I believe that this is probably as much money as could be productively used in fiscal year 2002. This budget is a very good one, but we should not assume that simply by increasing the budget these backlogs will disappear overnight. The VA is already hiring employees using funds they expect to receive in the supplemental appropriation bill. But it takes several years for an employee to obtain the requisite skills necessary to correctly decide a veteran's disability claim. While I expect we will see progress, there is no magic wand that will solve these matters overnight.

Mr. Chairman, on the health care side, the bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations, and again I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for their faithfulness to our veterans. This legislation provide a \$300 million increase in funds to funding bill H.R. 811, which we passed earlier this year for medical facility rehabilitation projects. I want my colleagues to understand that even though we have not gotten Senate agreement yet on the Veterans Hospital Emergency Repair Act, H.R. 811, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) are willing to fund this new authorization. I think they break some very important ground by their willingness to do this.

As the chief sponsor of H.R. 811, I can say that it is readily apparent that even though the VA may need to tear down or declare excess some of its aging facilities that are vacant and not needed to serve veterans in the future, there is an urgent need to renovate medical facilities throughout the country that will be serving veterans for the foreseeable future. Unfortunately, the proposed budget for VA facility repair and renovation has not come close to meeting the documented needs of a system with an estimated value of some \$35 billion.

An independent study by Price Waterhouse suggested that with a system as valuable as this one, an annual investment of about \$700 million to \$1.4 billion would be ideal. Unfortunately, VA budget proposals in the past few years contained far less than this for capital renovation projects. The changes in medical practice and technology demand that facilities be modernized on a regular basis; and frankly we have ignored that need in VA health care facilities in the last few budgets.

That is why all Members should be aware of the provision in the bill pledging \$300 million in capital construction funds to keep VA facilities and the care they deliver up to date. This is the problem we were attempting to address in H.R. 811 when we passed it earlier this year, and this appropriations language likewise addresses it as well.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from New York and all members of the committee for supporting this funding.

The reported bill also includes substantial increases in the budgets for state home construction grants, medical and prosthetic research, and the national cemetery system. Coupled with a projected increase in receipts from insurers, an increase of \$1.2 billion over the 2001 level would be provided for medical care. As the Chairman of the Subcommittee is aware, the VA carried forward \$1.3 billion from last year into the current fiscal year. In addition, health care receipts are about 25 percent higher this year than last year, so that a total of \$800 million in additional funds of medical care attributable to these receipts is a realistic possibility.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is also fair to mention the issue of VA managers diverting medical care funds in a manner that reached new heights late last year. Of the \$20 billion in medical care funds provided for the current fiscal year, \$6.2 billion was appropriated for three items. Those three items are pharmacy (drugs), Hepatitis C care, and long-term care. As we learned earlier this year from newly-confirmed VA Secretary Tony Principi, VA doesn't need all of this \$6.2 billion, and plans to spend \$750 million of it on other health care needs.

Given the VA's ability to reprogram sums as large as this without any explanation or authorization, it seems to me we need to take a much closer look at how VA is spending its money and what it is currently requesting. One of the themes I've stressed since becoming Chairman is to hold VA officials accountable for the decisions they make and how they spend taxpayer dollars. Thus, I think a one billion dollar increase is defensible and generous if we're going to have officials requesting funds for one purpose and then spending it one something else altogether. In addition, I believe we will finally see the long-awaited improvement in medical collections of around \$200 million in the current fiscal year, and that increase should carry over into fiscal year 2002.

All in all, I believe this is a very good bill for veterans, one that provides substantial increases where the funds will do the most good. Given the demands by millions of veterans for a high-quality affordable health care benefit, it is nearly impossible to say that higher appropriations for medical care are unnecessary. But they is a very good bill, and it keeps our pledge to maintain the quality for those veterans now enrolled with VA for their health care. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to vote for this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to identify with the remarks of my colleague who just spoke, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs,

and I wish to address the House in two capacities: one, as a friend of the veterans, as a veteran myself; and, two, in relationship to the amendment previously discussed by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

The fact of the matter is I know of no better friends for the veterans of America than the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). They both have very important roles to play, the gentleman from New Jersey as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from New York, who is where the rubber meets the road, on the Committee on Appropriations.

We can do all the authorizing in the world, but it does not mean much unless you follow up with appropriations. The gentleman from New York, to his credit, time after time has been there for the veterans, time after time has put more money in the budget to address very real problems that must be solved if we are to fulfill our commitments to the men and women who have worn the uniform of the United States military.

I am very much aware of the delays in solving the claims processing crisis. Indeed it is a crisis. On several occasions I have spoken to the gentleman from New York about this. Others have, too. We have always received the same answer: "We will be there when we are needed. Don't just judge us by our words. Judge us by our deeds." This budget includes \$128 million, an 11 percent increase, for the Veterans Administration to address the claims processing problem. That deserves our praise and support.

Now, we can always do more, but the fact of the matter is we are doing more than what is adequate to address a very real, legitimate problem. But to suggest that we take from another very sensitive area, and this is where I put on my second hat, as chairman of the Committee on Science, to suggest that we take money away from the National Science Foundation, which even Ronald Reagan, in my early years on the Hill, wanted to double funding for over a 5-year period, because he was wise then and we are wise now; and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is evidencing the wisdom of the Congress in providing additional funds for the National Science Foundation.

I do not need to remind my colleagues that we have been through a decade of unprecedented growth, quarter after quarter, year after year, growth in our economy. It is a little bit soft right now, a little bit shaky. People are concerned. I would suggest to my colleagues in the House that the way to continue to move forward, to make sure this economy keeps percolating is, one, to do what we have already done, cut taxes to get money back into the pockets of the American taxpayer, and so that they can help keep this economy humming, but secondly to invest in appropriate science,

to invest in the basic research that is so essential for the continued prosperity in America. We did not get where we have been these past 10 years, quarter after quarter year after year of growth because we just wished for better things to happen. We got there because we invested in science, and science has rewarded us with unprecedented developments. The whole Internet economy, the whole telecommunications industry growth, these are things that are products of science.

So I would suggest that to acquire \$25 million more for something that is already being addressed in a very substantial way, \$128 million more in the Walsh bill, but to get that additional \$25 million by taking \$92 million and, boy, talk about fuzzy math, it is tough to understand and explain in this short time how that comes about, but to take \$92 million away from the National Science Foundation is just not the thing to do. We can do what we should do in a responsible way, continuing to provide more funding for the National Science Foundation and do what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is proposing, more funding, \$128 million more to solve a very real problem, that is, the backlog in the claims processing for the men and women who have served our Nation so nobly.

I want to thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership. I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for what he is continuing to do, to make certain everyone clearly understands that our veterans are uppermost in our minds. We have an obligation. We have a commitment. We are going to meet it.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague from New Jersey, my chairman. I chair the Subcommittee on Health for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I too would like to commend the gentleman from New York and the ranking member of this committee for their support of veterans issues and particularly for improving the access veterans can have to health care across the country.

But I would also like to come here this afternoon and thank my chairman for working on another issue and it is one that is very important to a community of mine back home, Hutchinson, Kansas. Hutchinson is a community of just over 40,000 people. On January 17 of this year, the city experienced a series of explosions caused by natural gas that leaked into abandoned salt mines that migrated under the community. People in Hutchinson woke up that day to headlines and photographs demonstrating a major occurrence had occurred in this small town. Explosions rocked the community for the next 2 days, and fires continued to burn for the next 5 months. The explosions leveled two downtown buildings, destroyed homes, hundreds of people were

forced to relocate, move their home and businesses, and tragically two people died as a result of injuries sustained from this occurrence.

Just 2 weeks ago, another gas explosion occurred causing more damage to the community, both physically and emotionally. Hutchinson has a long history of salt production, resulting in hundreds of abandoned mines underneath the city and the surrounding region. In order to ensure that no natural gas further escapes and ignition occurs from these mines, each must be located and properly capped to ensure safety.

Addressing this situation is vitally important to this community and its future. It is an important priority for our country. Even President Bush mentioned in his energy strategy this tragedy. I have requested assistance from the chairman. This is the first time I have come to the gentleman from New York asking for assistance in this manner. I was anticipating being intimidated by the gentleman. He met me with sympathy and empathy. I am very grateful for that kind of response. I appreciate the gentleman indicating his willingness to assist and provide support as this bill goes to a House-Senate conference.

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

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just to briefly respond to the gentleman, I thank him for bringing this issue to my attention and to the attention of the committee. This catastrophic loss that occurred to his community, this devastating incident, seriously undermines public safety and economic activity in this city and the region. I know his concern is heartfelt. He has pressed this case before us. I will continue to work with the gentleman from Kansas during the conference to see what assistance we can provide to Hutchinson, Kansas. I thank him for his hard work on behalf of his community.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, to address the serious shortage of suitable housing for frail, low-income seniors, the fiscal year 2000 VA-HUD bill included authorizing language to provide a pilot program for up to three grants for the conversion of unused or underutilized commercial property into assisted living facilities for the elderly. Unfortunately, in that year the appropriation language did not allow HUD to issue a NOFA to implement the authorizing language.

In fiscal year 2001, the necessary appropriation language was included in the VA-HUD bill, and \$7.5 million of Section 202 funds were made available to provide for the pilot program of

grants for the conversion of unused or underutilized commercial property into assisted living facilities. Yet, upon issuance of the NOFA, HUD rejected all applications for these grants.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today has again appropriated funds for the conversion of eligible assisted living projects. I am concerned that HUD will continue to ignore congressional mandates on this issue, and I would ask the chairman if he would work with me in conference to correct this problem so that we can expedite the previously authorized pilot program for the conversion of unused or underutilized commercial property into assisted living facilities for the elderly.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to our attention and for the amount of energy and thought he has put into this. We have discussed this at length, and I would be happy to work with the gentleman as the bill moves forward to address the issue prior to conference.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the chairman's consideration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I want to commend the gentleman for the robust increases he has included in H.R. 2660 for veterans health care programs. I again want to reiterate to my colleagues that an increase of \$1.2 billion for the VA's Medicare account will go a long way toward improving services for our veterans.

There is an area of particular interest to me I would like to discuss the with the distinguished chairman, and that is the success of Alzheimer's disease. I am proud to support a bill that will help to improve the treatment of veterans that suffer from this debilitating dementia.

As cochairman of the Congressional Alzheimer's Task Force, I am proud of the clinical research the VA has been conducting on Alzheimer's disease. As the chairman is aware, the VA has developed a very promising model to treat Alzheimer's patients at the Bedford, Massachusetts, VA facility. This model emphasizes a home-like setting, making patients feel comfortable, instead of subjecting them to painful and heroic medical interventions, and employs an interdisciplinary team of clinicians, dieticians and therapists. All reviews of the Bedford program have concluded that it provides better care than traditional long-term care approaches.

It is my hope that, with the additional resources contained in this bill, the VA will take concrete steps to examine successful Alzheimer's programs such as the Bedford VA model and look to expand this approach to other VA medical centers.

I will yield to the chairman on that issue.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the passionate leadership that the gentleman provides on that committee for our veterans. He is always there to defend the interests of our veterans and to make sure we meet the commitments we made to our veterans.

I would also like to thank him for his interest and support in finding a cure for Alzheimer's disease. As the gentleman surely knows, nearly 600,000 veterans are estimated to be suffering from brain disease, dementia and related disorders such as Alzheimer's. I am in fact a member of the task force, and I share his commitment to helping patients and their families who are struggling with this condition.

As for the chairman's question, I believe that, yes, the VA should be carefully examining the Alzheimer's programs it manages, identifying promising models of care and then ensuring that successful models are implemented at other medical centers. In this manner, all of our veterans can receive the very latest treatment methods. Our veterans deserve nothing less.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the distinguished chairman for his commitment to our Alzheimer's patients, particularly to those who happen to be veterans, the 600,000 that he mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

PARKING REVOLVING FUND

For the parking revolving fund as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8109, income from fees collected and \$4,000,000 from the General Fund, both to remain available until expended, which shall be available for all authorized expenses except operations and maintenance costs, which will be funded from "Medical care".

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES

For grants to assist States to acquire or construct State nursing home and domiciliary facilities and to remodel, modify or alter existing hospital, nursing home and domiciliary facilities in State homes, for furnishing care to veterans as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 8131-8137, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. NADLER:

In title I, in the item relating to "DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE EXTENDED CARE FACILITIES", after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$4,806,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE

FUND", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$195,194,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND", after the seventh dollar amount (relating to incremental vouchers), insert the following: "(increased by \$195,194,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND", after the eighth dollar amount (relating to amounts made available on a fair share basis), insert the following: "(increased by \$144,762,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND", after the ninth dollar amount (relating to amounts made available to nonelderly disabled families), insert the following: "(increased by \$50,432,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM", after the aggregate dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM", after the second dollar amount (relating to the Downpayment Assistance Initiative) insert the following: "(reduced by \$200,000,000)".

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will provide an additional 34,000 Section 8 vouchers, 10,000 of which will be reserved for disabled families. In addition, the amendment would add almost \$5 million to veterans' extended care facilities.

I wish we could offer an amendment for a greater number of new vouchers, because the need is so great. Unfortunately, with such severe cuts to so many important housing programs necessitated by the budget resolution we passed earlier this year, it is difficult to find an offset that would provide the funds necessary to do so. We must focus the scarce resources in this bill on the areas of greatest need.

Therefore, the amendment offsets the increase in funds for additional Section 8 vouchers and for the additional funding for veterans' extended care facilities by removing \$200 million from the Down Payment Assistance Initiative which is an unauthorized part of the HOME program. By postponing appropriations for this initiative until it is actually authorized and until a number of concerns raised by local mayors regarding the structure of the program have been addressed, we will be able to use these funds immediately on chronically underfunded housing programs.

Mr. Chairman, the Down Payment Assistance Initiative is not only unauthorized, no committee hearings have been held on this initiative, it is unclear how the program will be administered, it is unclear that most low-income people would have sufficient income to be able to utilize the program, and, frankly, we should hold hearings and we should properly design and authorize this program, and then we will know how much to appropriate for it. Meanwhile, we can better use these funds on the chronically underfunded existing programs.

This bill makes dramatic and alarming cuts to next year's housing budget,

yet the need for housing assistance is staggering. By HUD's estimates, there are 5 million low-income families, almost 11 million people, who have worst-case housing needs; five million families who spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent or live in severely substandard housing. None of these 11 million people receive any housing assistance.

More importantly, there is not one local jurisdiction in the United States in which a full-time, full-time, minimum wage worker can afford the market rent for a one-bedroom apartment in his or her neighborhood. A study of 70 metropolitan areas showed that someone earning the minimum wage would have to work 100 hours a week to be able to afford the market rent in those areas.

What do we say to the working people of this country when they work endless hours, sacrificing time with their families, all in an effort to provide for their families, and they still cannot afford a decent place to live? We must not ignore these needs.

The Section 8 voucher program is one of the most effective and cost-efficient means of eliminating worst-case housing needs. 1.5 million families have been able to find affordable housing through the use of Section 8 vouchers. Rental assistance allows families to enter the private housing market and choose where they want to live. By reducing housing costs, these vouchers can free up funds within the budgets of low-income families for necessary expenses such as health and child care.

Unfortunately, the Section 8 program is severely underfunded. In New York City alone, there are nearly 200,000 people, 200,000 people, on the Section 8 waiting list. Nationwide, the average wait for those entering the Section 8 program is about 2 years; and in some places people have been on the waiting list for over 10 years.

Over the last 3 years, Congress has gradually increased Section 8 vouchers by too low an amount, but it has increased it by 50,000, 60,000, and 79,000 in the last 3 years respectively. But with a national waiting list of Section 8 vouchers being well over 1 million families today, these increases are drops in the bucket. This bill increases the number of Section 8 vouchers by only 34,000.

With so many people in need, it is not the time to reverse the progress of the last 3 years. To add only 34,000 vouchers this year is to actually cut the annual increase in vouchers by 46 percent.

This amendment will increase the housing certificate fund by \$195 million to provide an additional 34,000 Section 8 vouchers, of which 10,000, as I said, will be targeted to the disabled. The remaining \$4.8 million dollars in savings created by this amendment will be dedicated to the State Extended Care Facilities Program to finance the construction and renovation of veterans' nursing home and hospital care facilities.

I recognize, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is a modest action, given the shortage of affordable housing, but it is necessary to help thousands of low-income families, while, at the same time, providing resources to improve home care facilities for our Nation's veterans. By increasing funding for programs targeted at a wide range of people, from those with disabilities, to veterans, to those working to make ends meet at low salaries, this amendment sends a message that all people are deserving of the dignity and stability of a decent home.

I urge all my colleagues to support it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is instructive because it shows how difficult it is to find additional funds in this to reorder the priorities in this bill.

The amendment would cut \$200 million from funds that the President has asked us to provide to help low-income families to become homeowners.

Now we spend approximately \$16 billion on Section 8 vouchers. We are actually looking at a program that will allow individuals to use those Section 8 housing vouchers to purchase a home. It is a pilot program. We believe that the American dream still exists, and the President has said not only should we try this pilot program with Section 8 vouchers for mortgages but we should provide \$200 million to low-income families to help to make the initial down payment, that big chunk of money that we all know is necessary to plunk down before you can make a deal with a bank on the mortgage.

I cannot think of a better way, Mr. Chairman, to help families to move from welfare to work and from renting to owning. This is the President's major initiative in this bill, and I think we should honor it.

What the gentleman does is he proposes to take all of that money, all \$200 million, and spend it in other areas of the bill. What he has proposed is to provide 34,000 additional Section 8 housing vouchers, and some 10,000 of those would go to disabilities.

I would submit that imitation is the highest form of flattery. That is exactly what we did in the bill. He is just doubling it.

But the problem with that is, while we have done our very best to provide new vouchers to help families in need of housing, we continue to see those funds go unused. None of the funds we provided for new housing vouchers in fiscal year 1999 or 2000 was actually used, and it is likely that this will be the case again this year, since HUD has not yet awarded the new vouchers that have been provided.

At the same time, public housing authorities continue to fail to use the vouchers they already have. On average, PHAs are providing fulfillment of only 93 percent of the vouchers that have been allocated. Consequently,

huge amounts of money continue to go unspent. Last year, HUD recaptured over \$1 billion in unused voucher funds, money that would have funded 171,000 vouchers.

So I cannot support, Mr. Chairman, taking these funds that will help poor families to buy their home, to get a piece of the rock, to get a piece of the American dream, to deny them that, by putting it into a program that HUD cannot possibly spend the money for.

What I urge is that we reject this amendment.

I submit for the RECORD a letter that I received in my capacity as chairman of the subcommittee from the Enterprise Foundation, the National Council of State Housing Agencies, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, and the National Community Development Association supporting the HOME program and that \$200 million presidential earmark.

JULY 26, 2001.

Hon. JAMES T. WALSH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, HUD, and Independent Agencies, House Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The undersigned representatives of state and local governments and non-profit community development organizations thank you for increasing FY 2002 funding for the HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) program to \$2 billion in H.R. 2620, the FY 2002 VA/HUD appropriations bill. We strongly urge you to reject any House floor amendments to reduce HOME funding.

As you clearly recognize, HOME is one of the most important tools states and local governments have to respond flexibly to their unique and diverse affordable housing needs. HOME has consistently exceeded congressional expectations by assisting families with incomes below the HOME limits, leveraging significant public and private housing funds, and sparking innovative solutions to a wide array of housing challenges.

HOME's success in answering the nation's housing needs is limited by a single factor— inadequate funding. Though Congress authorized HOME at \$2 billion when it created the program in 1990, Congress has never appropriated that amount. A HOME appropriation of \$2 billion for the upcoming fiscal year is barely enough to compensate for the loss of purchasing power HOME has suffered since Congress first funded it nearly a decade ago.

We agree that a number of federal housing programs need more funding. HOME is one of the most deserving among them. Please insist on at least \$2 billion in HOME funds in FY 2002.

Sincerely,
The Council of State Community Development Agencies.
The Enterprise Foundation.
The Local Initiatives Support Corporation.
The National Association of Local Housing Finance Agencies.
The National Council of State Housing Agencies.
The National League of Cities.
The National Association of Counties.
The National Community Development Association.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that Members reject the amendment.

□ 1915

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the pending amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF STATE
VETERANS CEMETERIES

For grants to aid States in establishing, expanding, or improving State veterans cemeteries as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 2408, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 101. Any appropriation for fiscal year 2002 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations.

SEC. 102. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2002 for salaries and expenses shall be available for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 103. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs (except the appropriations for "Construction, major projects", "Construction, minor projects", and the "Parking revolving fund") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

SEC. 104. No appropriations in this Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons (except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, and persons receiving such treatment under 5 U.S.C. 7901-7904 or 42 U.S.C. 5141-5204), unless reimbursement of cost is made to the "Medical care" account at such rates as may be fixed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2002 for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" shall be available for payment of prior year accrued obligations required to be recorded by law against the corresponding prior year accounts within the last quarter of fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 106. Appropriations accounts available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2002 shall be available to pay prior year obligations of corresponding prior year appropriations accounts resulting from title X of the Competitive Equality Banking Act, Public Law 100-86, except that if such obligations are from trust fund accounts they shall be payable from "Compensation and pensions".

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2002, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall, from the National Service Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1920), the Veterans' Special Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1923), and the United States Government Life Insurance Fund (38 U.S.C. 1955), reimburse the "General operating expenses" account for the cost of administration of the insurance programs financed through those accounts: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall be made only from the surplus earnings accumulated in an in-

surance program in fiscal year 2002, that are available for dividends in that program after claims have been paid and actuarially determined reserves have been set aside: *Provided further*, That if the cost of administration of an insurance program exceeds the amount of surplus earnings accumulated in that program, reimbursement shall be made only to the extent of such surplus earnings: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall determine the cost of administration for fiscal year 2002, which is properly allocable to the provision of each insurance program and to the provision of any total disability income insurance included in such insurance program.

SEC. 108. (a)(1) Section 1729B of title 38, United States Code, is repealed. Any balance as of the date of the enactment of this Act in the Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund established under such section shall be transferred to the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund established under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1729B.

(b) Section 1729A(b) of such title is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (9); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraphs:

"(7) Section 8165(a) of this title.

"(8) Section 113 of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106-117; 38 U.S.C. 8111 note)."

(c)(1) Section 1722A(c) of such title is amended—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "under subsection (a)" and inserting "under this section"; and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

(2) Section 8165(a)(1) of such title is amended by striking "Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund established under section 1729B of this title" and inserting "Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund established under section 1729A of this title".

(3) Section 113(b) of the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act (Public Law 106-117; 38 U.S.C. 8111 note) is amended by striking "Department of Veterans Affairs Health Services Improvement Fund established under section 1729B of title 38, United States Code, as added by section 202" and inserting "Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Care Collections Fund established under section 1729A of title 38, United States Code".

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Department of Veterans Affairs shall continue the Franchise Fund pilot program authorized to be established by section 403 of Public Law 103-356 until October 1, 2002: *Provided*, That the Franchise Fund, established by title I of Public Law 104-204 to finance the operations of the Franchise Fund pilot program, shall continue until October 1, 2002.

SEC. 110. Amounts deducted from enhanced-use lease proceeds to reimburse an account for expenses incurred by that account during a prior fiscal year for providing enhanced-use lease services, may be obligated during the fiscal year in which the proceeds are received.

SEC. 111. Funds available in any Department of Veterans Affairs appropriation for fiscal year 2002 or funds for salaries and other administrative expenses shall also be available to reimburse the Office of Resolution Management and the Office of Employment Discrimination Complaint Adjudication for all services provided at rates which will recover actual costs but not exceed \$28,555,000 for the Office of Resolution Man-

agement and \$2,383,000 for the Office of Employment and Discrimination Complaint Adjudication: *Provided*, That payments may be made in advance for services to be furnished based on estimated costs: *Provided further*, that amounts received shall be credited to "General operating expenses" for use by the office that provided the service.

Mr. FILNER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read through line 25 of page 20, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will look to the manager for that unanimous consent request.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the ranking member of the authorizing committee has risen to offer an amendment, and we had had prior discussion, and I would suggest that remaining in regular order, I believe it would be the gentleman's opportunity to offer his amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I thought that this would allow that to occur, and then all of the other ones at the end of title I.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make a unanimous consent request to open up the bill through page 20, line 25?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, page 20 through line 25, 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 New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. EVANS

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an Amendment No. 11.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. EVANS:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds provided by this Act may be used for the purpose of implementing any administrative proposal that would require military retirees to make an "irrevocable choice" for any specified period of time between Department of Veterans Affairs or military health care under the new TRICARE for Life plan authorized in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (as enacted into law by Public 106-398).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this amendment at this point in the reading?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I had assumed that this was in title I, and there are about 6 or 7 amendments remaining in

title I that I assume the unanimous consent allowed to occur. Did the maker of the motion assume that?

The CHAIRMAN. Amendment 11 is drafted to the end of the bill.

Mr. FILNER. Okay. But other amendments to title I would be in order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the gentleman offering his amendments at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. That is without prejudice to any other amendment in title I.

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the Department of Veterans' Affairs from expending appropriated funds for the purpose of implementing a proposal contained in President Bush's budget.

The budget proposal would require all military retirees, including the one-quarter million veterans currently enrolled for care in the VA, to choose between either the VA or the DOD as their exclusive health care provider. This proposal has incurred the justifiable anger of our military retirees, the military itself, and the veterans service organizations. I believe that retirees have earned their right to access health care benefits in both systems and should be given that right and choice.

Mr. Chairman, while it is my understanding that the legislation will be needed to enact my proposal, I wish to prohibit any efforts by the Department of Veterans' Affairs to begin implementation of it. Congress should have more time to fully assess the effects this legislation will have and its impact on the lives of former servicemen and women.

Military retirees have devoted their lives to serving our country. We will breach our commitment if we allow the VA and the Department of Defense to simply implement their proposal that eliminates veterans' choice of providers. The truth is that these two systems provide very different packages of services and military retirees have earned the right to both.

I hope every Member of Congress will agree that this proposal is worthy of approval, and I urge its approval. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and my chairman on the authorizing committee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for getting this done. I appreciate it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We have no objection to the amendment. We support in theory what the administration is trying to do. Both the VA and DOD cannot adequately plan and budget for services when both of these depart-

ments do not know the number of people they are serving. However, there are very few details from either VA or DOD, nor have we heard explanations on the effects or restrictions of the proposed policy. So until DOD and the VA can present us with a complete, well-thought-out plan, I support the amendment of the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and fully support it. I just wanted to express that. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution to veterans.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), my good friend and ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to prohibit the use of funds in fiscal year 2002, to implement the administration's proposal that military retirees be required to make an irrevocable choice between military or VA health care for a defined period of years.

While we certainly want to encourage more efficient use of scarce Federal health resources, at this juncture, we simply do not have enough information about the potential impact of that specific proposal. I do not think either the VA or the Department of Defense is really prepared to deal with the implications of requiring this choice, and both health care systems are already experiencing considerable strain serving their beneficiaries. We need to understand the implications of this proposal much, much better.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Evans amendment. Forcing military retirees to choose between VA or DOD TRICARE is wrong.

Our country owes an enormous debt to the men and women who served in the Armed Forces.

It is because of their vigilance and dedication that we can enjoy the freedom that is cherished by every American.

In exchange for their service to our country, we promised them medical care for life. Without this amendment we will be taking a step backwards from this promise.

This issue is of the utmost importance to the military retirees in Marin and Sonoma counties.

Our community is fortunate to have the leadership of colonel Jack Potter, who works tirelessly to ensure that retired veterans have full access to both VA and DOD's TRICARE health care services.

Mr. Chairman, military retirees have earned their right to participate in both plans. If older retirees want to use tricare services for routine care, they should not then be forced to give up access to VA health care services.

The sixty-five thousand retired veterans in my district who are both medicare-eligible and enrolled in the VA Health Care System should not be the scapegoats for the Veterans' Administration's funding problems.

As colonel Potter points out, more than two-thirds of veterans who are enrolled in the VA health care system have disabilities.

If they want TRICARE for routine care, but are denied access to the VA's highly respected specialty care services, disabled veterans may not be able to get comparable care through other military or private health care systems.

Many will be referred back to the VA for this specialized care at their own expense—that's an unacceptable financial burden to place on these retirees.

Another important consideration for our older military retirees is access to no-cost services, such as hearing aids. These services will not be free under TRICARE.

As you can see Mr. Chairman, the plan proposed in the appropriations bill will cost our veterans more money for fewer medical care options.

I ask my colleagues to support the Evans amendment and correct the wrong that will be done to our deserving veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) to strike \$200 million for the down payment assistance initiative to mostly fund additional section 8 vouchers. This amendment would move this bill in the wrong direction and should be opposed, as it was. As a member of the Committee on Financial Services Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity and a former home renovator, I have worked on these issues, and I believe this legislation as drafted by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), moves in the right direction.

First, this amendment cuts the President's new down-payment assistance initiative for getting more first-time home buyers into their own homes. I cannot understate the importance of this initiative. So many Americans lack the opportunity to purchase a new home and spend a large percentage of their income on monthly rent. That can be the right choice for some, but most families greatly benefit from the purchase of their own homes. A home helps them create wealth for their families and, in the form of equity, also invests them in the community. In short, we help the families rise on the economic ladder and build stronger communities in the process. It is truly the American dream to own one's own home, a dream we have to help make a reality for families who currently lack that opportunity.

Second, this amendment designates funding for additional section 8 vouchers. This would be in addition to the 34,000 new vouchers this bill already provides. What I find interesting about this amendment is that the Democrat-controlled Senate provides half of that, 17,000 new section 8 vouchers. Why? In

the report that accompanies the Senate bill, they stated, "The reduction from the administration's request reflects the concerns of the committee that vouchers do not always provide the best opportunities for low-income families to obtain affordable housing."

Perhaps our esteemed colleagues in the Senate know about the problems housing authorities have had in distributing section 8 vouchers.

In my home county of Westchester, New York, we have 13,207 people on the section 8 waiting list, yet the county and communities are not able to use all of their section 8 vouchers because of a combination of lack of available housing units and the inability of section 8 vouchers to cover the fair market rent for the area.

I cannot help but feel frustrated by this problem. Here we have a program in place with extra vouchers to assist families; here we have a very long list of families who have applied for this assistance, yet they are unable to use them because they are priced out of the market. Unfortunately, the solution to this problem is not to add more vouchers. That solution will only come with more and new and affordable housing coming on to the market.

In short, the legislation takes an important step in the right direction addressing the current affordable housing crisis in our Nation. Unfortunately, the Nadler amendment would have reversed these positive initiatives to add funding to an area where it cannot be used. I have urged my colleagues to join me in voting against the Nadler amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FILNER:

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) MEDICAL CARE.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$30,000,000 for "Medical Care" for health care benefits for Filipino World War II veterans who were excluded from benefits by the Rescissions Acts of 1946.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I make this amendment which is embodied in bipartisan legislation by a large group of Members of this body, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who wrote the maiden legislation; the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who has been a strong supporter of this legislation; the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), who is with us today; and the gentle-

woman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), who spoke earlier; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD); the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR); and others who have contributed to this legislation.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, 55 years ago this Congress committed a terrible injustice. After World War II, after the victory that occurred, of course first in Europe and then in the Pacific, those who were drafted into the U.S. Army from our Philippines protectorate were unceremoniously deprived of the benefits that were promised and earned as veterans of the United States. In 1946 the then Congress rescinded all the benefits that had accrued to our Philippine allies.

There was no doubt of the contributions that the Filipinos made. Side by side with Americans, they held onto the Philippines and held up the Japanese advance for many, many, many months beyond what the Japanese had expected, and thus allowed the United States, at a terrible time in 1941, to prepare for the war.

These Filipinos fought at Bataan, where their resistance took many, many months. When they were finally captured, Americans and Filipinos were led on the famous death march, where hundreds and hundreds died on the march and later in the prison camps in which they were held.

They fought bravely at Corregidor, and again the Japanese were held up much longer than they had expected before they conquered the Philippines. Along with Americans who were in the Philippines, their guerrilla forces harassed for many, many months until MacArthur was able to return. When MacArthur returned and landed at Leyte and then was able eventually, of course, to defeat the Japanese, he attributed a good part of his victory to his Filipino allies.

President Roosevelt had drafted all the units of the Philippine Army, all of the members of the Commonwealth Army, all of the so-called scouts, the Old Scouts, New Scouts, all of the guerrilla units into the American Armed Forces. The implication was that they would be treated as American soldiers, and therefore, American veterans. But after the war was over, the Philippines did achieve independence and this Congress said, "Thank you, but no thank you. Your new government can take care of you, and everything we promised, we rescind."

I thought that was a terrible injustice, Mr. Chairman. The injustice burns very deeply into the remaining veterans who are alive, barely 75,000 from over a quarter of a million or 300,000 who had fought in the war. They are in their seventies and eighties. What they want most before they die is the dignity and honor that would come from being American veterans.

This amendment I have before us is a step toward that where we provide them a very modest sum of money, \$30 million, to be eligible for health care benefits, as any other U.S. veteran. I think this is the least of what we can do for these allies who did so much for us in World War II.

Mr. Chairman, because this has not been accepted earlier in authorization, I designate this as an emergency because it is an emergency. It is an emergency because our morality as a nation needs to be corrected, but more important, these gentlemen are about to die. Let us reward these folks finally with the honor and dignity that they deserve as our allies in World War II.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) to add \$30 million in health care benefits to a group of veterans who are in desperate need of our assistance.

Filipino veterans who fought by our side in World War II have never received fair and adequate veteran benefits because of the Congressional Rescission Act of 1946.

I have long been an advocate of assisting our Filipino veterans. For the past several Congresses, along with the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), we have introduced legislation to amend title 38 of the U.S. Code in order to provide that the persons considered to be members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army veterans and members of the Special Philippine Scouts, by reason of their service with the Armed Forces during World War II, should be eligible for full veterans' benefits.

Mr. Chairman, on July 26, 1941, President Roosevelt issued a military order, pursuant to the Philippines Independence Act of 1934, calling members in the Philippine Commonwealth Army into the service of the United States Armed Forces of the Far East under the command of Lieutenant General Douglas MacArthur.

For almost 4 years, over 100,000 Filipinos of the Philippine Commonwealth Army fought alongside the Allies to reclaim the Philippine islands from Japan. Regrettably, in return, Congress enacted the Rescission Act of 1946. That measure limited veterans' eligibility for service-connected disabilities and death compensation, and also denied the members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army the honor they deserved for being recognized as veterans of the United States Armed Forces.

A second group of veterans, the Special Philippine Scouts, called New Scouts, who enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces after October 6, 1945 primarily to perform occupation duty in the Pacific, were similarly excluded from benefits.

These members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Special

Philippine Scouts served just as courageously as their American counterparts during the Pacific War in World War II. Their contributions helped to disrupt the initial Japanese offensive timetable in 1942 at a point when the Japanese were expanding their aggression unchecked throughout the western Pacific.

This delay in the Japanese plans helped to buy valuable time for the scattered Allied forces to regroup, to reorganize and prepare for checking the Japanese advance in the battles of the Coral Sea and Midway.

Many have forgotten how dark those days before that victory at Midway really were. Their actions also earned the Philippine soldiers the wrath of their Japanese captors. As a result, many of the Filipinos joined their American counterparts in the Bataan Death March, suffering inhumane treatment which redefined the limits of human depravity.

During the next 2 years, Philippine Scout units operating from mobile, isolated bases in the rural interior of the Philippine Islands conducted an ongoing campaign of guerilla warfare, tying down precious Japanese resources and manpower.

In 1944, Philippine forces provided invaluable assistance in the liberation of the Philippine Islands, which in turn became an important base for taking the war to the Japanese homeland. Without the assistance of these Philippine units and guerilla forces, the liberation of the Philippine Islands would have taken much longer and been far more costly in lives than it actually was.

In a letter to the Congress dated May 16, 1946, President Harry Truman wrote, "The Philippine Army veterans are nationals of the United States and will continue in that status after July 4, 1946. They fought under the American flag and under the direction of our military leaders. They fought with gallantry and courage under the most difficult conditions during the recent conflict. They were commissioned by the United States. Their official organization, the Army of the Philippine Commonwealth, was taken into the Armed Forces of the United States on July 26, 1941. That order has never been revoked and amended. I consider it a moral obligation of the United States to look after the welfare of the Philippine veterans."

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is time for us to correct this injustice to provide the members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Special Philippine Scouts with the benefits of the services they valiantly earned during their service in World War II.

These veterans are well into the twilight years of their lives. It is long past time for our Nation to pay meaningful acknowledgment to their valuable contribution to the cause of freedom and democracy in the Second World War.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) to restore some measure of health benefits to Filipino veterans who fought in World War II. This amendment would simply provide \$30 million in health care benefits through the VA system for those veterans who honorably served our country.

On July 26, 1941, President Roosevelt issued a military order calling members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army into service. For nearly 4 years, over 100,000 Filipinos of the Philippine Commonwealth army fought alongside the allies to reclaim the Philippine Islands from Japan.

A second group, the Special Philippine Scouts, enlisted after October 6, 1945. Despite their valiant service, Congress enacted the 1946 Rescission Act to limit their veteran benefits.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would be a small step towards ensuring Filipino veterans receive benefits just like other veterans who served in World War II. For fundamental fairness, I urge the adoption of the amendment, and want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for their leadership.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would say, Mubulhi Ag Filipinos, and to Filipinos, mama haline keta Hunggung Wacus.

To the Filipinos I say, I will love you until the end of Earth.

I was stationed in the Philippines for many years, and I lived and almost died with them in Vietnam. I want to tell the Members, there is no more loyal group to the United States than the Filipinos.

I have never met a Filipino that turned his or her back on the United States or a friend, but I think this country has turned its back for too long on those people that fought and died for Americans.

General MacArthur said, "I shall return." The Filipinos never left. They gave their todays for many, American lives. They fought and they died.

Many have seen the old John Wayne movies. They say, "It was just a movie," but it depicted the lives and the sacrifices of Filipinos at Corregidor, Manila, Bagio City. Places like that, and the Bataan Death March, ring in our ears and our history, but yet, Filipinos lived and died in those issues, in those battles.

I served with thousands of Filipinos in the Navy that served on Navy ships. They served for 20 years just so that they could become American citizens. We have turned our back on them for 60 years with their sacrifices, what they have given to this country. They have never forgotten.

I think the gentleman from New York said, how many are left today?

Not very many. Yet, we promised them as veterans, as freedom fighters, veterans' benefits. They have been turned down.

So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and people who support this issue.

Members will not see very many Filipinos on welfare. Instead, we will see their children at our universities, because if we go into the Filipino community we will see them honor God and country and hard work, and the family values that all of us cherish. But they live it every single day, not only as citizens here, but as citizens in the Philippines, as well.

The Navy right now, as a matter of fact, is short sailors. During a period of time, they were our most loyal sailors. I have a bill coming forward that says we ought to reinstitute that program to have Filipinos serve, so they could become American citizens, just like in the past.

I want to tell the Members, in San Diego, the last American flag to fly over the Philippine Islands before it fell, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has it in his office. That flag, at great risk to a Filipino, when the Japanese tore it down in Bagio City, he wrapped it up in a piece of canvas and saved it for the end of the war, because it was of value to freedom. We should value those same traditions.

Today the President of the United States recognized thousands of Filipinos at the White House today for their 60 years of service as veterans. If we recognize that value, if we take a look and have a resolution to that from the President of the United States, from the Department of Veterans Affairs, Secretary Principi, then it should be recognized that they deserve the benefits due to veterans.

We are asking only for justice, what we say we all stand for in this body.

□ 1945

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the full 5 minutes, but I did want to rise to associate myself with the comments of our colleagues who have spoken before on behalf of the Filner amendment to restore health care benefits to Filipino war vets, and I thank my colleague for his leadership in offering this amendment and his leadership over the years on behalf of Filipino vets. He has done more than anyone, and any of us who care about the Filipino vets and the commitment our country has made to them are deeply in his debt.

As my colleagues have mentioned, for 4 years during World War II more than 100,000 Filipinos fought alongside the Allied Forces to free the Philippines from Japanese occupation. Drafted into the service in 1941 by order of President Roosevelt, these historic soldiers served under the command of Lieutenant General Douglas

MacArthur, fighting valiantly to recapture the Philippines and playing a key role in the allied victory in the Pacific.

Our Nation has not given these veterans the honor and respect they deserve at the hands of our country. In 1946, Congress denied benefits to these veterans and to another group of special Filipino Scouts who enlisted in the U.S. Armed Forces after October 6, 1945. Although these brave soldiers, and many of their fellow soldiers, gave up their lives for freedom, our country denied them the recognition and benefits accorded to other servicemen and women in the Armed Forces. It took us 50 years to give the Filipino Scouts the promised citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, many of us in our communities and all of us in our country are very blessed with a great Filipino-American community. In spite of the fact that we have not honored our commitment to them, they have blessed our country with their commitment to family values, with their commitment to the work ethic, and with their very, very staunch patriotism.

This amendment would make \$30 million available to provide Filipino veterans with the same health care benefits received by other World War II vets. These World War II Philippine veterans are elderly now, their numbers are dwindling. A number of them are suffering from health problems. We are running out of time. It is time to right this wrong and give the Filipino vets the recognition they deserve in their twilight years.

I urge my colleagues to support the Filner amendment on health benefits for Filipino vets. It is the least we can do, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to first commend my friend and my fellow Californian for his tenacious leadership in keeping this front and center, this issue that is really an unfair issue, and that is giving due diligence to the Filipino veterans who served admirably in World War II.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I simply rise in strong support of the Filner amendment to H.R. 2620, the VA-HUD appropriations bill. This amendment would appropriate \$30 million for medical care and general health care benefits for Filipino World War II veterans.

I have perhaps the largest concentration of Filipino citizens in my district in the city of Carson, and I tell my colleagues that they are constantly crying and pleading for fairness to be done and say this amendment will begin to correct a wrong visited upon the Filipino veterans who served alongside the U.S. forces during World War II.

Our agreement or even disagreement with the current policy and economic pressures should never diminish our love and profound respect for the men and women who chose duty over personal safety and went into the battle-torn areas carrying our flag. We should

have resources to take care of those Filipino veterans who have sacrificed on behalf of our Nation.

This amendment simply addresses the health care needs for a forgotten group of veterans, namely the Filipino veterans. These loyal and valiant men fought, suffered, and, in many instances, died in the same manner and under the same commander as other members of the United States Armed Forces during World War II. Their services to the Nation parallels others whose efforts and service have not been recognized or compensated.

We cannot forget the valiant and valuable services performed by the Filipino veterans. The Filner amendment will appropriate \$30 million for the health care benefits for these veterans of World War II who were excluded from benefits by the Rescissions Act of 1946. As we continue to address the needs of our Nation's veterans, we should heed the word of President Lincoln who called on all Americans "to care for him who shall have borne the battle."

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and adhere to President Lincoln's call.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

The amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and as such constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I do. I understand the Chairman's reservation. He gives the impression that anything that constitutes legislation or emergency is somehow beyond the rules of this House, and yet in this bill there are dozens, I would think, maybe hundreds, I do not know, nobody can tell me, of provisions that are not authorized in legislation. In fact, we have a \$1.3 billion emergency designation in the bill.

So to make the point that this is legislation and it is emergency, we all agree, but this has been done in this bill, in this Congress, many, many, many, many times for billions and billions and billions of dollars. I would just ask, on behalf of the 60,000 Filipino veterans that are left alive, that the gentleman does not insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone else wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Based on similar rulings—for example, on June 19, 2000—the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. KLECZKA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. KLECZKA: At the end of title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. (a) AUTHORITY OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PHARMACIES TO DISPENSE MEDICATIONS TO VETERANS ON PRESCRIPTIONS WRITTEN BY PRIVATE PRACTITIONERS.—Subsection (d) of section 1712 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Subject to section 1722A of this title, the Secretary shall furnish to a veteran such drugs and medicines as may be ordered on prescription of a duly licensed physician in the treatment of any illness or injury of the veteran."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) The heading of such section is amended by striking the sixth through ninth words.

(2) The item relating to that section in the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of that title is amended by striking the sixth through ninth words.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman of the committee giving me time to explain the amendment, although I do recognize that a point of order does lay against this proposal.

The amendment I offer to the bill would improve veterans' access to prescription drugs by permitting the Veterans Administration to accept the prescriptions written by a veteran's family doctor.

As my colleagues listen to this explanation, they might say, gosh, this is common sense. Why is this not being changed today? Well, the current law mandates that the veteran who is going to get a prescription from the VA has to see his primary doctor. In its wisdom a few years ago, Congress permitted nonservice connected disability veterans access to medical care, specifically the drug benefit. However, because of this law, veterans are having to wait 9 months to a year before they can see a Veterans Administration doctor. And once they wait that long, naturally, they have to still go to their local pharmacy and pay the full price for their drugs. But once they finally get through the waiting process, the doctor at the VA will examine the veteran and, for the most part, come to

the same conclusion that the veteran's family physician came to, and then they get whatever drug is being prescribed.

Well, not only are the veterans being inconvenienced by the long wait, but also the examination by the veteran's physician costs money. It is estimated that each visit to the primary VA doctor, which is duplicative at best, costs about \$254. In fact, many times the cost to the veteran's hospital for the VA physician visit is more than the drugs being given to the veteran.

The Inspector General testified before a Senate committee on July 24 of this year, and he indicated their recommendation was that this process should be streamlined. They recommended that the VA seek a statutory change authorizing the VA to fill prescriptions written by a veteran's family doctor.

The thing that is very important to note is Members here, care, that IG indicated this change would save some \$1.3 billion. Now, that cost savings can be plowed back into the veterans' health care and buy a lot of health care and clearly a lot of pharmaceutical drugs for veterans.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the chairman of the subcommittee would drop his request for the point of order. It clearly is appropriate to the bill, especially in light of the fact that this amendment would save the VA budget some \$1.3 billion.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do.

I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, violates clause 2 rule XXI. The rule states in part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

This amendment directly amends existing law, and I would ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, I do, and in closing and in response to the point of order being raised by the gentleman from New York, I cannot dispute that. In part there is legislating contained in this amendment. But in large part, and I think the gentleman would agree, if in fact the IG is even close to the mark, saving \$1.3 billion in the legislation that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from West Virginia took so much time to put together, and did such a great job on, would come in handy for providing payment for these prescription drugs that these veterans are getting.

But I think the gentleman is accurate in his assessment, and I ask the Chair to rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment directly amends existing law. The

amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) may offer his remaining four amendments to this title en bloc, may debate them for 16 minutes, equally divided, and I retain rights to reserve points of order on this en bloc amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from New York to give the Chair a better explanation of the time division.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the idea is to provide each side with 8 minutes to discuss these four amendments en bloc. The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and I have discussed this, and I believe he finds it acceptable.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. There will be 16 minutes for the Filner amendments en bloc, equally divided 8 minutes per side, and all amendments thereto.

AMENDMENTS NO. 1, 2, 4, AND 5 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments No. 1, 2, 4, and 5.

□ 2000

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments:

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments numbered 1, 2, 4 and 5 offered by Mr. FILNER:

AMENDMENT No. 1

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) MEDICAL CARE.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$1,700,000,000 for "Medical Care".

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AMENDMENT No. 2

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000 for "Compensation and Pensions", to be available only to establish a presumption of service-connection for the occurrence of Hepatitis C in veterans who were exposed to Hepatitis C risk factors during active military, naval, or air service.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AMENDMENT No. 4

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) MEDICAL RESEARCH.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$24,000,000 for "Medical Research".

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AMENDMENT No. 5

At the end of title I, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) READJUSTMENT BENEFITS.—In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Veterans Affairs elsewhere in this Act, there is hereby appropriated \$871,700,000 for "Readjustment Benefits". The provisions of H.R. 320 of the 107th Congress, as introduced, are hereby enacted into law, and the amount provided by this section shall be available only for the purpose of increases in benefits in the Montgomery GI Bill program made by those provisions.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the en bloc amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved against the en bloc amendments.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 8 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a series of amendments with regard to the Veterans Administration budget.

The chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member know that all of the Members of this body hold the view that their commitment to veterans cannot be challenged, nor can the commitment of our chair and ranking members of the authorizing committee.

Yet because of the budget situation we are in and notwithstanding improvements to the veterans budget over the last couple of years, the veterans budget is still grossly underfunded. As we like to say on the Democratic side at the Veterans Committee, we do not have a surplus unless we have paid our bills. We have not paid our bills to our Nation's veterans. We have not kept our commitment. We have not honored our contract.

My amendments try to put the money that would indicate our commitment back into this budget. I have the money designated as an emergency because, under the rules of House, otherwise I would have to take offsets to those agencies within this particular bill. I do not want to play off housing or environment or science against the needs of our veterans.

I will state that there is an emergency out there, Mr. Chairman. We have veterans who are waiting months and months and months, sometimes

years for the adjudication of their claims. We have veterans waiting 5, 6, 8 months to see a doctor. We have veterans with hepatitis C, recently diagnosed, having emerged after 20 years, a fatal disease that we do not have sufficient understanding of or resources to treat.

We are condemning our veterans to die. We have not figured out how to provide long-range care. We have not done what we should have for the homeless veterans, 500,000 of whom are on the street tonight. We do not put sufficient money into medical research. Eleven or 12 years after the Gulf War, we do not have any understanding of or treatment for Persian Gulf War illness. Hundreds of thousands of veterans are suffering from that.

Mr. Chairman, we have the resources in our society to say to those who are under the GI bill for education, let us make that GI bill really effective.

Mr. Principi, who is now the Veterans Administration Secretary, wrote a report before he became Secretary when he was chairman of the so-called Transition Commission; and he proposed that the Montgomery GI bill for education fully fund education, tuition and fees at college, plus books, plus expenses, plus a stipend of roughly \$1,000 a month. That would make that benefit real. That would give the veterans what they earned, and that would be a great recruitment tool for our forces.

Yet, what do we do now? We give a \$500 or \$600 a month stipend. Most veterans cannot use that because it is insufficient. So I am asking in my amendments for what we just owe our veterans and what we have the money for.

Our budget is based on the fact that we just passed the tax cut this year of about \$2 trillion over the next decade. That leaves us without paying our debt to our veterans.

How do I know how much money is needed? The Chair of the committee is often saying, no matter what money we give, everybody wants more. I will tell my colleagues, all the veterans' service organizations of our country got together and produced something called the independent budget. It is a very analytical and professional job. It does not just say, give me more money because I am a veteran. It says, put in this much money to the veterans' benefit administration so we can reduce the waiting times for adjudication to 30 days. It says, put in the amount of money we need so we do not have to wait 6 months for doctors. It says, put in the money for research so we can deal with Persian Gulf War illness and we can deal with post-traumatic stress syndrome.

The veterans know what we need and we know we are not giving it to them, Mr. Chairman. We had on the floor earlier statements from the committee and from the authorizing committee that says we are doing everything we can for our veterans. I would challenge

those colleagues to go with me to any town meeting anywhere in America and say to our veterans, we are doing what we should be doing for you. They would not be given a very good reception.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an additional \$1.7 billion for the health care of our veterans. The billion dollars that the Chair refers to that increased this year does not even keep up with inflation. We have got to at least keep up with inflation and move forward on a whole variety of efforts.

I have asked for money to make sure that veterans who are exposed to hepatitis C, probably a fatal disease, get the treatment and care that they need. I have asked that we fully fund the Montgomery GI bill at the level that is asked for in legislation that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) has introduced. I ask for research money to make sure that the VA, which has been in the forefront of research on a whole variety of things, a national resource that has been kept up and this Nation in the forefront of medical research.

We can keep those efforts in an excellent capacity. We can give the veterans the benefits they deserve. As our veterans are older, long-term care becomes more important. The aging of our population requires more resources and a different kind of attention.

And whether we are talking about the Persian Gulf illnesses, PTSD, Parkinson's disease, mental health illnesses, spinal cord injuries or heart disease, these are areas where we can give our veterans the treatment and care and attention they deserve.

So if we are to keep the promises that we made to our Nation's veterans, we should provide a budget that will address these needs.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support these amendments, to allow the designation of an emergency, to really show the veterans, the country which has produced this incredible surplus, they gave us this country and we owe it to them.

I know my colleague will ask for a point of order based on the fact that these are emergency designations. Come on, let us treat our veterans as real colleagues. Let us say it is an emergency. Let us give them the attention they need.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment which would restore the purchasing power of the GI bill.

I was encouraged earlier this session by the House's passage of H.R. 1291, the 21st Century Montgomery GI Bill Enhancement Act, which provided a modest and much needed increase to the GI bill's monthly benefits.

At a time when drastic tax cuts have overshadowed our nation's priorities, it was refreshing that the House took up legislation that improved education benefits for service men and women.

Educational benefits are the military's best recruiting tool, and the GI bill must be modernized to meet today's demands.

However, while this measure provides a stronger education package to the men and

women who choose to serve our country in uniform, I regret that we could not have achieved more.

Ultimately, unfortunately, the cost of this legislation was considered too prohibitive after the Administrations \$1.35 billion tax cut.

Tax cuts precluded Mr. EVANS the ranking member, from offering his amendment during subcommittee mark-up of H.R. 1291, which was abruptly canceled.

H.R. 320, the Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act, which Mr. EVANS intended to offer as an amendment, would have significantly improved educational benefits for veterans by covering the full cost of tuition, fees, books and supplies as well as provide a subsistence allowance for those who enlist or reenlist for four years.

Mr. FILNER's amendment mirrors the objectives of H.R. 320 and would give the Montgomery GI bill a much needed boost and move us closer to offering a competitive education package for the men and women who served our country with their military service.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

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

Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law."

This amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and, as such, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the technical basis for the point of order. I know the commitment that the Chair has for veterans, and I ask the gentleman to see beyond the technicalities. The gentleman knows his bill contains legislation that has not come before this House. He knows his bill contains emergency funds.

Mr. Chairman, this is not asking for any radical kind of move for this House. This is asking to make the commitment to our Nation's veterans that we have in our budget, the ability to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment en bloc includes an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in each constituent part of the amendment en bloc.

Based on a ruling of the Chair on June 19, 2000, on a similar amendment, the amendment en bloc constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING
HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER AND RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For activities and assistance to prevent the involuntary displacement of low-income families, the elderly and the disabled because of the loss of affordable housing stock, expiration of subsidy contracts (other than contracts for which amounts are provided under another heading in this Act) or expiration of use restrictions, or other changes in housing assistance arrangements, and for other purposes, \$16,334,242,000, of which \$640,000,000 shall be from unobligated balances from amounts recaptured from fiscal year 2000 and prior years pursuant to a reduction in the amounts provided for Annual Contributions Contract Reserve Accounts, and amounts that are recaptured in this account to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not later than October 1, 2001, the Department of Housing and Urban Development shall reduce from sixty days to thirty days the amount of reserve funds made available to public housing authorities: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$16,125,241,000, of which \$11,285,241,000 and the aforementioned recaptures shall be available on October 1, 2001 and \$4,200,000,000 shall be available on October 1, 2002, shall be for assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended ("the Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 1437): *Provided further*, That the foregoing amounts shall be for use in connection with expiring or terminating section 8 subsidy contracts, for amendments to section 8 subsidy contracts, for enhanced vouchers (including amendments and renewals) under any provision of law authorizing such assistance under section 8(t) of the Act (47 U.S.C. 1437f(t)), contract administrators, and contracts entered into pursuant to section 441 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act: *Provided further*, That amounts available under the first proviso under this heading shall be available for section 8 rental assistance under the Act: (1) for the relocation and replacement of housing units that are demolished or disposed of pursuant to the Omnibus Consolidated Rescissions and Appropriations Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-134; Stat. 1321-269); (2) for the conversion of section 23 projects to assistance under section 8; (3) for funds to carry out the family unification program; (4) for the relocation of witnesses in connection with efforts to combat crime in public and assisted housing pursuant to a request from a law enforcement or prosecution agency; (5) for tenant protection assistance, including replacement and relocation assistance; and (6) for the 1-year renewal of section 8 contracts for units in a project that is subject to an approved plan of action under the Emergency Low Income Housing Preservation Act of 1987 or the Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, no less than \$11,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*,

That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$197,246,000 shall be made available for incremental vouchers under section 8 of the Act, of which \$157,334,000 shall be made available on a fair share basis to those public housing agencies that have a 97 percent occupancy rate; and of which \$39,912,000 shall be made available to non-elderly disabled families affected by the designation of a public housing development under section 7 of the Act, the establishment of preferences in accordance with section 651 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13611), or the restriction of occupancy to elderly families in accordance with section 658 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 13618), and to the extent the Secretary determines that such amount is not needed to fund applications for such affected families, to other nonelderly disabled families: *Provided further*, That up to \$195,600,730 from amounts available under this heading may be made available for administrative fees and other expenses to cover the cost of administering rental assistance programs under section 8 of the Act: *Provided further*, That the fee otherwise authorized under section 8(q) of such Act shall be determined in accordance with section 8(q), as in effect immediately before the enactment of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998: *Provided further*, That \$886,000,000 is rescinded from unobligated balances remaining from funds appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development under this heading or the heading "Annual contributions for assisted housing" or any other heading for fiscal year 2001 and prior years: *Provided further*, That any such balances governed by reallocation provisions under the statute authorizing the program for which the funds were originally appropriated shall not be available for this rescission: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall have until September 30, 2002, to meet the rescission in the proviso preceding the immediately preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That any obligated balances of contract authority that have been terminated shall be canceled.

PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Public Housing Capital Fund Program to carry out capital and management activities for public housing agencies, as authorized under section 9 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g), \$2,555,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That, hereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law or any failure of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to issue regulations to carry out section 9(j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437g(j)), such section is deemed to have taken effect on October 1, 1998, and, except as otherwise provided in this heading, shall apply to all assistance made available under this same heading on or after such date: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, in addition to amounts otherwise allocated under this heading, \$262,000,000 shall be allocated for such capital and management activities only among public housing agencies that have obligated all assistance for the agency for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 made available under this same heading in accordance with the requirements under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 9(j) of such Act (except that the provisions of section 9(j)(4) shall not apply to such amounts): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary may not delegate to any Department official other than the Deputy Secretary any authority under paragraph (2) of such section 9(j) regarding the extension of the time periods under such sec-

tion for obligation of amounts made available for fiscal year 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the first proviso and paragraphs (3) and (5)(B) of such section 9(j), if at any time before the effectiveness of final regulations issued by the Secretary under section 6(j) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(j)) providing for assessment of public housing agencies and designation of high-performing agencies, any amounts made available under the public housing Capital Fund for fiscal year 1999, 2000, 2001, or 2002 remain unobligated in violation of paragraph (1) of such section 9(j) or unexpended in violation of paragraph (5)(A) of such section 9(j), the Secretary shall immediately recapture any such amounts and reallocate such amounts among public housing agencies that, at the time of such reallocation, are not in violation of any requirement under paragraph (1) or (5)(A) of such section: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this heading, the term "obligate" means, with respect to amounts, that the amounts are subject to a binding agreement that will result in outlays immediately or in the future: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$51,000,000 shall be for carrying out activities under section 9(h) of such Act, of which up to \$10,000,000 shall be for the provision of remediation services to public housing agencies identified as "troubled" under the Section 8 Management Assessment Program: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$500,000 shall be for lease adjustments to section 23 projects, and no less than \$43,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$75,000,000 shall be available for the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to public housing agencies for emergency capital needs resulting from emergencies and natural disasters in fiscal year 2002.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the concentration of poverty, any way one looks at it, simply stated is not productive. It is inhumane, unethical. It is not diverse and does not work.

According to the 1999 census data, 32.3 million people in the United States live in poverty. That gives us a poverty rate of 11.8 percent. The National Coalition reports as many as 3 million people are homeless during the course of a year. Of this number, 80,000 of them are in the City of Chicago. The concept of mixing income in neighborhoods offers the best practice of hope for low-income individuals.

Chicago, one of the most poverty-stricken cities in the Nation, has a tremendous need to uplift the quality of life for its residents. Currently, in Chicago the Robert Taylor and Rockwell Gardens developments, two of the most well-known public housing developments in the country, are in separate need of Hope VI funding which will allow integration and economic prosperity.

I stand today, Mr. Chairman, to beg, to implore, to appeal to the entire 107th Congress, and to argue to increase the funding for this program by \$100 million. Hope VI provides disadvantaged families and communities across the country with opportunities for revitalization and new chances, chances for advancement.

All of us would probably agree, Mr. Chairman, that it is time to tear down the high-rise public housing developments, the high-rises, as we know them, the concentrations of poverty. These families need hope and an adequate chance. It is time to fight inner city crime, teen pregnancy, high unemployment, which are all concentrated in the urban ghettos that exist in this Nation centered around high-rise public housing developments.

□ 2015

To improve the quality of life for these families, it is necessary to improve the quality of public housing. We can do that by providing the necessary support services, the programs, that encourage residents to go to school, find employment, develop careers, and realize a better quality of life. All of this is found in HOPE VI.

By 1999, HOPE VI had provided benefits to 7,840 current resident families, including 4,076 families relocated to section 8 in new units, 5,668 new families in revitalized development, 1,969 families leaving TANF, and a 98 percent increase of youth participation in self-sufficiency programs. HOPE VI had achieved leveraged ratios of 31 cents for every dollar in 1993 and increased this ratio to \$2.07 by 1999. HOPE VI revitalization has reduced the average density of on-site development from 23 to 11 and the average percentage of very low income families from 92 to 35 percent. The ultimate outcome of these developments has improved the quality of life for residents of HOPE VI developments and better integration into the overall community.

The city of Chicago has a bold new transformation plan for public housing, and, that is to replace the high-rises with mixed-income housing where individuals can interact with different-type persons across the board. But that transformation plan is contingent upon being able to receive assistance from HOPE VI. Unless there is adequate funding for HOPE VI, then we run the risk of going to the well and there being no water, of going to the trough and there being no substance.

And so I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that we support this amendment and

continue to give hope to the millions of people who need hope and can receive it through the HOPE VI program.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$100 million from the Public Housing Capital Fund in order to increase the HOPE VI program. As has been discussed today, we have already reduced the capital program for public housing. So I do not think it is a good idea to go any further.

The bill provides for \$573 million in the HOPE VI program which is at the same level as last year. As the gentleman knows, the bill already includes a reduction below last year for capital fund based on the unspent fund problem. There are approximately \$7 billion in unspent funds in the capital fund. There has been a lot of discussion and opposition to cutting it further or even cutting it that much. However, we do maintain funding for those public housing authorities which are actually spending their funds.

The gentleman's amendment would cut \$100 million of the \$262 million we have targeted to those high-performing public housing authorities in order to provide a 17 percent increase in HOPE VI. While I appreciate his support for HOPE VI, I must point out that, like the Public Housing Capital Fund, HOPE VI is another account where there are significant amounts of unspent funds. In fact, there are over \$3 billion in unspent HOPE VI funds. So while I share the gentleman's support for the program, I cannot support cutting the capital fund further in order to provide a 17 percent increase in the HOPE VI program and, therefore, I urge the rejection of the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, if someone is doing an illustrated dictionary and needs perhaps a metaphorical or a dictionary of figures of speech and wants to illustrate the phrase "robbing Peter to pay Paul," that is the dilemma we are in now.

I know the gentleman from Illinois who cares deeply about lower income people is as unhappy as many of us on this side in particular are at this kind of choice. I admire his commitment to the HOPE VI program which has been a very important one, because HOPE VI has been extremely useful in my district. My dilemma is that we also have a problem with public housing capital funds. And so, Mr. Chairman, Members who are undecided as to how to vote on this will get no guidance from me. They seem on the whole to do without that in general, so that is okay. But this is important because it underlines the tragedy that this bill represents. It quite literally sets the poor against the poor, lower income working people against lower income working people, public housing against subsidized housing for the elderly, anticrime/drug efforts in public housing against efforts to rehabilitate that housing.

This indicates how terribly inadequate this bill is. The gentleman from New York said no matter how much money there was, people would say it was inadequate. I have to tell him he is wrong, and I hope he will test us someday. Come in here with a bill that does not cut virtually every program in real terms.

Let us talk about the public housing situation. The public housing operating budget is cut in real terms. We are told it gets an increase, but out of that increase they are supposed to pay the higher utility bills. By the way, the Secretary of HUD when he testified before our committee and was asked what the budget assumed, the operating budget for public housing regarding fuel bills, he told us he did not endorse this. He, as a good soldier, told us that the Energy Department had instructed him to say that the expectation is that fuel bills next year will be lower for the housing authorities and, therefore, they were to get less money for that. They are to get some additional money and out of that pay for the public housing drug elimination program. On the capital funds, it has already been reduced some. We are told, well, it is reduced because they have not spent it all. They have not spent it all in part because you do not spend responsibly right away, you have to do capital planning, and they are doing this.

This bill underfunds virtually every category where we are dealing with housing. Public housing in particular deserves our attention. I quoted before the President's laudable sentiment that he would not leave any child behind. More poor children live in public housing than in any other segment obviously of our society.

And we are talking about this terrible choice. The gentleman from Illinois is not attacking public housing. The HOPE VI program helps public housing. What we are talking about here, as he correctly brings to us with this amendment, is this terrible choice about public housing. Which aspect of it will we underfund the worst? Will we let the projects deteriorate in general with inadequate capital funding? Will we allow, under HOPE VI, some concentration to improve them?

There are other areas of problems. I will be getting later to the question of the Federal Housing Administration. I want to stress again, it is not simply the poor and lower income working people who are being hurt by this Congress' failure and this administration's refusal adequately to fund things, the FHA program that builds multiple family housing for middle-income people has been shut down for months for want of \$40 million; and it will turn out later that they are, in fact, overcharging in other FHA programs, we are told by more than \$50 million.

So this amendment is to me a terrible dilemma. We have two very valuable programs that serve the poorest people in this society, and we have to

choose between them. The President said we need to do a tax cut of that magnitude because it is not the government's money, it is the people's money. People live in public housing. The government does not live in public housing. The residents of public housing are people who are in need. This dilemma is brought upon us by that irresponsible tax cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) will be postponed.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had planned to offer an amendment regarding the National Science Foundation, an amendment that would help assure some much-needed expertise in scientific project management for the National Science Foundation. Rather than offer an amendment that might not have an appropriate dollar amount, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from New York concerning the construction of scientific facilities and instruments provided in the National Science Foundation appropriation.

First let me congratulate the gentleman from New York and the Committee on Appropriations as well as his staff for the well-thought-out NSF appropriation. As he knows, NSF's primary mission includes funding peer-reviewed, investigator-initiated research by individuals or small groups. This is an operation that the NSF has managed well. However, NSF has seen its role in funding larger projects such as the construction of radio and optical telescopes expand significantly in recent years. Problems encountered in the management of some of these projects and concerns raised by the NSF inspector general suggest that the NSF may not have an adequate plan, adequate experience or adequate resources with which to effectively oversee these large-ticket projects. Indeed, language in the President's budget blueprint directs NSF to develop a plan "to enhance its capability to estimate costs and provide oversight of project development and construction."

Does the Committee on Appropriations share these concerns?

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. We do. The Committee on Appropriations shares the gentleman's concern concerning the current lack of oversight for project management within the National Science Foundation. In its March 2000 report to

Congress, the Inspector General of the National Science Foundation reported that "NSF does not have adequate policies and procedures in place to address the complex problems involved in overseeing and administering large infrastructure awards." This is why the committee report included language directing NSF to establish project management procedures and accounting systems.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, I think that is excellent. The National Science Foundation is currently drafting a facilities management and oversight plan and is expected to present a final draft to the National Science Board at their August meeting. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, I will be holding a hearing early in September to review this policy and try to ensure that it will adequately address concerns with regard to accounting, appropriate management, and construction oversight of NSF projects.

Scientific experiments are, by their nature, high-risk ventures that challenge the state of the art, if you will, in a number of technologies. As a result, these projects require rigorous cost and schedule control systems so that management can identify problems early and minimize the impact on the total project cost and success. Just as importantly, these projects require a management team that is extremely knowledgeable about the underlying science and has extensive experience in the management of large-scale, complex scientific projects.

I hope that our two committees can continue to work together to ensure that NSF has the resources and personnel it needs to manage these large, taxpayer-supported projects.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the committee shares the gentleman's goal of providing NSF with sufficient resources to adequately manage and safeguard the taxpayer's investment. As he noted, NSF is increasingly involved in the construction of these large complex scientific experiments and facilities. It is also increasingly reliant on detailees and other temporary employees to supplement their Federal workforce. A cadre of experienced Federal project management professionals would certainly improve the institutional memory and accountability within NSF.

□ 2030

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to continue working with the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH), and certainly the ranking member, to assure that we maintain the high standards for quality in research equipment and construction projects as has been very evident in the excellent past work of NSF in research.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue before us. I look forward to working with the gentleman in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments to public housing agencies for the operation and management of public housing, as authorized by section 9(e) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1437g(e)), \$3,494,868,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be provided to the Office of Inspector General for Operation Safe Home: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for programs, as determined appropriate by the Attorney General, which assist in the investigation, prosecution, and prevention of violent crimes and drug offenses in public and federally-assisted low-income housing: *Provided further*, That funds made available in the previous proviso shall be administered by the Department of Justice through a reimbursable agreement with the Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That no funds may be used under this heading for the purposes specified in section 9(k) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

REVITALIZATION OF SEVERELY DISTRESSED
PUBLIC HOUSING (HOPE VI)

For grants to public housing agencies for demolition, site revitalization, replacement housing, and tenant-based assistance grants to projects as authorized by section 24 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, \$573,735,000 to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which the Secretary may use up to \$5,000,000 for technical assistance and contract expertise, to be provided directly or indirectly by grants, contracts or cooperative agreements, including training and cost of necessary travel for participants in such training, by or to officials and employees of the department and of public housing agencies and to residents: *Provided*, That none of such funds shall be used directly or indirectly by granting competitive advantage in awards to settle litigation or pay judgments, unless expressly permitted herein.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING BLOCK GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For the Native American Housing Block Grants program, as authorized under title I of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) (25 U.S.C. 411 et seq.), \$648,570,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,200,000 shall be contracted through the Secretary as technical assistance and capacity building to be used by the National American Indian Housing Council in support of the implementation of NAHASDA; of which \$5,000,000 shall be to support the inspection of Indian housing units, contract expertise, and technical assistance in the training, oversight, and management of Indian housing and tenant-based assistance, including up to \$300,000 for related travel; and of which no less than \$2,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided*, That of the amount provided under this heading, \$5,987,000 shall be made available for the cost of guaranteed notes and other obligations, as authorized by title VI of NAHASDA: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the costs of modifying such notes and other obligations, 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 the total principal amount of any notes and other obligations, any part of

which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$52,726,000: *Provided further*, That for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$150,000 from amounts in the first proviso, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

INDIAN HOUSING LOAN GUARANTEE FUND
PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 1715z-13a), \$5,987,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the costs 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 total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$234,283,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, up to \$200,000 from amounts in the first paragraph, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses", to be used only for the administrative costs of these guarantees.

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR PERSONS WITH
AIDS

For carrying out the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS program, as authorized by the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12901), \$277,432,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the Secretary may use up to \$2,000,000 of the funds under this heading for training, oversight, and technical assistance activities.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For assistance to units of State and local government, and to other entities, for economic and community development activities, and for other purposes, \$4,801,993,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That of the amount provided, \$4,399,300,000 is for carrying out the community development block grant program under title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended (the "Act" herein) (42 U.S.C. 5301): *Provided further*, That \$69,000,000 shall be for grants to Indian tribes notwithstanding section 106(a)(1) of such Act; \$3,300,000 shall be available as a grant to the Housing Assistance Council; \$2,794,000 shall be available as a grant to the National American Indian Housing Council; \$5,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National Housing Development Corporation, for operating expenses not to exceed \$2,000,000 and for a program of affordable housing acquisition and rehabilitation; \$5,000,000 shall be available as a grant to the National Council of La Raza for the HOPE Fund, of which \$500,000 is for technical assistance and fund management, and \$4,500,000 is for investments in the HOPE Fund and financing to affiliated organizations; and \$34,424,000 shall be for grants pursuant to section 107 of the Act: *Provided further*, That no less than \$15,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*, That \$21,956,000 shall be for grants pursuant to the Self Help Housing Opportunity Program: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 20 percent of any grant made with funds appropriated under this heading (other than a grant made available in this paragraph to the Housing Assistance Council or

the National American Indian Housing Council, or a grant using funds under section 107(b)(3) of the Act) shall be expended for "Planning and Management Development" and "Administration" as defined in regulations promulgated by the Department.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. VELAZQUEZ
Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND", after the dollar amount specified for Youthbuild program activities, insert the following: "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will increase funding for the YouthBuild program by \$10 million. We are in the midst of an affordable housing crisis in this country. One of our most basic needs is to increase access to safe, affordable housing. That is why I am so concerned about the significant underfunding of so many of our most vital housing programs. Not only do many of our communities face a shortage of housing stock, but much of what is currently available is in disrepair and cannot be lived in.

That is where YouthBuild comes in. This program involves young people in meaningful work in their communities, constructing or rehabilitating much-needed homes for homeless and low-income people. Projects range from rehabilitating 10-unit buildings to constructing new single-family homes.

Finished buildings are rented as affordable housing. Sometimes they represent opportunities for low-income community residents to buy their first homes. As a result, housing that is substandard is transformed into attractive homes in communities where there is a critical need for housing.

As my colleagues are aware, the YouthBuild program provides grants on a competitive basis to nonprofit organizations to assist high-risk youth between the ages of 16 to 24 to learn housing construction job skills and to complete their high school education. What is more, program participants enhance their skills as they construct or rehabilitate affordable housing for low- and moderate-income persons. In fact, to date, more than 7,000 units of housing have been produced by YouthBuild participants.

As they develop these marketable skills which will allow them to secure

future employment, they are contributing to the revitalization of their community, and they are doing it in conjunction with the many community-based organizations, local small businesses and international corporations who have provided matching funds for these programs.

YouthBuild is currently training 6,500 people at 145 sites in 43 States. While this is certainly commendable, we could and should be reaching so many more people and places. In fiscal year 2000, HUD received 273 YouthBuild applications but could only fund 78 of them. And while we should be increasing funding for this important program to allow every applicant to receive funding, it is instead funded well below the need.

What do we say to an 18-year-old kid who wants to get into the construction trade but cannot get training? "I am sorry, the funding is not there. You will have to find another way."

Although YouthBuild deserves a significant increase, given the current budget restraints, I am merely asking that this vital program receive an additional \$10 million in fiscal year 2002. With this increase, we will provide aid to over 100 communities nationwide.

My amendment offsets this increase by taking an equivalent amount from HUD's Salaries and Expenses account, which receives a \$25 million increase. It stands to reason that if we can afford the money to implement a program that requires our neediest citizens to work for free, then we should provide the funding necessary to give these people access to job training.

This is an amendment that everyone can support. If one supports promoting self-sufficiency and community involvement for at-risk youth, one should support the YouthBuild program. If one agrees that we are in a housing crisis and affordable housing that these programs produce will be valuable to our communities, one should vote for this amendment.

I hope that Members will support this amendment and work with me to begin a dialogue on the productive, successful means of promoting self-sufficiency.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Velazquez amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to oppose my good friend and colleague from New York who does such a great job for our State, but its difficulty is that the cut that has been proposed in the HUD Salaries and Expenses account would force HUD to either cut over 100 staff members in order to provide the 17 percent increase in YouthBuild, or find some other accommodation, which I think would dramatically affect HUD's ability to operate and administer its programs.

Last year, the YouthBuild program received a 17 percent increase in the fiscal year 2001 bill, and that increase was maintained in 2002.

This is obviously a very difficult choice, but I would ask Members to stay with the subcommittee bill; and, therefore, I would oppose the amendment, which would provide another significant increase to a program that was increased dramatically last year at the expense of HUD's staff.

Therefore, I urge rejection of the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity in Santa Rosa, California, my district, operates a successful YouthBuild program, one that could actually be set up as a model across this Nation.

I am absolutely pleased and proud to stand in strong support of this amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) to increase funding for YouthBuild. In fact, if I had my way, we would set a path in this Nation so that every single year we would increase the YouthBuild program by at least 17 percent.

While building and remodeling homes for low-income families, YouthBuild-Santa Rosa participants literally rebuild their own lives. YouthBuild participants, who are unemployed young people between the ages of 16 and 24, learn construction skills that start them down a career path to a lifetime of well-paid jobs, jobs they can actually afford to raise a family on.

If a participant does not have a high school diploma, it is possible, encouraged and mandated that they complete their education, with strong support from mentors, tutors and learning labs.

YouthBuild programs help young people to develop personal and family living skills as they develop their life goals and their life plans. We know they do a good job, because 85 percent of the participants who completed their YouthBuild program went on to either attend college or to take good jobs. With the tools and skills they learn at YouthBuild, young people take control over their future. They do not become a burden to their communities. They do become contributors to their communities and to our country.

YouthBuild programs are great investments. I urge my colleagues to support the Velazquez amendment; and I urge that we increase the funding for YouthBuild, not just this year but every year in the future.

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

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, everybody says that they want to do things for young people. They recognize they are a special problem. But when you have a perfect program like YouthBuild, we have a great deal of difficulty getting it continued and expanded.

YouthBuild is the perfect program in terms of maximum participation and use of resources by the people who are

being helped and minimum bureaucracy, minimum overhead. I have a YouthBuild program in my district, and it functions in the poorest community in my district, in one of the poorest communities in the United States.

Brownsville is a community that has many indices that run parallel in a negative way. No matter how you look at it, the number of young people who are in juvenile delinquency programs, the number of AIDS cases, the low level of education, the low reading levels, that community has every strike against it, and young people have a rough time.

But the YouthBuild program has a director who came aboard several years ago and said, "If you want to be in this program, no alcohol, no drugs. You have got to be here on time, and you have got to be here frequently. One or two absences, and you are out." Yet the program has a long waiting list.

Young people see the program as having a concrete and immediate consequence. They see themselves being able to get a job. They also are required to get a high school diploma at the same time.

You have some other features in this program which run parallel to some of the kinds of things that are being talked about at great length nowadays, the faith-based initiatives.

The program that runs in my community would not be there if it was not for the Episcopal Diocese working in cooperation with the community. A large investment was made by the Episcopal Diocese. They have helped to keep the program going and develop it, and now the program has been able to get funding from other sources.

YouthBuild on a national level has been able now to attract funding from foundations and from private industry. It is the model of a kind of partnership program that we should all be striving for.

But let us not let the willingness of the private sector to invest or the willingness of foundations to invest be a cop-out for the Federal Government. Why should we bow out of a program that costs very small amounts of money, and I think we are talking about a \$10 million increase here? Every year we have asked for very small increases, and the money is definitely directed into the activities and the programs which help the young people.

It has a double impact, of course: the training for the young people, and then they actually do renovation and reconstruction of housing that poor people are able to go into.

So I would like to have us send a message out there, that we are no longer going to continue the present trend of backing away from the sponsorship of meaningful youth programs. In the Department of Labor, we have moved away from the Summer Youth Employment Program. Programs for young people have been relegated to the States to continue. The Summer

Youth Employment Program, which was so vital, some States are doing a good job, some are not. But we backed away from that vital program. In general, the funding for youth programs has gone down in the Department of Labor, job training programs of the type offered by YouthBuild.

At the same time that we are backing away from job training programs, the programs that are meaningful in terms of providing occupational development for young people, shortages of all kinds keep developing. We are being told now that school construction in New York City is costing too much because they have a shortage of skilled craftsmen.

□ 2045

We do not have enough carpenters; we do not have enough sheet metal people in the construction industry. We are having a problem of being overpriced because of the great pressure where the demand is greater than the supply in terms of skilled personnel.

Some years ago, we backed away from vocational education in New York City and the Federal Government. And we also ratcheted up the effort to provide vocational education to a new category we call technical education, and we got so technical until it got away from the education of youngsters who could go into some trades that pay very well and that are in demand. Youth Build brings us back to the reality that there are large numbers of young people who will not stay in school they will not go to college, but they are serious and they will respond to an effort where they see a concrete benefit at the end. Youth Build offers a concrete benefit at the end. They have a job doing something in the neighborhood, doing something that not only pays well to begin with, but it promises to pay more and more, and they are encouraged to go into the apprenticeship programs of the various trades.

So for \$10 million we get \$1 billion worth of response in terms of helping young people. I urge a yes vote for this important amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will not take the 5 minutes. I just wonder how many of my colleagues, particularly the chairman and others on the other side of the aisle, who would restrict this program have visited one. I visited them twice in my district, and it is an inspiration to see young people who have dropped out, who are at risk, whose lives could end up being a total mess, back in school and learning construction skills and building housing for low-income families.

Now, what could be a more efficient and more productive use of Federal dollars for housing? We are taking at-risk kids, diverting them from problems, giving them education, teaching them construction skills and building housing for low-income people. This

program could use a 50 percent or a 100 percent increase every year and put tens of thousands of kids back on the right track.

I urge my colleagues to support this very modest amendment to increase this program.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York for offering this amendment.

I strongly support her efforts to increase the appropriation for YouthBuild by \$10 million. The current level of \$60 million in the bill flat funds this laudable program—a program that helps at-risk youth learn valuable skills enabling them to gain employment and ultimately break the cycle of poverty. This \$10 million increase will make a significant difference.

YouthBuild students work across the country, including in my city and state. In New York City, the unemployment rate is above the national average, and a significant number of these unemployed New Yorkers are young people. Programs like YouthBuild can have a positive impact on our nation's young adults.

The program offers job training, education, counseling, and leadership opportunities to unemployed and out-of-school young adults, ages 16–24, through the construction and rehabilitation of affordable housing in their own communities. Many graduates go on to construction-related jobs or college.

YouthBuild works in conjunction with Community Based Organizations, local small businesses, and international corporations who provide matching funds for these programs.

This is a great initiative we all can support. Not only does YouthBuild help individual young people, but their work benefits many low-income families in our neighborhoods.

I support the Valázquez amendment.

I urge my colleagues to invest in our young people!

Vote in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the pending amendment?

Hearing none, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$29,387,000 shall be made available for capacity building, of which \$24,945,000 shall be made available for "Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing" for LIHC and the Enterprise Foundation for activities as authorized by section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 9816 note), as in effect immediately before June 12, 1997, with not less than \$4,989,000 of the funding to be used in

rural areas, including tribal areas, and of which \$4,442,000 shall be for capacity building activities administered by Habitat for Humanity International.

Of the amount made available under this heading, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may use up to \$54,879,000 for supportive services for public housing residents, as authorized by section 34 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, and for residents of housing assisted under the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (NAHASDA) and for grants for service coordinators and congregate services for the elderly and disabled residents of public and assisted housing and housing assisted under NAHASDA.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$25,000,000 shall be available for neighborhood initiatives that are utilized to improve the conditions of distressed and blighted areas and neighborhoods, to stimulate investment, economic diversification, and community revitalization in areas with population outmigration or a stagnating or declining economic base, or to determine whether housing benefits can be integrated more effectively with welfare reform initiatives: *Provided*, that any unobligated balances of amounts set aside for neighborhood initiatives in fiscal years 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001 may be utilized for any of the foregoing purposes.

Of the amount made available under this heading, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$59,868,000 shall be available for YouthBuild program activities authorized by subtitle D of title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, and such activities shall be an eligible activity with respect to any funds made available under this heading: *Provided*, That local YouthBuild programs that demonstrate an ability to leverage private and nonprofit funding shall be given a priority for YouthBuild funding: *Provided further*, That no more than ten percent of any grant award may be used for administrative costs: *Provided further*, That of the amount provided under this paragraph, \$2,000,000 shall be set aside and made available for a grant to YouthBuild USA for capacity building for community development and affordable housing activities as specified in section 4 of the HUD Demonstration Act of 1993, as amended.

Of the amount made available under this heading, \$77,000,000 shall be available for grants for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) to finance a variety of economic development efforts.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT LOAN GUARANTEES PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of guaranteed loans, \$14,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, as authorized by section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended: *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 total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$608,696,000, notwithstanding any aggregate limitation on outstanding obligations guaranteed in section 108(k) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That in addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, \$1,000,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses".

BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT

For Economic Development Grants, as authorized by section 108(q) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, for Brownfields redevelopment projects, \$25,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall make these grants available on a competitive basis as specified in section 102 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act of 1989.

HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the HOME investment partnerships program, as authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended, \$1,996,040,000 to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$200,000,000 shall be available for the Downpayment Assistance Initiative, subject to the enactment of subsequent legislation authorizing such initiative: *Provided further*, That should legislation authorizing such initiative not be enacted by June 30, 2002, amounts designated in the previous proviso shall become available for any such purpose authorized under title II of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, as amended: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, up to \$20,000,000 shall be available for Housing Counseling under section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; and no less than \$17,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LAFALCE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 15 offered by Mr. LAFALCE:

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOME INVESTMENT PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM", after the dollar amount specified for the Downpayment Assistance Initiative, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$122,600,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$22,600,000)".

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, which the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and I are offering jointly, would restore funding cuts made in the bill to vital homeless prevention programs in order to provide sufficient funding to renew expiring rental assistance grants for the disabled, the mentally ill, veterans, and other individuals at risk of homelessness.

One year ago, in a very bipartisan effort, Congress was forced to take emergency action to reinstate funding for

the renewal of homeless Shelter Plus Care, and SHP permanent housing grants which HUD did not renew as part of its continuum of care funding process. This rescued thousands of our most vulnerable Americans from losing their rental assistance and from becoming homeless. In my district alone, almost 200 very low income individuals were threatened with the loss of assistance and the loss of a home.

Learning from this experience, last year's House-passed VA-HUD appropriations bill authorized renewal of expiring Shelter Plus Care grants through the section 8 certificate fund, which would have eliminated the risk of nonrenewal. In conference, the House and Senate agreed to a similar approach establishing a separate \$100 million account for expiring Shelter Plus Care grants and directing HUD to develop a mechanism to renew expiring SHP permanent housing grants. Early this year, the administration's budget request was to continue funding this separate renewal account in the amount of \$100 million.

So it seems inexplicable to me that the majority has elected to cut this \$100 million renewal account. The effect is to reduce funding for homeless programs by \$100 million and put tens of thousands of individuals at risk of losing their rental assistance.

The National Alliance to End Homelessness, which strongly supports the amendment of the gentlewoman from California and myself, has written that projects would be shut down in the best of circumstances under this bill, and further pointed out that effective planning would be impossible, and that local communities would be in grave doubt about the ongoing viability of existing projects.

The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill has written in strong support of our amendment and notes that the bill would have the effect of undoing last year's farsighted decision by Congress to promote long-term stable funding from HUD and threatened to disrupt successful local programs.

This amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and myself would avert this crisis by restoring the \$100 million cut made to the account to renew Shelter Plus Care grants and providing an additional \$22.6 million to renew all SHP permanent housing grants. Specifically, the bill increases the homeless assistance grants account by \$122.6 million with the intent in conference to establish a reliable source of renewals, either through the section 8 account or a separate renewal account.

I understand that the majority will argue, as it does in their committee report, that action is not needed at this time to address renewal needs. The problem is that grants which expire on October 1, 2002 and later have no source of funding to renew such grants, except to apply for funding under the fiscal 2002 continuum of care competition. This is because the account established

last year for renewals may not be used to renew any grants expiring after fiscal year 2002.

This exposes tens of thousands of at-risk families to the same risk of non-renewal that we faced last year. However, even if such renewal grants are approved under the competitive award process, many projects will run out of money, and that is because the continuum of care awards have historically been made in December, months after many of the grants run out of money. It is for these reasons that all of the groups that deal with these programs say that the bill does not adequately address the problem of renewals.

I understand that the majority will argue, as it does in their committee report, that action is not needed at this time to address renewal needs. The problem is that grants which expire on October 1st, 2002 and later have no source of funding to renew such grants—except to apply for funding under the FY 2002 continuum of care competition. This is because the account established last year for renewals may not be used to renew any grants expiring after fiscal year 2002.

Finally, I would like to briefly anticipate objections the majority may have with our offset—the 50 percent reduction in new funding the bill provides for the administration's proposed \$200 million Downpayment Assistance Initiative. \$100 million is more than enough money in the first year for a program that has not even been authorized. If this program is so important, I would ask why the Housing Subcommittee has not even held a hearing on this initiative.

It would also be ironic if the majority insists on \$200 million for this initiative, when its very first action on taking over the House six years ago was to eliminate the \$50 million in funding for a virtually identical program, the National Homeownership Trust Act, which also block granted funds to states for down payment assistance.

It is interesting to note Republican arguments at that time, that a down payment block grant program authorizes nothing that is not currently allowed under HOME and CDBG. That argument is still valid; apparently the majority no longer wants to emphasize this fact. \$6 billion is currently available under these two programs for states, cities, and counties; so it is hard to argue that it is critically that they need all of the \$200 million for this new initiative.

Finally, our amendment cuts \$22.6 million from the HUD Salaries and Expense Account, still leaving a small increase compared to last year.

So I think we are faced with a simple choice: should we restore homeless funding cuts in this bill, cuts which threaten tens of thousands of individuals with the risk of homelessness—in order to fully fund a new, untested, unauthorized, undebated initiative that is already fully authorized under HOME and CDBG.

I think the choice is obvious. I urge support for the LaFalce-Lee amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of many amendments which goes after the

President's initiative to provide funds to low-income families to help them to buy homes. As I mentioned earlier, we have about \$16 billion in the bill for section 8 housing vouchers, and I think there has been a high demand for those, and it is a popular program. We have provided additional funds for section 8. Some of those funds will be used in pilot programs around the country to help to encourage low-income families who are now renting to utilize those vouchers for homeownership, to make monthly mortgage payments.

What the President has proposed, and Secretary Martinez has asked us to support, is providing \$200 million nationally so that those individuals would be provided with the funds to make that down payment, that big chunk of money that we all know we have to come up with in order to make the initial mortgage deal. The section 8 housing vouchers hopefully will provide the taxpayer and the owner with a very good investment, a very good return on those section 8 vouchers.

So it is an important initiative, and it would be wrong to deny low-income families moving from welfare to work and from tenantry to ownership. Those funds are important. We need to keep those funds where they are.

Now, as far as the homeless program where these funds would be provided, let me just state my feeling. I feel very strongly that we need to provide funds to help people who are homeless to find permanent homes. My first action as city council president in Syracuse back in 1987 was to establish a homeless and housing vulnerable task force. It has been working ever since. The need continues, but I think we have done a very good job in central New York in providing homes for the homeless.

We have provided over \$1 billion in this bill for that purpose nationwide. It is an increase, albeit a slight increase, over last year. So the subcommittee's commitment and support for programs to provide help to the homeless is in place.

As I believe the gentleman knows, all fiscal year 2002 renewal costs for Shelter Plus Care programs are fully funded. Mr. Chairman, 2002 is fully funded. The committee has already indicated it would address fiscal year 2003 needs for this program in next year's bill. The committee's action is identical to the way funding for these costs have always been treated with the exception of 2001, and is identical to the way all programs in this bill are treated.

This amendment proposes to treat this program differently than every other program in this bill by using fiscal year 2002 funds to forward-fund fiscal 2003 costs. To do this, the gentleman would cut \$100 million out of this very important program, and those funds would be divided amongst the States, including New York's, which would get a large proportion of these funds, and also to 594 cities to help provide affordable housing to members of our communities.

In addition, it would cause HUD to eliminate over 268 jobs by taking \$22 million from salaries and expenses.

□ 2100

I believe the real intent behind the gentleman's agreement is to ensure that fiscal year 2003 funding needs for this program do not compete with any other program next year.

While I have sympathy for his desire to essentially create an entitlement program, we cannot support this. We oppose it. It makes no sense to cut funds to States and localities and eliminate HUD employees to set aside funding that is not even needed next year for this program. I would therefore urge rejection of the amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the LaFalce-Lee amendment really aims to correct, as we heard, just one piece of this appropriations bill that cuts \$1.7 billion in budget authority from HUD's budget.

This amendment is also, incidentally, supported by the United States Conference of Mayors. It restores funding for some of the most vulnerable people in our society, those who are homeless and have the special problem of dealing with mental illness, disabilities, or who are turning around their lives in recovery from alcohol or drug abuse.

The Shelter Plus Care and Supportive Housing Program subsidizes housing for people with these special challenges and also offers continuum of care services for mental illness and other disabilities. For example, in my home district in Alameda County of California, there are approximately 13,000 homeless people and many more at risk for homelessness.

Mr. Chairman, most of these people now more than ever are women and children. In every one of our congressional districts there are homeless people. Shelter Plus Care operates nationwide and helps keep thousands of disabled and mentally ill people from walking the streets at night untreated and with no place to live.

A California study found that supportive housing reduces emergency room services and in-patient hospital stays by more than 57 percent. So with this very small investment we can save taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and provide humane treatment and shelter.

In our affordable housing debate, we talk about rental assistance, we talk about home ownership for low-, moderate-, and middle-income individuals and families, which we all support. But our debate and our initiatives are very devoid of housing issues as it relates to the homeless, so this amendment really does recognize them as deserving of our attention, also.

The offsets to this amendment still leave \$100 million for this unauthorized downpayment assistance program. We have not even held hearings yet on this unauthorized program, so we have all

supported downpayment assistance programs, even when my colleagues on the other side have not.

This offset leaves intact a net increase also in HUD salaries and expenses over the last fiscal year. So, Mr. Chairman, there is really nothing compassionate about the cuts to HUD, nearly \$2 billion in cuts made to fund the nearly \$2 billion tax cut. That is not very compassionate, if you ask me.

This bill actually cuts \$493 million from public housing programs, including the complete elimination of the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program. It cuts \$640 million from Section 8, \$322 million from Community Development Block Grants, \$200 million from empowerment zones, and \$25 million from the Rural Housing and Economic Development Program. So now with this, also, we are really seeing the real impact in the cost of this Bush administration tax cut.

So I guess what I want to ask tonight is, will this Congress really continue to place the burden of the tax cut on the back of the homeless, the mentally ill, and the indigent? What type of a society will we be if we approve this really I think disgraceful bill, if we do not amend it tonight?

I ask Members for an aye vote on this amendment to restore and support decent and humane treatment for our homeless and the mentally ill, who also happen to live in the richest country in the world.

Finally, let me just say that States, counties, and cities will get \$6 billion in HOME and CDBG funds in fiscal year 2002 which can be used to do all of the activities authorized under the downpayment housing initiative.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE). This amendment unfortunately would cut in half the funding for an important initiative proposed by the President to assist low-income families to purchase their own homes.

With this money, he proposes to forward-fund the Shelter Plus Care program. While I am a strong supporter of the Shelter Plus Care program, it is not necessary to add additional funds to the program to ensure that all contract renewals will occur. This funding would then be used to forward-fund contracts in fiscal year 2003.

This would set an unnecessary precedent. I believe the money is put much better to use in the downpayment assistance initiative next year. We must do more to move low-income families into their own homes. This is a critical need that we need to work to address. We know the barriers for low-income families to purchase their own home, and one of the largest is the downpayment.

I cannot understate the importance of this initiative. So many Americans

lack the opportunity to purchase a new home and spend a large percentage of their income on their monthly rent. That can be the right choice for some but not for all.

Most families greatly benefit from the purchase of their own homes. A home helps a family create wealth through equity. It also invests them into the community. In short, we help these families rise on the economic ladder and build stronger communities in the process.

It is truly the American dream to own one's own home, a dream we must make a reality for families who currently lack the opportunity to realize this goal.

In addition, the LaFalce amendment cuts \$23 million from the salary and expense accounts from HUD. HUD is struggling with real problems these days. They have shut down programs because their mission in recent years has been so spread out that they have been incapable of properly overseeing and implementing the programs that they administer.

Secretary Martinez has been working to refocus HUD on their true core mission, one of providing and facilitating the creation of housing. This is not the time to reduce the resources of HUD.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the chairman of the Committee on Financial Services, says he will oppose any amendment that cuts money for the downpayment assistance program of the HOME program. In short, let us work on the funding for the Shelter Plus Care program next year when they really need the funding.

In the meantime, let us fully fund the President's downpayment assistance initiative in this bill by joining me in defeating the LaFalce amendment.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has offered a very thoughtful amendment, once again aimed at helping the people in our society most in need of help.

Now, it is unfortunate that the motif of this bill comes through again. It is so substantially underfunded because the tax cut deprived us of these revenues that it makes a choice between two needy groups.

This choice is a little easier for this reason. The \$200 million in the HOME program which has, in this bill, been earmarked for a home ownership program is an interesting example of retrograde behavior on the part of my colleagues on the other side; not the only example, but an interesting one. This one more clearly leads to a repudiation of some of their own professed principles.

The HOME program has been a block grant, in effect. It gives monies to the cities and the consortia with a great deal of flexibility. It had been working very well, apparently too well for the Republican leadership and the President. The President decided he wanted

to do something for poor people, but he did not want to actually spend any new money on doing it.

The President went shopping for the poor, but he unfortunately did not think when we were talking about poor people that he could go to a store, because that requires money, and he gave that away in the tax cut. So the President went to the recycling bin to see what he could find for the poor people.

He found \$200 million that had already been assigned to the poor people. This great act of charity that comes forth Members should understand is not additional money. It is an earmarking of \$200 million that had previously been sent to the mayors. I should not even say recycling, because that assumes somebody else had discarded it. The mayors had not discarded this. This is something the mayors had been planning to spend.

Indeed, the \$200 million for home ownership, again, it is not a new money program. It is \$200 million for home ownership taken out of a pot of money that had previously been given as a block grant to the mayors. So it is putting a categorical stamp, to a certain extent, on what had been a block grant program, which the Republicans will do from time to time when they want to, rhetoric to the contrary notwithstanding.

The mayors, the National Conference of Mayors, the League of Cities, do not like this earmark, so the \$200 million here is over the objection of the people who have been the administrators of the program and the recipients of the program.

If indeed this amendment were ultimately not to pass, and of course the way we are working it tonight we will not know that for a while, probably until a couple of days until we have these roll calls, or maybe later, I will propose we will cancel out the \$200 million earmarks and leave it where the mayors and League of Cities want it to be.

In other words, I think we should go back to the block grant and repudiate this faux gift that comes from the President. He is making a gift of somebody else's money for home ownership.

But, on the merits, we talk about the American dream. Let us first try to alleviate the American nightmare. Let us first try to show a response to the poorest of the poor, the homeless. Can there be in this wealthy society anything less morally tolerable than homeless children? Can anyone let any other program go by while children are still homeless?

The gentleman from New York gives us a chance to remedy that situation, to a certain extent, by taking money that is now being assigned to programs that the people who run the programs do not want. Granted, their first choice would be to have the money on an unrestricted basis, but the way it now stands, that is why we have, from so many mayors, support for this.

The President is also a bad one from that standpoint. HOME has been a very

flexible, very well-run block grant. The notion of now letting conservative politicians look generous, not by providing any additional funding for low-income people but by putting restrictions on what has heretofore been a successful, relatively unrestricted set of programs geared to local needs, ought to be rejected.

So I hope this amendment is adopted. If this amendment is not adopted, I will then be offering next the amendment, and we will have the choice when the roll calls come to put all that money at least back into the unrestricted pot.

Let us not allow a situation in which the President plays Santa Claus with money that really should have gone to the mayors and which the mayors would rather see go to alleviating the homeless than not.

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is horrible to be in a time of tight budgets and deficits. I have been through that in this Congress. But, of course, that is not the case today. But from the debate tonight on the floor, we would think that that was the case.

Earlier we heard, well, we could not afford to improve and enhance veterans' health care. There is just not enough money. We had to make tough choices. They had to make copayments and be deprived of needed health care.

We could not afford more money for the YouthBuild program to help reform youth, get them on a straight path, and build low-income housing.

Now we are being told we have to choose between the downpayment initiative and the Shelter Plus Care program. I thought we had a multitricillion dollar looming surplus. I thought that was why the Republicans jammed through a \$1 trillion tax cut, particularly heavily oriented towards those who earn over \$273,000 a year. Most of whom are not homeless, I expect.

Mr. Chairman, 3.5 million people are likely to experience homelessness during a given year in the United States, and 45 percent of those people will be employed. They do not meet the stereotypes. Thirty-nine percent are children, as mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts before me, and 27 percent are disabled.

One-third of families currently requesting shelter have to be turned away for lack of room, families trying to stay together. The family values party does not want to help them stay together because they are not putting the money out to do the job.

I am especially concerned in light of the committee's decision to increase the permanent housing set-aside, the 35 percent. Just last year the permanent housing set-aside was raised to 30 percent of all funds under McKinney-Vento. That last-minute change does not sound like it means anything except a percent here, in Washington, D.C.; a billion here, a billion there. But

the last-minute change of Congress caused HUD to reprioritize their grants, and new transitional housing projects for homeless families were left on the chopping block.

In fact, in my district alone, Douglas County lost \$126,458, a county with a very high unemployment rate that has been hit hard because of the recession in the timber industry. Curry County lost \$113,637. Benton, Lincoln, and Lynn lost \$271,518.

Other States lost money because of this additional set-aside.

□ 2115

We should not be forcing these sorts of choices; \$1.3 million all together for rural Oregon counties and \$1 million for rural continuum of care.

We do not have to make that choice. If I just went back and pulled out the budget and the rosy scenario and all the things that have been used here on the floor to pass the tax cut that favors those who earn over \$273,000 a year, we would find that if we just applied those same assumptions and rosy scenarios, or God forbid we cut back on the big tax breaks for those at the very top, we could afford all these and we would not have to make these choices.

So I reject what is being offered on the majority side, saying, oh well, we just cannot afford that this year, maybe next year; and, well, we have to make these tough choices. These are choices that need to be made to hold together the social fabric of this society, to hold together homeless families, to help the 39 percent of homeless kids, and the 27 percent who are disabled. We, the greatest society on Earth, can afford to do this little bit.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support this amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lee-LaFalce amendment. According to HUD, over 10,000 San Franciscans are currently homeless. Shelter Plus Care and Supportive Housing Program permanent housing grants are a critical component of our nation's response to this growing crisis. These programs must be preserved, and this amendment provides the necessary funding.

Supportive housing programs link employment, substance abuse, mental health, and other supportive services to permanent supportive housing for chronically ill homeless individuals and families. Studies show that these programs are very successful. Tenants of supportive housing use fewer emergency room and inpatient hospital services, increase their earned income and rate of employment, and reduce their dependence on public assistance.

The claim that Shelter Plus Care does not need funding in FY 2002, and that such action would constitute "forward funding" is untrue. Failure to provide renewal funding will result in a significant shortfall for Shelter Plus Care Programs nationwide, and a loss of approximately 260 units of housing in my district.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lee-LaFalce amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 280]

AYES—189

Ackerman	Frost	McNulty
Allen	Gephardt	Meehan
Andrews	Gonzalez	Meek (FL)
Baca	Green (TX)	Millender-
Baird	Gutierrez	McDonald
Baldacci	Harman	Miller, George
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Mink
Barcia	Hefley	Moore
Barrett	Hill	Moran (VA)
Becerra	Hilliard	Murtha
Bentsen	Hinchee	Nadler
Berkley	Hinojosa	Napolitano
Berman	Hoeffel	Neal
Berry	Holden	Oberstar
Bishop	Holt	Obey
Blagojevich	Honda	Olver
Bonior	Hoolley	Ortiz
Borski	Hoyer	Owens
Boucher	Inslee	Pallone
Boyd	Israel	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Pelosi
Capps	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Capuano	John	Pomeroy
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Rangel
Clay	Kaptur	Reyes
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Clement	Kildee	Rodriguez
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Ross
Condit	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Conyers	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	LaFalce	Rush
Crowley	Lampson	Sabo
Cummings	Langevin	Sanchez
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Sanders
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Sandlin
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sawyer
DeGette	Lee	Schakowsky
Delahunt	Levin	Schiff
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Deutsch	Lofgren	Serrano
Dicks	Lowey	Sherman
Dingell	Lucas (KY)	Skelton
Doggett	Luther	Slaughter
Dooley	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Doyle	Markey	Snyder
Edwards	Mascara	Solis
Engel	Matheson	Spratt
Eshoo	Matsui	Stenholm
Etheridge	McCarthy (MO)	Strickland
Farr	McCarthy (NY)	Stupak
Fattah	McCollum	Tanner
Filner	McDermott	Tauscher
Ford	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Frank	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)

Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)

Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman

Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—230

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Armedy
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Evans
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman

NOT VOTING—14

Blumenauer
Cubin
Hall (OH)
Hutchinson
Istook

Linder
Lipinski
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Miller (FL)

Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins (OK)
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Mr. RAHALL and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, after consulting with the committee that has jurisdiction on the floor this evening, we have determined that it is possible, with cooperation from our Members, for us to take the five votes that have been ordered thus far this evening in just a few more moments. Those five votes would be the last votes that Members would be asked to cast this evening. We would ask that the committee continue to work through title II this evening, with an understanding that any votes that are ordered on title II will be taken up at 9 o'clock in the morning when we resume the bill, and having completed the work through title II should make it possible for us, with good cooperation, to complete consideration of this bill by 2 o'clock tomorrow, our normal Friday getaway time.

The committee has been very cooperative. The committee is to be commended for their good spirit and their efforts to make life better for the Members. I should, however, advise the Members at this time that if we are unable to finish the work by 2 o'clock tomorrow, and everybody that has examined the amendments that are before us is in agreement that we should be able to do so comfortably given the time agreements that we can make, but if that is impossible, we will continue tomorrow to work beyond our normal Friday getaway time until such time as the bill is completed, and we will not leave until the bill is completed.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, on a bit lighter note for all of our colleagues, tonight happens to be a great event that you may not be aware of, but tonight happens to be the 20th anniversary of MIKE OXLEY being a Member of this great institution, having been elected in a special election in 1981. I think we all owe MIKE OXLEY a great round of applause for his 20th anniversary.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished leader for yielding.

I question the gentleman's estimate about when we can finish this bill even if we were to proceed here tonight. There is a lot of material here. He might be right, he might be wrong, but my judgement is he is probably underestimating the amount of time it is

going to take to finish this bill. I would not expect to be able to be finished by 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that would be unfortunate for so many Members who had planned to leave by 2, but it has been my experience in this body that when we all work together and pull in the same direction, in good humor and cheer, that we can meet our goal. I fear we must try. Our schedule for next week is, quite frankly, very exciting; and we simply cannot afford to let this bill hold over for next week.

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

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

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I understand Members' desires to leave, but there is a constitutional responsibility to debate seriously important issues. I am the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity. Under the schedule proposed by the majority leader, we would be debating much of these important housing issues beginning sometime after 11 o'clock tonight until the early hours with no votes. I cannot agree to that, and I must inform Members that there will be no assurance of not having votes. There are votes on appeals from the chair. There are motions to rise. The problem is that important issues have to be discussed. We have all week next week. I am ready to work, but I will not agree, and Members should not expect to leave at 11 o'clock while we debate these important issues and not have votes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has made his point. The fact is he can, in fact, delay everything we try to do tonight and prevent us from completing our work. In that event we would have to work through the weekend.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY); amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER); amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS); amendment No. 22 offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ); amendment No. 15 offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. FOLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated 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 107, noes 311, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 281]

AYES—107

Ackerman	Gekas	Ney
Akin	Gephardt	Otter
Baird	Gilman	Pascrell
Barr	Goodlatte	Paul
Bilirakis	Goss	Pence
Bonilla	Greenwood	Pitts
Boswell	Gutierrez	Putnam
Boyd	Hansen	Ramstad
Bryant	Hart	Rangel
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cantor	Hayes	Royce
Capito	Hayworth	Sandlin
Chabot	Herger	Saxton
Coble	Hilleary	Scarborough
Condit	Hostettler	Schaffer
Costello	Hutchinson	Schrock
Crane	Israel	Sessions
Crowley	Jenkins	Shadegg
Davis (FL)	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Davis, Jo Ann	Johnson (IL)	Simmons
DeMint	Jones (NC)	Simpson
Deutsch	Keller	Skeen
Diaz-Balart	Kelly	Stearns
Dingell	Kerns	Strickland
Duncan	Kildee	Tancred
Dunn	King (NY)	Tauscher
Edwards	Kingston	Thurman
Engel	Larsen (WA)	Tiberi
Evans	Lewis (KY)	Toomey
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Trafigant
Flake	Maloney (CT)	Turner
Fletcher	Manzullo	Udall (NM)
Foley	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Forbes	Mica	Weiner
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Wexler
Galleghy	Myrick	

NOES—311

Abercrombie	Capuano	Farr
Aderholt	Cardin	Fattah
Allen	Carson (IN)	Filmer
Andrews	Carson (OK)	Ford
Armey	Castle	Frank
Baca	Chambliss	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Clay	Frost
Baker	Clayton	Ganske
Baldacci	Clement	Gibbons
Baldwin	Clyburn	Gilchrest
Ballenger	Collins	Gillmor
Barcia	Combust	Gonzalez
Barrett	Conyers	Goode
Bartlett	Cooksey	Gordon
Barton	Cox	Graham
Becerra	Coyne	Granger
Bentsen	Cramer	Graves
Bereuter	Crenshaw	Green (TX)
Berkley	Culberson	Green (WI)
Berman	Cummings	Grucci
Berry	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Biggart	Davis (CA)	Harman
Bishop	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Blagojevich	Davis, Tom	Hefley
Blunt	Deal	Hill
Boehlert	DeFazio	Hilliard
Boehner	DeGette	Hinchey
Bonior	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Bono	DeLauro	Hobson
Borski	DeLay	Hoefel
Boucher	Dicks	Hoekstra
Brady (PA)	Doggett	Holden
Brady (TX)	Dooley	Holt
Brown (FL)	Doolittle	Honda
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hooley
Brown (SC)	Dreier	Horn
Burr	Ehlers	Houghton
Burton	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Buyer	Emerson	Hulshof
Callahan	English	Hyde
Calvert	Eshoo	Inslee
Camp	Etheridge	Isakson
Capps	Everett	Issa

Jackson (IL)	Mollohan	Serrano
Jackson-Lee	Moore	Shays
(TX)	Moran (VA)	Sherman
Jefferson	Morella	Sherwood
John	Murtha	Shimkus
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Shows
Johnson, Sam	Napolitano	Shuster
Jones (OH)	Neal	Skelton
Kanjorski	Norwood	Slaughter
Kaptur	Nussle	Smith (MI)
Kennedy (MN)	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Smith (TX)
Kilpatrick	Olver	Smith (WA)
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Snyder
Kirk	Osborne	Solis
Klecza	Ose	Souder
Knollenberg	Owens	Spratt
Kolbe	Oxley	Stenholm
Kucinich	Pallone	Stump
LaFalce	Pastor	Stupak
LaHood	Payne	Sununu
Lampson	Pelosi	Sweeney
Langevin	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Lantos	Peterson (PA)	Tauzin
Largent	Petri	Taylor (MS)
Larson (CT)	Phelps	Taylor (NC)
Latham	Pickering	Terry
LaTourette	Platts	Thomas
Leach	Pombo	Thompson (CA)
Lee	Pomeroy	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Portman	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Price (NC)	Thune
Lewis (GA)	Pryce (OH)	Tiahrt
Lofgren	Quinn	Tierney
Lowe	Radanovich	Towns
Lucas (KY)	Rahall	Udall (CO)
Lucas (OK)	Regula	Upton
Luther	Rehberg	Velazquez
Maloney (NY)	Reyes	Vitter
Markey	Reynolds	Walden
Mascara	Riley	Walsh
Matheson	Rivers	Wamp
Matsui	Rodriguez	Waters
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Watkins (OK)
McCollum	Rogers (KY)	Watson (CA)
McCrery	Rogers (MI)	Watt (NC)
McDermott	Rohrabacher	Watts (OK)
McGovern	Ross	Waxman
McHugh	Rothman	Weldon (FL)
McInnis	Roukema	Weldon (PA)
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Weller
McKinney	Rush	Whitfield
McNulty	Ryan (WI)	Wicker
Meehan	Ryun (KS)	Wilson
Meek (FL)	Sabo	Wolf
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	Woolsey
Menendez	Sanders	Wu
Millender	Sawyer	Wynn
McDonald	Schakowsky	Young (AK)
Miller, Gary	Schiff	Young (FL)
Miller, George	Scott	
Mink	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—15

Bass	Hunter	Miller (FL)
Blumenauer	Istook	Nethercutt
Cubin	Linder	Northup
Hall (OH)	Lipinski	Spence
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Stark

□ 2214

Mr. PICKERING and Mr. Langevin changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. FLETCHER, SCHROCK, SESSIONS and ENGLE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 281, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 281, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6, of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which

the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) 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 CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 284, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 282]

AYES—139

Abercrombie	Jackson-Lee	Peterson (MN)
Ackerman	(TX)	Price (NC)
Allen	Jefferson	Rahall
Baca	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Baldacci	Kaptur	Reyes
Baldwin	Kennedy (RI)	Rivers
Barrett	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Becerra	Kind (WI)	Ross
Berkley	Klecicka	Rothman
Berman	Kucinich	Royal-Allard
Berry	LaFalce	Rush
Blagojevich	Langevin	Sanchez
Bonior	Lantos	Sanders
Boswell	Larsen (WA)	Sandlin
Boucher	Lee	Sawyer
Boyd	Levin	Schakowsky
Brady (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Brown (FL)	Lowey	Scott
Brown (OH)	Lucas (KY)	Serrano
Capps	Luther	Sherman
Carson (IN)	Maloney (NY)	Shows
Clay	McCarthy (NY)	Skelton
Coyne	McCollum	Slaughter
Crowley	McDermott	Smith (WA)
Davis (FL)	McIntyre	Snyder
Davis (IL)	McKinney	Solis
DeFazio	McNulty	Spratt
DeLauro	Meehan	Stenholm
Dicks	Meeks (NY)	Strickland
Doggett	Menendez	Tancred
Engel	Millender	Tanner
Etheridge	McDonald	Tauscher
Evans	Miller, George	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Mink	Thurman
Fattah	Mollohan	Tiberi
Filner	Moran (VA)	Towns
Ford	Nadler	Udall (CO)
Frost	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
Gonzalez	Obey	Velazquez
Gutierrez	Oliver	Visclosky
Harman	Ortiz	Waters
Hinche	Owens	Watt (NC)
Hinojosa	Pallone	Waxman
Holt	Pascrell	Weiner
Honda	Payne	Wexler
Hooley	Pelosi	Woolsey
Jackson (IL)		Wu

NOES—284

Aderholt	Bishop	Cantor
Akin	Blunt	Capito
Andrews	Boehert	Capuano
Armey	Boehner	Cardin
Bachus	Bonilla	Carson (OK)
Baird	Bono	Castle
Baker	Borski	Chabot
Ballenger	Brady (TX)	Chambliss
Barcia	Brown (SC)	Clayton
Barr	Bryant	Clement
Bartlett	Burr	Clyburn
Barton	Burton	Coble
Bass	Buyer	Collins
Bentsen	Callahan	Condit
Bereuter	Calvert	Conyers
Biggert	Camp	Cooksey
Bilirakis	Cannon	Costello

Cox	Hoyer	Pombo
Cramer	Hulshof	Pomeroy
Crane	Hunter	Portman
Crenshaw	Hutchinson	Pryce (OH)
Culberson	Hyde	Putnam
Cummings	Inslee	Quinn
Cunningham	Isakson	Radanovich
Davis (CA)	Israel	Ramstad
Davis, Jo Ann	Issa	Regula
Davis, Tom	Istook	Rehberg
Deal	Jenkins	Reynolds
DeGette	John	Riley
Delahunt	Johnson (CT)	Rodriguez
DeLay	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
DeMint	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers (MI)
Deutsch	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Diaz-Balart	Jones (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dingell	Kanjorski	Roukema
Dooley	Keller	Royce
Doolittle	Kelly	Ryan (WI)
Doyle	Kennedy (MN)	Ryun (KS)
Dreier	Kerns	Sabo
Duncan	Kildee	Saxton
Dunn	King (NY)	Scarborough
Edwards	Kingston	Schaffer
Ehlers	Kirk	Schrock
Ehrlich	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Kolbe	Sessions
English	LaHood	Shadegg
Eshoo	Lampson	Shaw
Everett	Largent	Shays
Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Sherwood
Flake	Latham	Shimkus
Fletcher	LaTourrette	Shuster
Foley	Leach	Simmons
Forbes	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Fossella	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
Frank	LoBiondo	Smith (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Loftgren	Smith (NJ)
Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)
Ganske	Maloney (CT)	Souder
Gekas	Manzullo	Stearns
Gephardt	Markley	Stump
Gibbons	Mascara	Stupak
Gilchrest	Matheson	Sununu
Gillmor	Matsui	Sweeney
Gilman	McCarthy (MO)	Tauzin
Goode	McCrery	Taylor (MS)
Goodlatte	McGovern	Taylor (NC)
Gordon	McHugh	Terry
Goss	McInnis	Thomas
Graham	McKeon	Thompson (MS)
Granger	Meek (FL)	Thornberry
Graves	Mica	Thune
Green (TX)	Miller, Gary	Tiahrt
Green (WI)	Moore	Tierney
Greenwood	Moran (KS)	Toomey
Grucci	Morella	Trafiacant
Gutknecht	Murtha	Turner
Hall (TX)	Myrick	Upton
Hansen	Napolitano	Vitter
Hart	Neal	Walden
Hastings (FL)	Ney	Walsh
Hastings (WA)	Northup	Wamp
Hayes	Norwood	Watkins (OK)
Hayworth	Nussle	Watson (CA)
Hefley	Osborne	Watts (OK)
Herger	Ose	Weldon (FL)
Hill	Otter	Weldon (PA)
Hilleary	Oxley	Weller
Hilliard	Paul	Whitfield
Hobson	Pence	Wicker
Hoeffel	Peterson (PA)	Wilson
Hoeckstra	Petri	Wolf
Holden	Phelps	Wynn
Horn	Pickering	Young (AK)
Hostettler	Pitts	Young (FL)
Houghton	Platts	

NOT VOTING—10

Blumenauer	Linder	Spence
Combest	Lipinski	Stark
Cubin	Miller (FL)	
Hall (OH)	Nethercutt	

□ 2222

Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. RUSH and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 60, noes 360, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 283]

AYES—60

Andrews	Gephardt	Napolitano
Bishop	Gutierrez	Owens
Blagojevich	Hilliard	Payne
Bonior	Hoeffel	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	Holt	Rahall
Carson (IN)	Honda	Ross
Carson (OK)	Jackson (IL)	Rush
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Sandlin
Clyburn	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Condit	Kildee	Scott
Conyers	Kilpatrick	Shays
Costello	Kucinich	Solis
Cummings	Lampson	Tauscher
Davis (IL)	Lee	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Jo Ann	Lewis (GA)	Udall (CO)
DeGette	Lucas (KY)	Udall (NM)
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Velazquez
Evans	McKinney	Waters
Fattah	Mink	Watson (CA)
Filner	Myrick	Wynn

NOES—360

Abercrombie	Camp	Ehrlich
Ackerman	Cannon	Emerson
Aderholt	Cantor	Engel
Akin	Capito	English
Allen	Capps	Eshoo
Armey	Capuano	Etheridge
Baca	Cardin	Everett
Bachus	Castle	Farr
Baird	Chabot	Ferguson
Baker	Chambliss	Flake
Baldacci	Clayton	Fletcher
Baldwin	Clement	Foley
Ballenger	Coble	Forbes
Barcia	Collins	Ford
Barr	Combest	Fossella
Barrett	Cooksey	Frank
Bartlett	Cox	Frelinghuysen
Barton	Coyne	Frost
Bass	Cramer	Gallegly
Becerra	Crane	Ganske
Bentsen	Crenshaw	Gekas
Bereuter	Crowley	Gibbons
Berkley	Culberson	Gilchrest
Berry	Cunningham	Gillmor
Biggert	Davis (CA)	Gilman
Bilirakis	Davis (FL)	Gonzalez
Blunt	Davis, Tom	Goode
Boehlert	Deal	Goodlatte
Boehner	DeFazio	Gordon
Bonilla	Delahunt	Goss
Bono	DeLauro	Graham
Borski	DeLay	Granger
Boswell	DeMint	Graves
Boucher	Deutsch	Green (TX)
Boyd	Diaz-Balart	Green (WI)
Brady (TX)	Dicks	Greenwood
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Grucci
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Gutknecht
Brown (SC)	Dooley	Hall (TX)
Bryant	Doolittle	Hansen
Burr	Dreier	Harman
Burton	Duncan	Hastings (FL)
Buyer	Dunn	Hastings (WA)
Callahan	Edwards	Hayes
Calvert	Ehlers	

Hayworth McHugh
Hefley McInnis
Herger McIntyre
Hill McKeon
Hinchey McNulty
Hinojosa Meek (FL)
Hobson Meeks (NY)
Hoekstra Menendez
Holden Mica
Hooley Millender-
Horn McDonald
Hostettler Miller, Gary
Houghton Miller, George
Hoyer Mollohan
Hulshof Moore
Hunter Moran (KS)
Hutchinson Moran (VA)
Hyde Morella
Inslee Murtha
Isakson Nadler
Israel Neal
Issa Ney
Istook Northup
Jackson-Lee Norwood
(TX) Nussle
Jefferson Oberstar
Jenkins Obey
John Oliver
Johnson (CT) Ortiz
Johnson (IL) Osborne
Johnson, Sam Ose
Jones (NC) Oxley
Jones (OH) Pallone
Kanjorski Pascrell
Keller Pastor
Kelly Paul
Kennedy (MN) Pence
Kennedy (RI) Peterson (MN)
Kerns Peterson (PA)
Kind (WI) Petri
King (NY) Phelps
Kingston Pickering
Kirk Pitts
Klecza Platts
Knollenberg Pombo
Kolbe Pomeroy
LaFalce Portman
LaHood Price (NC)
Langevin Pryce (OH)
Lantos Putnam
Largent Quinn
Larsen (WA) Radanovich
Larson (CT) Ramstad
Latham Rangel
LaTourette Regula
Leach Rehberg
Levin Reyes
Lewis (CA) Reynolds
Lewis (KY) Riley
LoBiondo Rivers
Lofgren Rodriguez
Lowey Roemer
Lucas (OK) Rogers (KY)
Luther Rogers (MI)
Maloney (CT) Rohrabacher
Maloney (NY) Ros-Lehtinen
Manzullo Rothman
Markey Roukema
Mascara Roybal-Allard
Matheson Royce
Matsui Ryan (WI)
McCarthy (MO) Ryun (KS)
McCollum Sabo
McCrery Sanchez
McDermott Sanders
McGovern Sawyer

NOT VOTING—13

Berman Linder
Blumenauer Lipinski
Cubin Meehan
Hall (OH) Miller (FL)
Hilleary Nethercutt

□ 2229

Ms. HARMAN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. DOGGETT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms.

VELÁZQUEZ) 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 CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 209, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 284]

AYES—216

Abercrombie Green (TX)
Ackerman Gutierrez
Allen Hall (TX)
Andrews Harman
Baca Hastings (FL)
Baird Hill
Baldacci Hinchey
Baldwin Hinojosa
Barcia Hoeffel
Barrett Holden
Becerra Honda
Bentsen Hooley
Bereuter Horn
Berkley Inslee
Berman Israel
Berry Jackson (IL)
Bishop Jackson-Lee
Blagojevich (TX)
Bonior Jefferson
Borski John
Boswell Johnson (IL)
Boucher Johnson, E. B.
Boyd Jones (NC)
Brady (PA) Jones (OH)
Brown (FL) Kanjorski
Brown (OH) Kaptur
Burr Kennedy (RI)
Capito Kildeer
Capps Kilpatrick
Capuano Kind (WI)
Cardin Kleczka
Carson (IN) Kucinich
Carson (OK) LaFalce
Chabot Lampson
Clay Langevin
Clayton Lantos
Clement Larsen (WA)
Condit Larson (CT)
Conyers Leach
Costello Lee
Coyne Levin
Cramer Lewis (GA)
Crowley Lofgren
Cummings Lowey
Davis (CA) Lucas (KY)
Davis (FL) Luther
Davis (IL) Maloney (CT)
DeFazio Maloney (NY)
DeGette Manzullo
Delahunt Markey
DeLauro Mascara
Deutsch Matheson
Dicks Matsui
Dingell McCarthy (MO)
Doggett McCarthy (NY)
Dooley McCollum
Dunn McDermott
Edwards McGovern
Emerson McIntyre
Engel McKinney
Eshoo McNulty
Etheridge Meehan
Evans Meek (FL)
Farr Meeks (NY)
Fattah Menendez
Filner Millender-
Ford McDonald
Fossella Miller, George
Frank Mink
Frost Mollohan
Gephardt Moore
Gonzalez Moran (KS)
Gordon Murtha

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—209

Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
McCrery
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller, Gary
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering

NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer Linder
Cubin Lipinski
Hall (OH) Miller (FL)

□ 2239

Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. STEARNS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. ISAKSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. LAFALCE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE)

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 CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 124, noes 300, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 285]

AYES—124

Abercrombie	Gordon	Mollohan
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Nadler
Allen	Gutierrez	Neal
Baldacci	Holt	Oberstar
Baldwin	Honda	Obey
Barrett	Hoolley	Olver
Becerra	Israel	Owens
Bentsen	Jackson (IL)	Pascarell
Berkley	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Berman	(TX)	Payne
Bishop	Jones (OH)	Pelosi
Blagojevich	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Bonior	Kaptur	Rahall
Borski	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Boswell	Kilpatrick	Ross
Boyd	Klecicka	Roybal-Allard
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Sabo
Brown (OH)	LaFalce	Sanders
Capps	Lampson	Sandlin
Capuano	Langevin	Sawyer
Carson (IN)	Lantos	Schaffer
Clay	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Clayton	Lee	Scott
Conyers	Levin	Serrano
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Crowley	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Lowey	Solis
Davis (CA)	Lucas (KY)	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Luther	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Tierney
Delahunt	Markey	Udall (CO)
DeLauro	Matheson	Udall (NM)
Deutsch	Matsui	Velazquez
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Visclosky
Etheridge	McCollum	Waters
Evans	McDermott	Watson (CA)
Farr	McGovern	Watt (NC)
Fattah	McIntyre	Waxman
Filner	McKinney	Weiner
Frank	McNulty	Wexler
Frost	Meehan	Wu
Gephardt	Miller, George	

NOES—300

Aderholt	Callahan	DeMint
Akin	Calvert	Diaz-Balart
Andrews	Camp	Dicks
Armey	Cannon	Dingell
Baca	Cantor	Doggett
Bachus	Capito	Dooley
Baird	Cardin	Doolittle
Baker	Carson (OK)	Doyle
Ballenger	Castle	Dreier
Barcia	Chabot	Duncan
Barr	Chambliss	Dunn
Bartlett	Clement	Edwards
Barton	Clyburn	Ehlers
Bass	Coble	Ehrlich
Bereuter	Collins	Emerson
Berry	Combest	English
Biggert	Condit	Eshoo
Bilirakis	Cooksey	Everett
Blunt	Costello	Ferguson
Boehlert	Cox	Flake
Boehner	Cramer	Fletcher
Bonilla	Crane	Foley
Bono	Crenshaw	Forbes
Boucher	Culberson	Ford
Brady (TX)	Cunningham	Fossella
Brown (FL)	Davis (FL)	Frelinghuysen
Brown (SC)	Davis, Jo Ann	Gallegly
Bryant	Davis, Tom	Ganske
Burr	Deal	Gekas
Burton	DeGette	Gibbons
Buyer	DeLay	Gilchrest

Gillmor	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Gilman	LoBiondo	Sanchez
Gonzalez	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Goode	Maloney (CT)	Scarborough
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Schiff
Goss	Mascara	Schrock
Graham	McCarthy (MO)	Sensenbrenner
Granger	McCrery	Sessions
Graves	McHugh	Shadegg
Green (WI)	McInnis	Shaw
Greenwood	McKeon	Shays
Grucci	Meek (FL)	Sherwood
Gutknecht	Meeks (NY)	Shimkus
Hall (TX)	Menendez	Shows
Hansen	Mica	Shuster
Harman	Millender-	Simmons
Hart	McDonald	Simpson
Hastings (FL)	Miller, Gary	Skeen
Hastings (WA)	Mink	Skelton
Hayes	Moore	Slaughter
Hayworth	Moran (KS)	Smith (MI)
Hefley	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Herger	Morella	Smith (TX)
Hill	Murtha	Snyder
Hilleary	Myrick	Souder
Hilliard	Napolitano	Spratt
Hinchey	Ney	Stearns
Hinojosa	Northup	Stenholm
Hobson	Norwood	Stump
Hoeffel	Nussle	Stupak
Hoekstra	Ortiz	Sununu
Holden	Osborne	Sweeney
Horn	Ose	Tancredo
Hostettler	Otter	Tanner
Houghton	Oxley	Tauscher
Hoyer	Pallone	Tauzin
Hulshof	Paul	Taylor (MS)
Hunter	Pence	Taylor (NC)
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Terry
Hyde	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Inslie	Petri	Thompson (MS)
Isakson	Phelps	Thornberry
Issa	Pickering	Thune
Istook	Pitts	Thurman
Jefferson	Platts	Tiahrt
Jenkins	Pombo	Tiberi
John	Pomeroy	Toomey
Johnson (CT)	Portman	Towns
Johnson (IL)	Pryce (OH)	Traficant
Johnson, E. B.	Putnam	Turner
Johnson, Sam	Quinn	Upton
Jones (NC)	Radanovich	Vitter
Keller	Ramstad	Walden
Kelly	Regula	Walsh
Kennedy (MN)	Rehberg	Wamp
Kerns	Reyes	Watkins (OK)
Kildee	Reynolds	Watts (OK)
Kind (WI)	Riley	Weldon (FL)
King (NY)	Rivers	Weldon (PA)
Kingston	Rodriguez	Weller
Kirk	Roemer	Whitfield
Knollenberg	Rogers (KY)	Wicker
Kolbe	Rogers (MI)	Wilson
LaHood	Rohrabacher	Wolf
Largent	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey
Larsen (WA)	Rothman	Wynn
Latham	Roukema	Young (AK)
LaTourette	Royce	Young (FL)
Leach	Rush	
Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)	

NOT VOTING—9

Blumenauer	Linder	Nethercutt
Cubin	Lipinski	Spence
Hall (OH)	Miller (FL)	Stark

□ 2247

Mrs. NAPOLITANO changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there be no more procedural votes this evening; that the committee be allowed to work with the Members in question on title II of the bill, without interruption; and as they complete that work this evening, any votes that are ordered on amendments be postponed until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair already has the authority to postpone votes on

amendments but not on procedural motions.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be no more procedural votes this evening and that the committee be allowed to continue its work on title II.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole cannot entertain that request.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read and open for amendment at any time.

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

Mr. FRANK. I object.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, it is clear and obvious to me that the Members of this body cannot work tonight effectively and make progress on this bill. That is unfortunate. Obviously, it will delay our departure tomorrow. But in consideration of the mood that we find on the floor this evening,

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. SHIMKUS, 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. 2620) 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, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PLAN COLOMBIA SEMI-ANNUAL OBLIGATION REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 3204(e) of Public Law 106-246, I hereby transmit a report detailing the progress of spending by the executive branch during the first two quarters of Fiscal Year 2001 in support of Plan Colombia.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 2001.

REPORT ON H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-169) on the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the legislative