

Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Stenholm
Miller, Gary	Reyes	Strickland
Miller, George	Reynolds	Stump
Mink	Riley	Stupak
Mollohan	Rivers	Sununu
Moore	Rodriguez	Sweeney
Moran (KS)	Roemer	Tancredo
Moran (VA)	Rogers (KY)	Tanner
Morella	Rogers (MI)	Tauscher
Murtha	Rohrabacher	Tauzin
Myrick	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Nadler	Ross	Taylor (NC)
Napolitano	Rothman	Terry
Neal	Roukema	Thomas
Nethercutt	Royal-Allard	Thompson (CA)
Ney	Royce	Thompson (MS)
Northup	Rush	Thornberry
Norwood	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Nussle	Ryun (KS)	Thurman
Oberstar	Sabo	Tiahrt
Obey	Sanchez	Tiberi
Olver	Sanders	Tierney
Ortiz	Sandlin	Toomey
Osborne	Sawyer	Towns
Ose	Saxton	Traficant
Otter	Scarborough	Turner
Owens	Schakowsky	Udall (NM)
Oxley	Schiff	Upton
Pallone	Schrock	Velazquez
Pascarella	Scott	Visclosky
Pastor	Sensenbrenner	Vitter
Paul	Serrano	Walden
Payne	Sessions	Walsh
Pelosi	Shadegg	Wamp
Pence	Shaw	Waters
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Watkins (OK)
Peterson (PA)	Sherman	Watson (CA)
Petri	Sherwood	Watt (NC)
Phelps	Shimkus	Watts (OK)
Pickering	Shows	Waxman
Pitts	Shuster	Weiner
Platts	Simmons	Weldon (FL)
Pombo	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Pomeroy	Skeen	Weller
Portman	Skelton	Wexler
Price (NC)	Slaughter	Whitfield
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Wicker
Putnam	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Quinn	Smith (TX)	Wolf
Radanovich	Smith (WA)	Woolsey
Rahall	Solis	Wu
Ramstad	Souder	Wynn
Rangel	Spratt	Young (AK)
Regula	Stearns	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Baca	Goode	Schaffer
Berkley	Hansen	Snyder
Cox	Hefley	Spence
DeGette	Jefferson	Stark
Fattah	Lipinski	Udall (CO)

□ 1844

So, (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1845

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2647, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-171) on the resolution (H. Res. 213) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2647) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2505, HUMAN CLONING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-172) on the resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2505) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to House Resolution 210 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2620.

□ 1846

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 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, with Mr. SHIMKUS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Friday, July 27, 2001, amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 33 line 5 through page 37 line 9.

Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOMELESS ASSISTANCE GRANTS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the emergency shelter grants program as authorized under subtitle B of title IV of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, as amended; the supportive housing program as authorized under subtitle C of title IV of such Act; the section 8 moderate rehabilitation single room occupancy program as authorized under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to assist homeless individuals pursuant to section 411 of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; and the shelter plus care program as authorized under subtitle F of title IV of such Act, \$1,027,745,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That not less than 35 percent of these funds shall be used for permanent housing, and all funding for services must be matched by 25 percent in funding by each grantee: *Provided further*, That all awards of assistance under this heading shall be required to coordinate and integrate homeless programs with other mainstream

health, social services, and employment programs for which homeless populations may be eligible, including Medicaid, State Children's Health Insurance Program, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Food Stamps, and services funding through the Mental Health and Substance Abuse Block Grant, Workforce Investment Act, and the Welfare-to-Work grant program: *Provided further*, That no less than \$14,200,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading is transferred to the Working Capital Fund to be used for technical assistance for management information systems and to develop an automated, client-level Annual Performance Report System: *Provided further*, That \$500,000 shall be made available to the Interagency Council on the Homeless for administrative needs.

HOUSING PROGRAMS

HOUSING FOR SPECIAL POPULATIONS
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For assistance for the purchase, construction, acquisition, or development of additional public and subsidized housing units for low income families not otherwise provided for, \$1,024,151,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That \$783,286,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for housing for the elderly, as authorized by section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, as amended, and for project rental assistance for the elderly under such section 202(c)(2), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a one-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing, of which amount \$49,890,000 shall be for service coordinators and the continuation of existing congregate service grants for residents of assisted housing projects, and of which amount \$49,890,000 shall be for grants under section 202b of the Housing Act of 1959 (12 U.S.C. 1701q-2) for conversion of eligible projects under such section to assisted living or related use: *Provided further*, That of the amount under this heading, \$240,865,000 shall be for capital advances, including amendments to capital advance contracts, for supportive housing for persons with disabilities, as authorized by section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act, for project rental assistance for supportive housing for persons with disabilities under such section 811(d)(2), including amendments to contracts for such assistance and renewal of expiring contracts for such assistance for up to a one-year term, and for supportive services associated with the housing for persons with disabilities as authorized by section 811 of such Act, and for tenant-based rental assistance contracts entered into pursuant to section 811 of such Act: *Provided further*, That no less than \$1,000,000, to be divided evenly between the appropriations for the section 202 and section 811 programs, shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems: *Provided further*, That, in addition to amounts made available for renewal of tenant-based rental assistance contracts pursuant to the second proviso of this paragraph, the Secretary may designate up to 25 percent of the amounts earmarked under this paragraph for section 811 of such Act for tenant-based assistance, as authorized under that section, including such authority as may be waived under the next proviso, which assistance is five years in duration: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may waive any provision of such section 202 and such section 811 (including the provisions governing the terms and conditions of project rental assistance and tenant-based assistance) that the Secretary determines is

not necessary to achieve the objectives of these programs, or that otherwise impedes the ability to develop, operate, or administer projects assisted under these programs, and may make provision for alternative conditions or terms where appropriate.

**FLEXIBLE SUBSIDY FUND
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

From the Rental Housing Assistance Fund, all uncommitted balances of excess rental charges as of September 30, 2001, and any collections made during fiscal year 2002, shall be transferred to the Flexible Subsidy Fund, as authorized by section 236(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

MANUFACTURED HOUSING FEES TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses as authorized by the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974, as amended (42 U.S.C. 5401 et seq.), \$13,566,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Manufactured Housing Fees Trust Fund: *Provided*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund pursuant to section 620 of such Act: *Provided further*, That the amount made available under this heading from the general fund shall be reduced as such collections are received during fiscal year 2002 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2002 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0 and fees pursuant to such section 620 shall be modified as necessary to ensure such a final fiscal year 2002 appropriation.

**FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION
MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAM
ACCOUNT**

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

During fiscal year 2002, commitments to guarantee loans to carry out the purposes of section 203(b) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed a loan principal of \$160,000,000,000.

During fiscal year 2002, obligations to make direct loans to carry out the purposes of section 204(g) of the National Housing Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$250,000,000: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with sales of single family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan program, \$330,888,000, of which not to exceed \$326,866,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"; and not to exceed \$4,022,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General". In addition, for administrative contract expenses, \$145,000,000, of which not less than \$96,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

**GENERAL AND SPECIAL RISK PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)**

For the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by sections 238 and 519 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-3 and 1735c), including the cost of loan guarantee modifications as that term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, of up to \$21,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That any amounts made available in any

prior appropriations Act for the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans that are obligations of the funds established under section 238 or 519 of the National Housing Act that have not been obligated or that are deobligated shall be available to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in connection with the making of such guarantees and shall remain available until expended, notwithstanding the expiration of any period of availability otherwise applicable to such amounts.

Gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by sections 204(g), 207(l), 238, and 519(a) of the National Housing Act, shall not exceed \$50,000,000, of which not to exceed \$30,000,000 shall be for bridge financing in connection with the sale of multifamily real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act; and of which not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall be for loans to nonprofit and governmental entities in connection with the sale of single-family real properties owned by the Secretary and formerly insured under such Act.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$211,455,000, of which \$193,134,000, shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"; and of which \$18,321,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Office of Inspector General". In addition, for administrative contract expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed and direct loan programs, \$139,000,000, of which no less than \$33,500,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of information technology systems.

**GOVERNMENT NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION (GNMA)**

**GUARANTEES OF MORTGAGE-BACKED SECURITIES
LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM ACCOUNT**

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

New commitments to issue guarantees to carry out the purposes of section 306 of the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1721(g)), shall not exceed \$200,000,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

For administrative expenses necessary to carry out the guaranteed mortgage-backed securities program, \$9,383,000 to be derived from the GNMA guarantees of mortgage-backed securities guaranteed loan receipt account, of which not to exceed \$9,383,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses".

**POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND RESEARCH
RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY**

For contracts, grants, and necessary expenses of programs of research and studies relating to housing and urban problems, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title V of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701z-1 et seq.), including carrying out the functions of the Secretary under section 1(a)(1)(i) of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1968, \$46,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That \$1,500,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the Millennial Housing Commission, as authorized by section 206 of Public Law 106-74: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided under this heading, \$7,500,000 shall be for the Partnership for Advancing Technology in Housing (PATH) Initiative.

**FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
FAIR HOUSING ACTIVITIES**

For contracts, grants, and other assistance, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, as amended by the Fair Housing

Amendments Act of 1988, and section 561 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987, as amended, \$45,899,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which \$19,449,000 shall be to carry out activities pursuant to such section 561: *Provided*, That no funds made available under this heading shall be used to lobby the executive or legislative branches of the Federal Government in connection with a specific contract, grant or loan.

OFFICE OF LEAD HAZARD CONTROL

LEAD HAZARD REDUCTION

For the Lead Hazard Reduction Program, as authorized by sections 1011 and 1053 of the Residential Lead-Based Hazard Reduction Act of 1992, \$109,758,000 to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which \$10,000,000 shall be for the Healthy Homes Initiative, pursuant to sections 501 and 502 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 that shall include research, studies, testing, and demonstration efforts, including education and outreach concerning lead-based paint poisoning and other housing-related environmental childhood diseases and hazards.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative and non-administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$7,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$1,086,800,000, of which \$520,000,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration, \$9,383,000 shall be provided from funds of the Government National Mortgage Association, \$1,000,000 shall be provided from the "Community development fund" account, \$150,000 shall be provided by transfer from the "Title VI Indian federal guarantees program" account, and \$200,000 shall be provided by transfer from the "Indian housing loan guarantee fund program" account: *Provided*, That no less than \$85,000,000 shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund for the development and maintenance of Information Technology Systems: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall fill 7 out of 10 vacancies at the GS-14 and GS-15 levels until the total number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions in the Department has been reduced from the number of GS-14 and GS-15 positions on the date of enactment of Public Law 106-377 by two and one-half percent: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit a staffing plan for the Department by November 1, 2001.

**AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MR. WELDON OF
PENNSYLVANIA**

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 42 offered by Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania:

Page 47, line 10, after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$50,000,000)".

Page 72, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

Does the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I am not in opposition. I do not know that there is going to be opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), and then the gentleman from Maryland will have the right to claim the time.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN). I offer this amendment in full support and adulation for the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittee, recognizing their ongoing cooperation in this effort. And I offer this in complete support of the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), without whose efforts last year would not allow us to be here today.

Mr. Chairman, the number is 102, and the number in 1999 was 112. That was the number of U.S. citizens, most of them volunteers, who were killed in the line of duty in protecting our towns. If we lost that many soldiers, it would be a national scandal. If we lost that many teachers, it would be a national disgrace. Yet every year, on average, America loses over 100 men and women who are simply protecting their towns.

Last year, for the first time, with the leadership of the good chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), we appropriated \$100 million on the competitive grant program to help our Nation's 32,000 fire and EMS departments leverage their money to help them better train and better equip themselves.

The response was overwhelming. Thirty thousand applications came in within 1 month. Twenty thousand individual fire and EMS departments in every district in America applied. And now it is time for us to increase that funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, without whose efforts this would not have happened.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his determined dedication to this issue of providing support for those men and women who serve on the front line in guaranteeing the safety and security of our communities, along with police officers. Without our firefighters, I am not sure where we would be going as a Nation or as a community.

I would say the gentleman was very kind in his remarks directed to this chairman, but I must tell my colleagues that he, in fact, is the most dedicated, most persistent, most deter-

mined Member of this House to see that this type of assistance is made available for those brave men and women who do support the security of our Nation in fighting the fires, protecting our properties, and protecting our lives.

Again, I would say thanks to him for the determination and the strong effort that he has made in this respect.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in no way in opposition to this account being funded at the amount designated in the amendment, \$150 million, however, there is a better place to do that; and we will certainly, at that time, look as favorably as we can upon the request.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) will control the balance of the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of the Weldon amendment.

The Weldon amendment is carrying out what I think is a very worthwhile and important objective. It would increase the \$100 million provided in the bill for the fire grant program by \$50 million.

Before I speak on the substance, I want to thank the chairman and ranking members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, I understand the constraints they are under. I also understand their support of this program.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), as well as so many others who have been supportive, and I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), for rising to speak on behalf of this amendment. All of them have been tireless in their support of this program.

The response, Mr. Chairman, from the fire services to the Fire Act, which authorized \$300 million and to which we appropriated \$100 million last year, has been nothing short of astonishing and has exceeded everyone's expectations. In this first year of the program, the U.S. fire administration received over 30,000 requests from local departments, totaling more than \$3 billion.

To put this in perspective, there are 32,000 departments in this country. Our first responders respond to fire, flood, hurricane, and other crises. In the first year, the departments were limited to applying for only 6 of the authorized 14 categories. That gives us, I think, Mr. Chairman, a sense of the need that is out there that fire departments throughout this country have.

The \$100 million in this bill is insufficient. The chairman and the ranking member know that. Hopefully, in conference, we will be able to get that figure up to the figure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks and, indeed, if there are additional funds, they would be warranted as well.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), a cosponsor of this amendment and one who has been a real leader in this effort.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), which I was pleased to cosponsor. I also thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER); the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) for their support.

The Weldon amendment allocates an additional \$50 million in funding for the Firefighters Assistance Grant Program, which is one of our Nation's most vitally important programs. In fiscal year 2001, approximately two out of three fire departments in our Nation applied for funds, totaling nearly \$3 billion in requests. Regrettably, the majority of those requests could not be granted because funding for the program was not sufficient to meet the overwhelming demands of our Nation's fire departments.

As the popularity of this program increases, it falls upon all of us in the Congress to meet the demand with adequate funding. We must make sure our Nation's firefighters have the resources to perform their dedicated work in our communities, saving lives and property.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to show their support for our Nation's firefighters by voting in support of the Weldon firefighter amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been such a hard fighter on behalf of this program for the firefighters and first responders of our Nation.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Weldon amendment to increase funding

for the Firefighters Assistance Grant Program.

There are a million firefighters in America, one million, and 32,000 fire departments. The number of applications for the first year is just overwhelming. This is a replica of the COPS program, which proved to be so successful. And I want to congratulate folks from both sides of the aisle. The amount of applications is an indication, Mr. Chairman, of how serious the need is in our Nation's fire departments.

I totally support this amendment. We are all going to be hearing from the fire departments in our own districts, because there is only so much money to go around for so many applications.

□ 1900

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who is a senior member of the Committee on Science and who has been an advocate for the fire service.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the committee that oversees the Federal Fire Administration, I would like to suggest that it is about time we really started helping communities across America by helping firemen.

Today in the United States there are over 1 million fire fighters and 77 percent are volunteers. If we had to pay all of these volunteers, we would be spending billions of dollars more in property tax coming out of taxpayers' pockets.

Last year I worked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and others to get \$100 million into this program. This amendment is going to increase that by \$50 million to \$150 million.

I think it is important to mention that in 1999 there were 45,000 fire fighters injured and 112 fire fighters killed in duty-related incidents. These men and women are American heroes. They are truly our first responders. They are the ones that are at the scene when there is natural disasters. They are the ones at the scene when there is shootings in school, chemical spills, terrorism, looking for lost kids, or getting the kitten out of a tree.

We give billions of dollars to law enforcement in this country. It is time we gave a few dollars to help local communities and help the first responders of this Nation.

This amendment would increase the funding allocation to help local fire departments hire new firefighters, purchase new safety equipment, and provide improved training.

These men and women are American heroes. They are truly first responders. They are part of national security.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be an easy choice to make. Either we fund more bureaucracy or fund more help for firefighters. The increased funding for the fire grants program could be used for new equipment to fight

fires, new training so that our firefighters are brought up to speed on the latest firefighting techniques, advanced safety equipment that can help prevent firefighter injury or death. This type of support is especially critical for volunteer fire departments that often must supplement their sources of funding with bake sales and the like.

Despite the risks, the million men and women of the fire services continue to guard against fires, accidents, disasters, and terrorism. We in this body must continue to get them the support they need.

It may come as a surprise to many of the people viewing tonight, but the United States has one of the highest fire death rates in the industrialized world at 13.1 deaths per million population. In 1999, 3,570 Americans lost their lives and another 21,875 were injured as the result of fire—more Americans than were killed in all natural disasters combined. The National Safety Council ranks fires as the fifth leading cause of accidental deaths, behind only vehicle accidents, falls, poisonings, and drownings.

The total cost of fire to society is staggering—estimated over \$100 billion per year. This includes the cost of adding fire protection to buildings, the cost of paid fire departments, the equivalent cost of volunteer fire departments (\$20 billion annually), the cost of insurance overhead, the direct cost of fire-related losses, the medical cost of fire injuries, and other direct and indirect costs. Direct property losses due to fire was estimated at \$10 billion in 1999.

The top three causes of fires in the U.S. are smoking (22 percent), incendiary and suspicious (or arson) (21 percent), and heating (11 percent). The leading cause of injuries is cooking (22 percent), followed by arson (13 percent), and children playing (11 percent).

On the front lines, protecting the public from fire, are the Nation's over one million firefighters, three-quarters of whom serve as volunteers. Every day, these men and women place their lives on the line to protect their neighbors. Every 17.3 seconds, a firefighter in this country responds to a fire.

In my State of Michigan volunteer firefighters are very important. Between 1995–2000, eleven Michigan firefighters—both volunteer and professional—lost their lives fighting fires.

Last year alone, four Michigan firefighters lost their lives—Ronald Haner of Portage, David Maisano of Mio, David Sutton of Fraser, and Gail VanAuken of Holland. Firefighter Sutton was killed by an arsonist who ignited combustibles on the first and second floors of a Fraser apartment building. Mr. Sutton had sought to save a resident of that apartment building, who was trapped on the second floor, and was also killed by that fire. This fire was one of six arson fires that occurred in the same general area over a two day period of last year.

For their bravery and sacrifice, we owe first responders and their families a debt of gratitude. Our Nation's founders were deeply committed to the idea that the individual had an obligation to serve the community and the country. Those who serve as first responders exemplify these ideals every day.

It is unfortunate that today many now consider duty and honor relics of a bygone age. While our society lavishes praise on athletes and rock stars, we tend to forget about those

who stand ready at a moment's notice to risk their lives to keep our communities safe. It is only after disaster strikes that we appreciate fully the contributions they make.

They have kept faith with us, and we in this body must continue to keep faith with them by getting them the support they need. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research, which has jurisdiction over the U.S. Fire Administration, I am pleased that last year we were able to pass legislation reauthorizing USFA. This legislation is helping get USFA back on the right track so that it can provide the training and research our firefighters need.

In addition, last year, many of us worked to get more help to firefighters. These efforts led to the passage of unprecedented legislation to benefit America's fire service, much of which was reflected in my Help Emergency Responders Operate—HERO—Act.

This type of support is particularly important to volunteer fire departments that often do not have adequate funding. Many volunteer departments have to supplement their local funding with bake sales and other activities just to keep themselves afloat.

The VA/HUD appropriations bill for fiscal year 2002 provides another \$100 million for this purpose. Like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I was hoping that we can increase that amount to \$150 million, and I am still hopeful that we can get some more funding as the bill moves through conference. Remember that each year fire results in \$10 billion in property loss and more than 3,500 deaths in the U.S. I have also cosponsored legislation offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. LARSON, that would set up special tax-free retirement accounts, similar to IRA's, for volunteer firefighters.

Increasingly, we are asking firefighters to take on expanded responsibilities—to respond to terrorist attacks or to help stem environmental disasters, for example. It is important that as we ask them to take on more, we stay committed to insuring we support them as best we can.

I thank the gentleman for his efforts on behalf of firefighters and thank him for bringing this issue before the House tonight. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and thank him for all he has done for the fire fighters of the State of Maryland and of the District of Columbia. I have witnessed firsthand what he has done to beef up the capability of fire stations, not just within these two jurisdictions, but across the country. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the head of the Fire Caucus.

The fact is that fire fighters today do so much more than fight fires. They respond to medical emergencies, crises, catastrophes. They are the first line of defense when we have emergencies that occur across the country. So I support the intent of this amendment very strongly.

I do have some reticence about the fact that it would be taken from salaries and expenses in HUD, as I know

the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) do. But I suspect that when we sit down with the Senate, that the fire fighters will be recipients of the kind of financial support and political support that they need and deserve.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI), one of our freshmen Members who was a leader of the fire service in Brookhaven in Long Island.

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

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weldon amendment, which would increase the Fire Assistance Grant Program by \$50 million.

Last Monday it was my honor to announce the awarding of a Federal grant to the Davis Park Fire Department in my district. This grant was one of only 108 that were awarded to the fire departments across this country under FEMA's Fire Assistance Grant Program.

The Davis Park Fire Department along with nearly 20,000 other fire companies applied for grants. That is almost two-thirds of all fire companies in America. In the coming months, more than \$100 million in grants will be rewarded to fire companies for vehicles, fire prevention programs, equipment and training.

The Davis Park Fire Department will use its \$30,000 in funds to train its fire fighters in the most recent fire fighting and rescue techniques. When I spoke with the department's chief, he expressed his excitement over how the grant would help to strengthen the safety of not just the citizens of Davis Park, but also the brave men and women who serve them.

By supporting the Weldon amendment we can guarantee that fire departments, like Davis Park, will be able to benefit from this vital program next year.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Weldon amendment which would increase the Fire Assistance Grant Program by \$50 million.

Last Monday, it was my honor to announce the awarding of a Federal grant to the Davis Park Fire Department in my district. This grant was one of only 108 that were awarded to fire departments across this country under FEMA's Fire Assistance Grant Program.

The Davis Park Fire Department along with nearly 20,000 other fire companies applied for grants—that is almost two-thirds of all fire companies in America. In the coming months, more than \$100 million in grants will be rewarded to fire companies for vehicles, fire prevention programs, equipment and training.

The Davis Park Fire Department will use its \$30,000 in funds to train its firefighters in the most recent firefighting and rescue techniques. When I spoke with the department's chief he expressed his excitement over how the grant would help to strengthen the safety of not just the citizens of Davis Park but also the brave men and women who serve them.

By supporting the Weldon amendment we can guarantee that Fire Departments like the Davis Park will be able to benefit from this vital program next year. In doing so we can increase the safety of countless communities throughout our nation.

I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in providing our nations local fire departments with the opportunity to improve the quality of both services they offer and safety standards under which they serve.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), one of the co-chairs of the Fire Service Caucus who does an outstanding job on behalf of the fire fighters of America.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

In the new century the front line of America's defense is not the battle-fields of Europe or the high seas around the globe or even the skies above us. The front line is the domestic battle against terrorism.

The first line of defense in that battle is the fire fighters, EMS, and public safety personnel of our country. They certainly deserve the amount that is suggested by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for making sure that \$100 million is already in this bill.

I know we can all work together in the conference with the other body to try to increase that amount to \$150 million by trying to find the appropriate place in the bill from which the money may be taken.

We are going to spend \$300 billion on defending this country by the Armed Services this year. I support that. This is a small fraction and an important element of our fight or national defense. I enthusiastically support this amendment. I thank its authors.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), one of the champions of our national security and one of the champions of the fire service in America, who along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has been there, along with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have ever spoken on an amendment which I am not sure is going any place, but I will say this: I can remember when it was first introduced they were talking about \$1 billion. Most people thought there would not be that kind of a need or application. But in my district this has been one of the most popular things we have done in this Congress.

We are having trouble getting volunteers. They are having trouble getting equipment. So this is the type of thing we will have to get involved in. I pre-

dict that in the end there will be a lot more money in this program. It is going to be just like defense. It is going to increase more and more. So I support the program and enthusiastically endorse what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) are trying to do.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the group of people we are talking about are our domestic defenders. People ask why we should fund the fire service, are we trying to federalize the Nation's fire service? The answer is absolutely no. But in today's climate we are asking these domestic defenders to deal more with weapons of mass destruction and terrorist incidents.

In fact, for every major disaster in America, floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, they are the first responder. It is not the FEMA bureaucrat, it is not the National Guard, it is not the Marine Corps CBIRF teams, it is the men and women of the American Fire Service.

We have responsibility to help them. We spend over \$300 billion on our international defenders, and I support that and more. We spend \$4 billion a year on our police officers, and I support that. Imagine asking our police officers to go out and have a chicken dinner or tag day to raise the funds to buy their police car or their crime incident vehicle.

Every day across this country our paid and volunteer fire EMS people are asked to do more with less. This is a small effort for us to assist them, to give them seed money, to help them use their very limited dollars to help leverage that money to buy the equipment they need.

Is this program a success? The first round of grants are now going out. Let me read just one. The smallest grant award to date was \$757 to buy a smoke machine for training fire fighters in the Paisley Volunteer Fire Department in southeastern Oregon. That may save one life, and if we save one life out of those hundreds that are killed each year, it is well worth the funding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for working together on this effort. It would not have happened without the bipartisan support of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and all of the others

who have spoken, are the reason we are here today.

Mr. Chairman, to our fire and EMS leaders, we are only just beginning. I thank my colleagues and ask them to support this amendment.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is going to take a short time, and this amendment is going to be I think withdrawn. It is going to be withdrawn because we understand that we ought not to take \$50 million out of the salary and expense money of HUD. HUD needs that money.

Mr. Chairman, I rise really to say that this committee's 302(b) allocation is insufficient to meet the unbelievable demands that it confronts. I think the chairman and ranking member are going to say that in just a minute. But I empathize with that because this is a critical need. We have talked about the need being manifested in the grant applications that have been submitted. Over \$3 billion with \$100 million available. Those grant applications are not for some objective which somebody would make fun of.

We talk about fires, and that is what we think about our fire service and emergency response teams as doing; but we have also talked about natural disasters. There are also unnatural disasters; for instance, automobile accidents. The first people usually on the scene are the fire service and/or the EMS, emergency medical service. They are there. They need equipment and training. That means more lives saved.

Just as it has been said that we spend a lot of money on people that we send overseas to defend our security, that is why the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and I and others on this floor refer to our fire service and EMS personnel as our domestic defenders; because, indeed, they are the persons, along with our police department, that we ask to defend us here at home to make sure that we not only have law and order, but that we have security at time of crisis, whether it is natural disaster or fire or accident or some other calamity.

Mr. Chairman, the fire service was one of the first on the scene when Timothy McVeigh set that awful explosion that killed 168 people. They were there in that building climbing those stairs bringing children out, bringing women and visitors from that building.

They take risks every day, and we lose on an average one every 3 days in America. It is important, and I think America believes it to be a priority, that we give to them the training, the equipment, so that they cannot only respond effectively to save our lives, but they can do so in the safest possible manner that we can give to them.

In conclusion, let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). I know that they care deeply about this program and I know the constraints on them. The good

news is when we go to conference I hope we can get to this number.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and with the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership last year, and ask the gentleman if he can work with us in conference to help move toward this goal?

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, this is as good an idea that has come along in a long time. It has broad support. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is as consistent as Old Faithful regarding fire fighters. The gentleman is their hero; and there are many others in this room who have made this happen.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I have an allocation that would force us to go into HUD that would cut salaries and expenses. Nobody wants to do that. Give us a chance to work with the gentleman as we move towards conference, and I think we probably will have a positive result.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for their leadership on this issue.

This amendment is less about a desire in this body of getting resources to fire fighters than it is about the scarcity about the resources that we have to appropriate here.

As the chairman indicated, we need a larger allocation to do justice to this amendment. We need more money to do justice to this amendment. We hope as this process moves forward, it will be available. It will be very difficult in the context of the tax cut we had earlier in the year. We are going to work hard to honor both gentlemen's request here as it moves forward. I will support the chairman in that process.

□ 1915

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our colleagues for their comments. The gentleman from Maryland has an additional comment to make, and then I will make my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I think everybody here that has spoken says this is something we ought to do. Hopefully between now and when we adjourn, we will be able to get this accomplished, not just for the

fire service of America but for the people of our Nation and safer communities.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank all of my colleagues for speaking. It is pretty evident that this is something we want to do. Working with the other body, hopefully we can get there.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Weldon-Pascarell-Andrews amendment which would increase the FY02 budget for the Fire Assistance Grant Program from \$100 million to \$150 million.

Mr. Chairman, there is such a great need for this program in this country that while it has been funded at \$100 million for FY01, there has been \$2.9 billion in requests from across the country for this vital program.

Mr. Chairman, new and advancing technologies are constantly requiring expensive purchase and upgrading of equipment to enable our firefighting units to provide the very best in services to our communities. My own district of the U.S. Virgin Islands, is one such community in need. They have put in a request for this assistance and support to ensure that they have the right equipment, vehicles and other tools necessary to meet the important need of keeping our community safe in times of fire disaster.

Mr. Chairman, our firefighters, across the country, put their lives on the line day after day—for us! Let us appreciate their service, and improve their safety as well, by passing the Weldon-Pascarell-Andrews amendment today.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$93,898,000, of which \$22,343,000 shall be provided from the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration and \$10,000,000 shall be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home in the appropriation for the "Public housing operating fund": *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have independent authority over all personnel issues within the Office of Inspector General.

CONSOLIDATED FEE FUND

(RESCISSON)

Of the balances remaining available from fees and charges under section 7(j) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act, \$6,700,000 is rescinded.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL HOUSING ENTERPRISE OVERSIGHT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For carrying out the Federal Housing Enterprise Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992, including not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$23,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight Fund: *Provided*, That not to exceed such amount shall be available from the general fund of the Treasury to the extent necessary to incur obligations and make expenditures pending the receipt of collections to the Fund: *Provided further*, That the general fund amount shall be

reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year so as to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Fifty percent of the amounts of budget authority, or in lieu thereof 50 percent of the cash amounts associated with such budget authority, that are recaptured from projects described in section 1012(a) of the Stuart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 (42 U.S.C. 1437 note) shall be rescinded, or in the case of cash, shall be remitted to the Treasury, and such amounts of budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury shall be used by State housing finance agencies or local governments or local housing agencies with projects approved by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for which settlement occurred after January 1, 1992, in accordance with such section. Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the Secretary may award up to 15 percent of the budget authority or cash recaptured and not rescinded or remitted to the Treasury to provide project owners with incentives to refinance their project at a lower interest rate.

SEC. 202. None of the amounts made available under this Act may be used during fiscal year 2002 to investigate or prosecute under the Fair Housing Act any otherwise lawful activity engaged in by one or more persons, including the filing or maintaining of a non-frivolous legal action, that is engaged in solely for the purpose of achieving or preventing action by a Government official or entity, or a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 203. (a) Notwithstanding section 854(c)(1)(A) of the AIDS Housing Opportunity Act (42 U.S.C. 12903(c)(1)(A)), from any amounts made available under this title for fiscal year 2002 that are allocated under such section, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall allocate and make a grant, in the amount determined under subsection (b), for any State that—

(1) received an allocation in a prior fiscal year under clause (ii) of such section; and

(2) is not otherwise eligible for an allocation for fiscal year 2002 under such clause (ii) because the areas in the State outside of the metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) in fiscal year 2002 do not have the number of cases of acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) required under such clause.

(b) The amount of the allocation and grant for any State described in subsection (a) shall be an amount based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases in the areas of that State that are outside of metropolitan statistical areas that qualify under clause (i) of such section 854(c)(1)(A) in fiscal year 2002, in proportion to AIDS cases among cities and States that qualify under clauses (i) and (ii) of such section and States deemed eligible under subsection (a).

SEC. 204. Section 225(a) of the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, Public Law 106-74 (113 Stat. 1076), is amended by inserting “and fiscal year 2002” after “fiscal year 2001”.

SEC. 205. Section 251 of the National Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1715z-16) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “issue regulations” and all that follows and inserting the following: “require that the mortgagee make available to the mortgagor, at the time of loan application, a written explanation of the features of an adjustable rate mortgage consistent with the disclosure requirements applicable to variable rate mortgages secured by a principal dwelling under the Truth in Lending Act.”; and

(2) by adding the following new subsection at the end:

“(d)(1) The Secretary may insure under this subsection a mortgage that meets the requirements of subsection (a), except that the effective rate of interest—

“(A) shall be fixed for a period of not less than the first 3 years of the mortgage term;

“(B) shall be adjusted by the mortgagee initially upon the expiration of such period and annually thereafter; and

“(C) in the case of the initial interest rate adjustment, is subject to the one percent limitation only if the interest rate remained fixed for five or fewer years.

“(2) The disclosure required under subsection (b) shall be required for a mortgage insured under this subsection.”.

SEC. 206. (a) Section 208(c) of the National Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1709(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and (k)” and “or (k)”;

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting immediately after “subsection (v),” the following: “and each mortgage that is insured under subsection (k) or section 234(c),”; and

(B) by striking “and executed on or after October 1, 1994.”.

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply only to mortgages that are executed on or after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) be implemented in advance of any necessary conforming changes to regulations.

SEC. 207. (a) During fiscal year 2002, in the provision of rental assistance under section 8(o) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)) in connection with a program to demonstrate the economy and effectiveness of providing such assistance for use in assisted living facilities that is carried out in the counties of the State of Michigan specified in subsection (b) of this section, notwithstanding paragraphs (3) and (18)(B)(iii) of such section 8(o), a family residing in an assisted living facility in any such county, on behalf of which a public housing agency provides assistance pursuant to section 8(o)(18) of such Act, may be required, at the time the family initially receives such assistance, to pay rent in an amount exceeding 40 percent of the monthly adjusted income of the family by such a percentage or amount as the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines to be appropriate.

(b) The counties specified in this subsection are Oakland County, Macomb County, Wayne County, and Washtenaw County, in the State of Michigan.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

The text of the amendments en bloc is as follows:

Amendments en bloc offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, consisting of amendment No. 31, amendment No. 33, amendment No. 34, and amendment No. 35:

AMENDMENT NO. 31:

At the end of title II, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2 _____. For an additional amount for providing public housing agencies with tenant-based housing assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f) to provide amounts for incremental assistance under such section 8, and the amount otherwise provided by this title for “PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING CAPITAL FUND” is hereby reduced by, \$100,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 33:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to “NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION-SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY” insert the following: “Additionally, for the Space Grant program, to promote science, mathematics, and technology education for young people, undergraduate students, women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities in the State of Texas, for careers in aerospace science and technology, \$8,900,000.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 34:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to “NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION-SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY” insert the following: “Additionally, for the Minority University Research and Education Program to emphasize partnership awards that leverage the National Aeronautics and Space Administration’s investment by encouraging collaboration among the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Other Minority Universities, and other university researchers and educators, \$58,000,000.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 35:

In title III, at the end of the matter relating to “NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION-EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES” insert the following: “Additionally, for training young scientists and engineers, creating new knowledge, and developing cutting-edge tools that together will fuel economic prosperity and increase social well-being in the years ahead, \$662,000,000.”.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman’s amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for giving me the opportunity to engage in debate on these important issues on the floor of the House.

First let me say that I want to add my support for the Weldon amendment that was debated just previously and would hope to be one of those supporting the concept of public safety and the appreciation of our Federal fire service and all of our firefighters.

The issues I want to discuss this evening I believe warrant consideration; and I would hope, with good will, I would be able to have the point of order waived. But let me describe the reason for offering first of all amendment No. 31, which has to do with more funding for section 8. Realizing that there were funds that were not utilized under the section 8 program, my concern is that in various jurisdictions there are still long waiting lists for the section 8 certificates. It seems to me that with that in mind, we need to either revise the program or work with

the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make sure that this program actually utilizes all the dollars and gets to all the regional areas where there is a definitive need.

In my community, the waiting list has been extensive. I believe it is extremely important to assure that there is affordable housing to disperse to the hardworking poor in areas throughout the community for them to have a better quality of life.

My other amendments, 33, 34 and 35, deal with an important issue. I am on the Committee on Science and am well aware of the opportunity for dealing with these issues in the Committee on Science. I would say that we have done a very good job of that, but I have found that there is a great importance and great need for engaging our Historically Black Colleges and our Hispanic Serving Institutions in the important work that NASA does. The NASA space grant program is a program authorized by Congress in 1987 designed to increase the understanding, assessment, development and use of aeronautics and space resources. My interest is ensuring that this program has the dollars to be able to collaborate with those colleges.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in NASA Space Grant Program. The NASA Space Grant program is a program, authorized by Congress in 1987, designed to increase the understanding, assessment, development, and use of aeronautics and space resources. All 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have Space Grant Consortium programs in which more than 700 affiliates participate. These consortia form a network of colleges and universities, industry, state/local governments, and nonprofit organizations with interests in aerospace research, training, and education. This amendment is for an increase of \$8.9 million to the existing FY 2002 budget request. This increase would bring the existing budget from \$19.1 million to \$28 million.

I ask that my colleagues support me in this amendment.

In addition, I am particularly interested in the minority university research and education program that emphasizes the partnership awards with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's investment in collaboration with Historically Black Colleges and other minority universities. Even today we find that there is a dearth of trained minorities in the sciences. We have always talked about the importance of math and science in our elementary and secondary schools. It is equally important to establish criteria and curricula in our colleges to be able to network, if you will, with the kind of disciplines and employment needs that we have in the particular industry. These research grants that I would have asked for more money for would have provided that increased opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R.

2620, VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in the NASA Minority University Research and Education Program (MUREP). MUREP is a program that focuses primarily on expanding and advancing NASA's scientific and technological base through collaborative efforts with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Other Minority Universities (OMUs), including Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSI) and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCU).

NASA's outreach to Minority Institutions (MI) in FY 2002 will build upon the prior years' investments in MI research and academia infrastructure by expanding NASA's research base; contributing to the science, engineering and technology pipeline; and promoting educational excellence in all MUREP. These contributions include the education of a more diverse resource pool of scientific and technical personnel who will be well prepared to confront the technological challenges to benefit NASA and the Nation.

The strategic goals of this program are to (1) Foster research and development activities at MI's which contribute substantially to NASA's mission; (2) to create systemic and sustainable change at MI's through partnerships and programs that enhance research and education outcomes in NASA-related fields; (3) to prepare faculty and students at MI's to successfully participate in the conventional, competitive research and education process; and (4) To increase the number of students served by MI's to enter college and successfully pursue and complete degrees in NASA-related fields.

This amendment is for an increase of \$58 million to the existing FY 2002 budget request. This increase would bring the budget up from \$82.1 million to \$140.1 million.

I ask my colleagues support me in this amendment.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, might I say in amendment 35, that amendment has to do with the National Science Foundation education and human resources which goes, again, to the point of training young scientists and engineers, creating new knowledge and developing cutting-edge technology that would fuel the economic prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA-HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations for FY 2002.

I am requesting an increase in the National Science Foundation (NSF). NSF supports the nation's future and trains young scientists and engineers, creates new knowledge, and develop cutting-edge tools that together will fuel economic prosperity and increase social well-being in the years ahead. NSF will provide leadership in the President's Math and Science Partnership, and sustained investments in NSF's core programming will contribute to progress across science and engineering. The productivity of the U.S. scientific and engineering community—the fruits of which can be seen in the information technology, communications, and biotechnology industries—depends critically on NSF support of fundamental research.

This amendment proposes a 15 percent increase in NSF's budget over FY 2001, rather than the administration's proposed 1 percent. This amendment is for an increase of \$662

million. This increase would bring the FY 2002 budget up to \$5.1 billion.

I ask that my colleagues support me in this amendment.

The more people we have in this Nation from all walks of life understanding science, understanding technology, being able to create the new leverage for energy technology, space technology, health technology, I believe this Nation is better off. My amendments have that intent, and certainly I would hope that the chairman would see the interest that I have in science and particularly the interest that I have in, if nothing else, revising or looking at the section 8 program so that those individuals, as I move to housing, those individuals that want to get into section 8, that is a voucher to allow you to live in rental property, dispersed around the community, not necessarily in one area, enhancing your quality of life would do so.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to present this argument on the floor of the House, and I thank the ranking member as well.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has time reserved. I think we best allow her to close before I insist on my point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me simply say that what I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, is to have the opportunity to withdraw these amendments. I would like to be able to have the gentleman from New York speak and yield to me to ask a question.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Is the gentlewoman prepared to withdraw the amendments?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am interested in withdrawing the amendments, yes. What my general question is, as the gentleman knows, one of my amendments deals with section 8 housing which I know this committee has worked very hard on. The other amendments have to do with technology and Historically Black Colleges and minority colleges and the importance of those institutions having access to technical training. My simple question would be is that this subcommittee on appropriations, VA, HUD and other agencies, has in its mind and in its focus that these issues will remain important issues as we move toward finalizing this bill and that these issues are important in the committee and will not be forgotten, if you will.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentlewoman for continuing to yield. I think in this bill, we have really made an effort to make sure that Historically Black Colleges, Hispanic Serving Institutions and other minority programs are part of the focus of the National Science Foundation. I think there has been some criticism, and it is somewhat due, that the larger, better established research institutions around the country, the colleges, have benefited substantially. Certainly the country has benefited from that research, also.

But there has been a tradition on this subcommittee, beginning with Chairman Lou Stokes, to make sure that some of these resources are provided, that we encourage those institutions that I mentioned to expand their research capacity. I know the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has been a strong and consistent voice for these, also. We will always do that, and we would always welcome the gentlewoman's input as to whether or not we are meeting the goals that we have set.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired. The remaining time is controlled by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I believe we can all work together for these important issues. Training of our young people; providing funding for these colleges is very important; housing is very important. With that as I had asked, I hoped that we would waive the point of order, but I think it is more important for us to find common ground.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague's amendment to appropriate an additional \$662 million for the National Science Foundation's education and human resources account, to be used for training young scientists and engineers.

There is a pressing need for this level of funding, particularly as it relates to minority scientists and engineers. Recent reports have cited the "brain drain" as our current pool of scientists and engineers prepare to retire. Furthermore, it is clear that America's youth are not being prepared to pursue the rigorous disciplines associated with the hard sciences. American students perform comparably to other children in foreign countries in math and science until they reach the fourth grade level. However, there is a serious drop-off in their achievement and competitiveness in later years.

For minority students the case is even worse. Funding the NSF with increased resources will prepare communities and our nation to respond to the intellectual and real world challenges that await the engineers and scientists of the future. I urge my House colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw these four amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 36 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 54, after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 208. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by increasing the aggregate amount made available for "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—HOUSING CERTIFICATE FUND", increasing the amount specified under such item for incremental vouchers under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, reducing the amount specified under such item for rescission from unobligated balances remaining from funds previously appropriated to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, increasing the amount made available for "COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUND", and increasing the amount specified under such item for the community development block grant program, by \$100,000,000, \$100,000,000, \$324,000,000, \$224,000,000, and \$224,000,000, respectively.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me explain the purpose of this amendment, which is to add dollars, \$100 million, to increase the community block grant programs. This goes to a continuing issue that we are confronted with in Houston, Texas, based upon the devastation of Tropical Storm Allison.

First of all, let me rise in support of the \$1.3 billion that the committee has put in for additional funds for FEMA. Let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for protecting those dollars. We are in desperate need around the country. There are 31 disaster sites around the country. We do not know how many more may come about, because we are in hurricane season. I thank them particularly for the recovery that Houston is going through.

What we are beginning to face is a shortage of housing because many people are facing the determination or the assessment of the condition of their homes as to whether or not they can be built or rebuilt or not. We are in what we call the "buyout program" that FEMA has which requires a complicated process of percentages of whether or not your house has been

damaged or not damaged and whether or not you can have the opportunity to rebuild your house. In many instances, there is a need for down payment dollars or dollars to initiate the program. The programs are being designed at this point by Harris County government, and the city of Houston is assessing their status as to whether or not they will be participating in the buyout program. I simply wanted to have enough dollars for flexibility in this community development block grant program that if the city were to engage in participating in these programs, it would have the dollars to do so, any cities, to do so.

My amendment provides for funding so that the many disaster areas that may have lost housing and have to participate in a buyout program would have the resources through the flexibility of the community development and buyout program.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that provides \$50 million in funding for the Housing and Urban Development's Community Block Grant program from the HUD Section 8 Housing Certificate Fund.

As many of you know, last month Tropical Storm Allison ravaged our nation from Texas to the Northeast. This storm has been particularly hard on the residents of Harris County and the city of Houston. Although words cannot even begin to describe adequately the destruction of Houston and its surrounding areas, I will attempt to describe for you some of the havoc that the storm has wreaked.

The more than three feet of rain that fell on the Houston area beginning June 6 has caused at least 23 deaths in the Houston area and as many as fifty deaths in six states. Over 10,000 people have been left at least temporarily homeless during the flooding, many with no immediate hope of returning to their homes. More than 56,000 residents in 30 counties have registered for federal disaster assistance. The damage estimates in Harris County, Texas alone are \$4.88 billion and may yet increase.

Some of the most hard hit areas include the University of Houston, Texas Southern University, and the Kashmere Gardens neighborhood, a Houston enclave that is predominantly low income and possesses the fewest resources needed to bounce back from this once in a lifetime event.

The devastation of single family, mobile homes and multi family homes is almost unbelievable. It is estimated that in the city of Houston, 1,067 were destroyed, 5,098 need major repairs and 24,182 need minor repairs, for a total of 30,347 homes affected. In Harris County, it is estimated that 2,429 homes were destroyed, 4,545 need major repairs and 6,826 need minor repairs, for a total of 13,800.

Of the multi-family housing units in the city, 56 units were utterly destroyed, 150 need major repair and 672 need minor repairs. All totaled, over 3,500 homes were destroyed and nearly 10,000 need major repairs.

FEMA is bringing in trailers as temporary housing for some of those who are now homeless. A new staging site for travel trailers has been secured, and FEMA has received 441 travel trailers. There are currently 138 travel trailers occupied. I met with FEMA several weeks ago to request this relief for the multitudes of Houstonians that have been left

temporarily homeless. These temporary housing trailers, which will be an integral part of FEMA's temporary housing program, are being located at either the severely damaged homes of flood victims or at commercial mobile home parks in and around Houston. The city of Houston will ease permit provisions for these trailers.

The city and county are working diligently with FEMA and SBA to provide grants and loans for home buyout and repair. However, these funds fall short of what the county and city need to help its residents.

For example, through its buyout program, called the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, FEMA provides only government entities 75 percent of the buyout expense. Harris County and Houston must pay the rest, as the state of Texas has declined to lend financial assistance toward this effort. Further, the total eligible buyout funds are only 15 percent of FEMA's estimated total disaster costs.

Moreover, after closing costs and moving expenses, the local governments' buyout share may end up closer to half of all expenses for buyouts. Estimates are that the repair and buyout of homes may cost \$200 million or more. The local governments and low and moderate-income residents will scarcely have the resources to meet their expenses.

FEMA does also provide a limited source of funds to individuals and families to be used not only for essential home repair, but also to purchase destroyed clothing and other needed personal property, as well as to meet necessary medical, dental, transportation, and even funeral expenses. However, the average grant is only five to six thousand dollars, hardly enough in many cases to achieve the recovery that is needed. Therefore, I seek additional HUD Community Development Block Grant funds to be used to help supplement our local governments meet their obligations to their residents in need.

CDBG provides eligible metropolitan cities and urban counties with annual direct grants that they can use to revitalize neighborhoods, expand affordable housing and economic opportunities, and/or improve community facilities and services, principally to benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

Since 1974 CDBG has been the backbone of improvement efforts in many communities, providing a flexible source of annual grant funds for local governments nationwide—funds that they, with the participation of local citizens, can devote to the activities that best serve their own particular development priorities, provided that these projects either (1) benefit low- and moderate-income persons; (2) prevent or eliminate slums or blight; or (3) meet other urgent community development needs. The CDBG Entitlement Communities Program provides this Federal assistance to almost 1000 of the largest localities in the country.

As one of the Nation's largest Federal grant programs, the impact of CDBG-funded projects can be seen in the housing stock, the business environment, the streets and the public facilities of these entitlement communities. The rehabilitation of affordable housing has traditionally been the largest single use of CDBG funds.

Recipients of CDBG entitlement funds include local governments with 50,000 or more residents, other local government designated as central cities of metropolitan areas, and

urban counties with populations of at least 200,000 (excluding the population of entitled cities). Local governments may carry out all activities themselves or award some or all of the funds to private or public nonprofit organizations as well as for-profit entities.

Low and moderate-income persons, generally defined as members of a family earning no more than 80 percent of the area median income, benefit most directly and most often from CDBG-funded activities. Grantees must use at least 70 percent of CDBG funds for activities that principally benefit low- and moderate-income persons. This includes activities where either the majority of direct beneficiaries such as housing rehabilitation low- or moderate-income persons.

Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include acquiring real property (primarily land, buildings, and other permanent improvements to the property) for public purposes. This type of activity might include, for example, buying abandoned houses for rehabilitation or an old industrial site in a distressed neighborhood for redevelopment. CDBG also helps communities demolish property and clear sites to prepare the land for other uses.

These funds can also be used for reconstructing or rehabilitating housing and other property from homeless shelters to single-family homes and from playgrounds to shopping centers. CDBG enables communities to improve properties that have become less usable, whether due to age, neglect, natural disaster, or changing needs.

The committee has recommended a rescission of \$886 million for the Section 8 Housing Certificate Fund, stating that it is one of several programs that has built up a substantial balance of unspent funds. It is attempting to take these funds out of HUD until the programs spend the funds it has on hand. Well, I say, let HUD keep these funds and put them to a desperately needed use. This amendment will merely put those funds to a direly needed use.

Hence, I will be requesting in conference that this CDBG money be earmarked for the desperate needs of the homes devastated by Tropical Storm Allison, particularly in Houston and Harris County.

The people of Houston have made extraordinary efforts and acts of heroism during this disaster, as we recognized when we passed H. Res. 166 by a vote of 411–0. Houston contributes significantly to our national economy, as energy capital of the nation and a renowned center for medical care, and scientific and academic research. FEMA and SBA's efforts have been praiseworthy, contributing significant financial assistance and other much needed support. But to return to our potential, Houston needs to know that Congress continues to support its recovery. Although I look forward to this Chamber supporting Representative DELAY's request for \$1.3 billion in emergency contingency funding for FEMA, even if we approve these funds, their release would still be up to the administration.

The flood has devastated us emotionally, physically and financially. To return to our potential, we still need help. Houston needs to know that Congress continues to recognize. Now, it is our turn to continue to make sure that we do our share to help them.

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

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

Just briefly, the subcommittee has done its level best to provide additional section 8 housing vouchers. In fact, we have 34,000 new section 8 vouchers in the bill. As we have discussed earlier, this is a very tight allocation. There are really very few other places to go within the bill to move money from one account to another.

Since this increase certainly is well intended but there is no offset provided, I would obviously continue to re-serve my point of order.

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

□ 1930

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In conclusion, this is such an important issue for us, I totally agree and believe that the committee has been as fair as it can possibly be. I would argue that there is such an emergency and such a need for assistance in this housing program and giving flexibility in additional dollars, I would argue and ask that the point of order be waived and the amendment be allowed to go forward.

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

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2002 on July 26, 2001, House Report 107-165. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee allocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the Act.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my simple point on this amendment is that I think it is important that the idea of being able to assist flood victims is only at this time. I appreciate the fact that we have received additional dollars in FEMA. The housing represents an enormous crisis. Simply, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the point of order be considered waived in light of the emergency nature of the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair is authoritatively guided under section 312 of the Budget Act by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget that an amendment providing any net increase in new discretionary budget authority would cause a breach of the pertinent allocation of such authority.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill. As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the American Battle Monuments Commission, including the acquisition of land or interest in land in foreign countries; purchases and repair of uniforms for caretakers of national cemeteries and monuments outside of the United States and its territories and possessions; rent of office and garage space in foreign countries; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries, when required by law of such countries, \$30,466,000, to remain available until expended.

For the partial cost of construction of a new interpretive and visitor center at the American Cemetery in Normandy, France, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Commission shall ensure that the placement, scope and character of this new center protect the solemnity of the site and the sensitivity of interested parties including families of servicemen interred at the cemetery, the host country and Allied forces who participated in the invasion and ensuing battle: *Provided further*, That not more than \$1,000,000 shall be for non-construction related costs including initial consultations with interested parties and the conceptual study and design of the new center.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, as amended, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, \$8,000,000, \$5,500,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2002 and \$2,500,000 of which to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That, hereafter, there shall be an Inspector General at the Board who shall have the duties, responsibilities, and authorities specified in the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended: *Provided further*, That an individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of FEMA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES-3, \$80,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which \$500,000 shall be for technical assistance and training programs designed to benefit Native American communities, and up to \$8,948,000 may be used for administrative expenses, including administration of the New Markets Tax Credit, up to \$6,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to \$1,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$15,000,000.

**CONSUMER PRODUCT SAFETY COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

For necessary expenses of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable under 5 U.S.C. 5376, purchase of nominal awards to recognize non-Federal officials' contributions to Commission activities, and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$54,200,000.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

**NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS
OPERATING EXPENSES**

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 106-377, the Corporation for National and Community Service shall use such amounts of such funds as may be necessary to carry out the orderly termination of the programs, activities, and initiatives under the National Community Service Act of 1990 (Public Law 103-82) and the Corporation: *Provided*, that such sums shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation.

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 30 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

In title III, under the heading "NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS OPERATING EXPENSES"—

(1) strike "orderly termination of the"; and

(2) strike the proviso at the end.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it seems this evening that I am speaking a lot about the impact of Tropical Storm Allison in the Houston area and throughout Texas, but also as it has impacted Louisiana, the Southeastern Coast and many other States. We see now in the State of West Virginia that there has been extensive flooding over the last couple of days.

The reason why I rise is to present this amendment to ensure that there will be no language in this legislation that would suggest that the Corporation of National Service would be dismantled.

First of all, I believe that all of us are aware of the Corporation of National Service, the AmeriCorps volunteers. They are in our communities every single day. As I went about Houston during the initial days of the flood, and we were opening Red Cross centers and what we call DRCs, the recovery centers organized by FEMA, the complimentary volunteers that were there were the AmeriCorps young people and National Service Corporation individuals who were there every single day helping the flood victims.

As I noted to you, we have got about \$4.88 billion in damage, and growing. Over 20,000 homes that have been damaged. But I have seen AmeriCorps working in many other capacities, in classrooms, daycare centers, cleaning up parks, working side-by-side with the respected citizens of the respective areas they are in.

This amendment is a very simple one and asks that we not consider this agency to be one dismantled and to be able to provide the support for the agency that I would hope all of us would desire to do.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) seek time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am not in opposition to the amendment. I do seek to control the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) will control 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, this AmeriCorps, similar to how the program has been handled in the last several years, the House has come into this bill without funding for AmeriCorps. It has been resolved in conference each time with funding being provided. I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that that is the way that this issue will be resolved again this year.

The President has spoken in support of AmeriCorps. There are many advocates for the program within the House and in the Senate. The language that the gentlewoman deals with in the bill would strike language that deals with

the elimination or the phasing-out of the AmeriCorps program. I do not think that that is necessary within the bill because of recent history, the fact that AmeriCorps is ultimately funded in conference.

So, assuming that that will happen, there is no need for that language. I think it is a positive amendment, it has no deleterious effect on the bill, and, for that reason, Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the Corporation for National Service changes lives. It gets people of all ages to volunteer, and, as they volunteer, to improve the lives of others. While they are doing that, they improve their own lives. At the same time, the corporation volunteer program fills unmet local community needs.

In my district, the sixth district of California, AmeriCorps volunteers are reading tutors in Larkspur; students from Sonoma State University volunteer for a Vista program in Rohnert Park; AmeriCorps sponsors a multicultural alliance and teacher fellowship program in Ross, California; and seniors in Sonoma County donate their time and wisdom through the local Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, RSVP.

We have been lucky to get assistance also from California Statewide AmeriCorps programs. Last summer, AmeriCorps volunteers from Los Angeles came to my district and spent a week clearing the property around the historic Carrillo Adobe. They have done so much. They contribute so much.

Forty other volunteers assisted at the Redwood Empire Food Bank. But the Corporation for National Service and AmeriCorps aren't important only for the good they do in our communities, or for the experiences of the individual volunteers. At a time when too many Americans are defined by their differences, the Corporation for National Service, and AmeriCorps, give thousands of volunteers, and the communities where they serve, an opportunity to meet across the barriers of education, race, and income, to work together for a common good. The corporation for National Service is one of this Nation's best investments in a future of good citizens, and we should be supporting it, not trying to eliminate it.

Mr. Chairman, I was glad to hear the chairman agree with the sponsor of this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her leadership in working with the program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the distinguished ranking member.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to rise and compliment the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for this amendment. It brings to the attention of the body the fact that in this bill this account, the Corporation for National and Community Service, was not funded. It also gives us an opportunity to express our support for it. The chairman, I know, is very supportive of this program and has in the past taken the lead in making sure it was restored in conference.

The simple fact is, and I want to assure the gentlewoman for the chairman, that there was an outlay problem in this bill. The Senate has more outlays than we do, \$300 million. We have fewer outlays than the Senate, so this program was not funded, because it was known that it would be supported in conference.

I would like to say that the chairman, as I stated earlier, has taken the lead in restoring this in the past; and I have all the confidence in the world that he will in the future. He is extremely supportive of community service.

The corporation funds some wonderful programs; AmeriCorps, Points of Light, it funds at \$10 million; Youth Life foundation, it funds at \$1.5 million; America's Promise, it funds at \$7.5 million; Communities in Schools, \$5 million; and Boys and Girls Clubs at \$2.5 million.

These are very worthwhile programs targeted to our youth principally, and they certainly merit our support and the funding. However, more funding certainly could be used in these areas. This program is an excellent program for focusing in on our youth and funding worthwhile programs that are working to ensure that we support organizations that get them off on the right foot.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I will close by simply saying this is like the domestic Peace Corps. I thank the chairman and ranking member. I think all Americans support this volunteer effort, helping our young people to be part of the volunteer spirit, similar to the Peace Corps. I believe these are very vital programs. I hope my colleagues will support us, and I thank the chairman for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment to this section of the bill H.R. 2620, VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations for FY 2002.

It has been the habit of this House to appropriate little or no funds for the Community of National Service and this appropriations legislation before the House today has the same deficit. This situation is disingenuous because those of us who remember the history of the appropriations process understand that funding for the Community of National Service will be funded by several hundred million dollars.

I am appreciative for the work done by this office of the Executive Branch and know that many communities throughout the United

States have benefited from its existence. I am particularly grateful for the assistance provided by AmeriCorps Volunteers, who were directed to the Houston area by the Corporation of National and Community Service. The Corporation's three major service initiatives are AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve America and the National Senior Service Corps.

Over 200 AmeriCorps members from four regional campuses responded to a call-up from the American Red Cross to assist victims of Tropical Storm Allison in Texas and Louisiana. The members are serving as first-line Family Assistance Representatives, helping families to receive immediate aid and to identify each family's long term needs. The corps members are also operating emergency assistance shelters, working in soup kitchens, and delivering meals to people affected by the flooding. Additionally, Spanish speaking members are helping translate emergency assistance forms for people who don't speak English. The members are working in ten emergency assistance shelters in the Houston, TX vicinity and three shelters around Baton Rouge, LA.

Overall, the storm caused upwards of \$4.88 billion in damage to Houston and surrounding Harris County. Over 20,000 homes were damaged by the flooding as the storm dumped over 36 inches of rain in some areas with some houses reporting over seven feet of water in them.

It is unfortunate that the Appropriations Committee zeroed out the account for the Community Development Fund, when the Administration requested \$411 million in funding for FY 2002. My amendment would restore the program and allow them to continue their work on the behalf of communities throughout the United States.

AmeriCorps, the domestic Peace Corps engages more than 40,000 Americans in intensive, results-driven service each year. We're teaching children to read, making neighborhoods safer, building affordable homes, and responding to natural disasters through more than 1000 projects. Most AmeriCorps members are selected by and serve with projects like Habitat for Humanity, the American Red Cross, and Boys and Girls Clubs, and many more local and national Organizations. Others serve in AmeriCorps*VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) and AmeriCorps*NCCC (the National Civilian Community Corps). After their term of service, AmeriCorps members receive education awards to help finance college or pay back student loans.

AmeriCorps is a win-win program that I hope the Rule for this legislation will allow it to continue in its work to help make America a better place to live. Homelessness in America continues to be a problem that seems to lack a broad commitment to see and end to this blight on the American Dream. Attempting to attribute homelessness to any one cause is difficult and misleading. More often than not, it is a combination of factors that culminates in homelessness. Sometimes these factors are not observable or identifiable even to those who experience them first hand (Wright, Rubin and Devine, 1998). For example, lack of affordable housing is a factor repeatedly cited as contributing to homelessness (Hertzberg, 1992; Johnson, 1994; Metraux and Culhane, 1999; National Coalition for the Homeless, 1999-F). However, lack of affordable housing is often representative of a collectivity of other

problems. Other key factors include the inability to earn a living wage, poverty, welfare reform, unemployment and/or domestic violence that can combine to form a situation in which even the most basic housing is not affordable.

The support that AmeriCorps volunteers provided to Houston area residences must be supported by funds from the federal government in allowing families to have homes to live in after the damaged causes by Tropical Storm Allison. I have an amendment that increases funds for HUD's Community Development Block Grant Program to be used as matching funds for home repair and buyout for Harris County and the City of Houston citizens who have been displaced by Tropical Storm Allison.

In time of great difficulty the Corporation of National Service has been there to assist citizens of our nation to put their lives back into order. It is time that this House stop using the Corporation of National Service as a budget gimmick to hide the fact that the VA-HUD appropriations legislation that will pass is in fact in violation of the budget agreement reached by the House earlier this year.

This is the reason why we must revisit many fiscal issues as they relate to our nation's surplus and its obligations. I ask that my colleagues support me in removing language from this bill, which gives the false impression that this office will be discontinued.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, we are prepared to accept the gentlewoman's amendment. We believe it is constructive.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$5,000,000, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2003.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims as authorized by 38 U.S.C. 7251-7298, \$13,221,000, of which \$895,000 shall be available for the purpose of providing financial assistance as described, and in accordance with the process and reporting procedures set forth, under this heading in Public Law 102-229.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES, ARMY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, for maintenance, operation, and improvement of Arlington National Cemetery and Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, including the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and not to exceed \$1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$22,537,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended, \$70,228,000.

AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i), 111(c)(4), and 111(c)(14) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended; section 118(f) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended; and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, \$78,235,000, to be derived from the Hazardous Substance Superfund Trust Fund pursuant to section 517(a) of SARA (26 U.S.C. 9507): *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited health care providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2002, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$680,410,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to

members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,014,799,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPSS

Mrs. CAPPSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mrs. CAPPSS:

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT", after the last dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$7,200,000)".

In title III, in the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND", after the last dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$7,200,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPSS).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase by \$7.2 million Federal efforts to clean up leaking underground storage tanks. The amendment pays for this increase by cutting the same amount from the EPA's Environmental Programs and Management Account. It is my intention that this funding would come from the Regional Management Programs, which has been increased by nearly \$20 million under the bill.

I am offering this amendment with the hope that we can increase our attention to the problem that MTBE contamination is causing to drinking water across this country. While I cannot, under the rules of the House, specify that this funding be used for MTBE cleanup, it is my hope the House will send a clear message that we want to do something about this huge problem.

MTBE is a fuel additive designed to reduce the production of smog by increasing the burning efficiency of gasoline. Unfortunately, due to its unique properties, MTBE has become one of the leading water contamination problems in the United States. MTBE makes water smell and taste like turpentine, even at very low levels, and has resulted in the closing of important drinking water supplies all across the country.

For example, in my district, the coastal town of Cambria, California, is facing a real calamity. MTBE contamination has shut down two municipal drinking water wells the Community Services District has used as back-up sources during dry seasons and droughts.

□ 1945

The district has spent more than \$1 million to research the problem.

Cambria is also considering the addition of a desalination plant to ensure an adequate supply of drinking water, and that will cost millions more.

In fact, there are 38 MTBE contaminated sites in San Luis Obispo County and another 86 in Santa Barbara County, both in my district. However, Mr. Chairman, MTBE contaminated drinking water is a huge problem not just in my district, but across the country. Santa Monica, California has lost about 80 percent of its drinking supply and spends a quarter of a million dollars per year buying replacement supplies.

The South Tahoe Public Utility District has shut down 13 of its 34 drinking water wells due to MTBE contamination. Twenty-one of Wisconsin's 71 counties have detected MTBE in groundwater in potable wells. In Iowa, it has been detected in 23 percent of urban alluvial wells. In Maryland, over 149 domestic public water systems are contaminated by MTBE, and the list goes on and on.

Owners and operators of underground tanks are responsible for cleanup, and that is where the responsibility should lie. But the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust fund provides additional cleanup resources, especially when no responsible party can be found or when the responsible party is no longer viable.

It may also be used to enforce corrective actions and recover costs spent from the fund for cleanup activities. Funded by one-tenth of a cent tax per gallon of gasoline, this LUST fund is a backstop to ensure prompt and appropriate cleanup of leaking tanks. This tax is bringing in close to \$190 million this year. Mr. Chairman, at the end of fiscal year 2002, the administration expects the balance in the LUST fund to be nearly \$2 billion. The interest on this balance is bringing the trust fund another \$87 million, yet the bill before us appropriates only \$72 million to support communities in their efforts to clean up leaking tanks. That is \$96,000 less than we appropriated last year, and that is about \$15 million less than the interest we expect to earn on the trust fund balance this year.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can do better than that. The American people pay taxes on gasoline and other fuels, in part to ensure that these underground tanks are not polluting their drinking water, so we should use those funds for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, last week the Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously adopted my amendment to authorize up to \$200 million out of the LUST fund for MTBE inspections and cleanup. We took this action because MTBE contamination is presenting a real problem to thousands of communities across this country. My amendment today is only a small step toward addressing those cleanup needs when we should be taking a giant leap. So I would urge my colleagues to support this common sense amendment.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise actually in support of the gentlewoman's amendment and am prepared to accept it for our bill.

This is a good idea. It is a little tough on the Environmental Protection Agency because it will have to find these funds out of existing appropriated funds but, at the same time, it shows that the Congress considers this issue a very high priority. I know members of the subcommittee, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN), has spoken long and strong in favor of doing a better, more aggressive job on leaking underground storage tanks, and especially with this issue of MTBE, which pollutes our drinking water. This amendment would also provide funds to orphaned sites where the owner cannot be located or otherwise cannot be identified.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious problem. Communities all over the country worry about this issue and suffer from this issue, and we need to do a vigilant job in protecting our groundwater supplies which, once they are polluted, can be next to impossible to abate the problem.

So I support the gentlewoman's amendment and am prepared to accept it.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say how much I appreciate the support of the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. PALLONE:

In the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

In the item relating to "ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS", after the 1st and 7th dollar amounts, insert the following: "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say, first of all, that this is a bipartisan amendment. It is sponsored by myself and the gentlemen from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and (Mr. SMITH), my two colleagues on the Republican side.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, Congress unanimously passed the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act; it is also known as the Beaches Act. The Beaches Act established consistent water quality standards for beach water and provides grants to help States develop and implement water quality testing and notification programs to warn the public about unsafe conditions at our Nation's beaches.

The reason we needed the Beaches Act and why it is so important is because beach waters are often contaminated by pathogens, which are disease-causing bacteria and viruses found in human and animal wastes from polluted runoffs, storm drains, sewer overflows and malfunctioning septic systems. These pathogens can cause ear, nose and throat infections, dysentery, hepatitis. The risks of infections are higher for children, the elderly, and those with weak immune systems.

Just as an example, Mr. Chairman, during 1999, there were more than 6,000 beach closings and advisories posted at U.S. beaches. Since 1988, more than 36,000 beach closures and health advisories have been issued across the Nation, but only 11 States regularly monitor most or all of their beaches and notify the public. One of the reasons why this amendment is sponsored by three Members from New Jersey is because we had New Jersey as an example of the type of monitoring, and we used this as an example in trying to get this bill passed last year.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It increases EPA's budget by \$3 million for grants to States for beach water quality testing and notification. Last year, Congress unanimously passed the Beaches Act, and the Beaches Act authorizes \$30 million in EPA grants. However, even though it authorizes \$30 million, I think the President recommended only \$2 million. The committee was generous in increasing it to \$7 million. But we really think that a lot more money is needed and, if we are able to increase this by \$3 million to \$10 million, it would really make a big difference.

Mr. Chairman, if I could just say a few more things. In some ways, I see it almost as an unfunded mandate, that now we are asking States to do all of these things, but we are not providing them with enough money, and that is why I think this amendment is very important. I should also mention that there are 23 national and regional organizations, environmental groups representing millions of Americans who support this.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from New Jersey and his colleagues from New Jersey who have led this fight to provide additional funds. This is a brand new program. It was authorized just last year, called the Beach Act. It is very popular legislation, it is important legislation, and it is clear that the subcommittee considered it a priority. It was authorized at a \$2 million level. We added \$5 million to raise funding to \$7 million, and this amendment would add another \$3 million, bringing a brand new program a fivefold increase in its first year. That is a pretty good test of the popularity and the importance of the program.

The funds, however, will have to come out of the Environmental Protection Agency's State Travel Assistance Grants. Those are very competitive funds. There is strong support and demand on those funds by Members for projects within their districts. So this will put somewhat of a hardship not only on EPA, but also on some of the Members' projects. But this is, we think, an acceptable amendment and we are prepared to support it.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his support and the statement that he made. I understand the limitations under which the subcommittee is living and the problem with the offset, but I do appreciate the fact that he, first of all, was willing to increase the amount from what the President recommended and now also go along with this amendment.

So with that, I thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, just a note of clarification; I misspoke. The funding comes out of the Environmental Programs and Management Fund, which is EPA's fund and goes into the State Travel Assistance Grant. The gentleman understood clearly that I was in support of his amendment. I am in support of it. We accept it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support for the Pallone-Saxton-Smith Amendment, which seeks an additional \$3 million to the EPA budget for enhancing beach water monitoring programs. These programs are authorized under the BEACH Act (Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000), signed last year as Public Law 106-284.

Beach water monitoring programs are critical to the health of the millions of people who swim in our oceans. Since 1988, more than 36,000 beaches have been closed due to contaminated water. During 1999 alone, more than 6,000 beaches were closed because beach waters were found contaminated with pathogens, or disease-causing bacteria and viruses.

Pathogens are found in human and animal waste from polluted runoff, storm drains, sewer overflows and malfunctioning septic systems. When swimmers are unknowingly exposed to these pathogens, they can become sick from a whole host of diseases—gastroenteritis, dysentery, and hepatitis among others. Children, who frequent our beaches, are among the highest at risk because their immune systems are not as fully developed.

If we do not take action to keep our shores safe and clean, the dream of a family vacation can become a nightmare of disease and illness. Many of these pathogens are invisible and undetectable to the naked eye. Without testing, there is no way of knowing if beach waters are too contaminated for swimming, surfing, and other recreational activities.

Yet, until last year, no national standards were in place to monitor beaches for pathogen contamination to ensure the water is safe. As a result, Congress unanimously passed the BEACH Act (P.L. 106-284) to establish consistent water quality standards for our beaches. The bill also provides grants to help states develop and implement water quality testing and notification programs about unsafe conditions at our beaches.

The fact of the matter is that our beaches are national assets that deserve national protection. Just like our national parks, our beaches are not enjoyed solely by those who live near them. In fact, just the opposite is true: our beaches are visited by tens of millions of people from all over the country. Foreign tourists come from all parts of the globe to visit our coasts and beaches, including the Jersey Shore.

Our nation's beaches contribute heavily to our national economy—four times as many people visit our nation's beaches each year than visit all of our National Parks combined. And yet Congress provides copious funding for national parks—as it should. It is estimated that 75% of Americans will spend some portion of their vacation at the beach this year. Beaches are the most popular destination for foreign visitors to our country as well. The amount of money spent by beach-going tourists creates an extensive economic benefit—a portion of which goes back to the Federal government in the form of income and payroll taxes.

Clean and safe beaches are not just good public health policy, clean beaches are also good for the economy. In my State of New Jersey, in 1999, tourism brought \$27.7 billion to the state—out of the 167 million trips made to New Jersey in 1999, 101 million were to the Shore area.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all members of Congress to support the Pallone-Saxton-Smith Amendment which adds an additional \$3 million to the EPA budget for beach water monitoring programs, for a total of \$10 million to states and localities to monitor pathogen contamination. Because, a trip to the beach should not result in a trip to the hospital.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provi-

sions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$34,019,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$25,318,000, to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; \$1,270,000,000 (of which \$100,000,000 shall not become available until September 1, 2002) to remain available until expended, consisting of \$635,000,000, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), as amended by Public Law 101-508, and \$635,000,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$11,867,000 shall be transferred to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2003, and \$36,891,000 shall be transferred to the "Science and technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2003.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BARCIA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. BARCIA:

Page 62, line 21, after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$140,000,000)".

Page 64, line 5, after the dollar amount insert the following: "(increased by \$140,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

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

The amendment that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and I are offering today is a simple one. It would provide funding for an authorized grant program that has the potential to benefit communities in every district across this country. These communities are currently struggling with the pervasive and devastating problem of sewer overflows from both combined and sanitary sewer systems. Sewer overflow control programs are often the largest public works projects that communities will face.

The amendment itself is a mere down payment on the funding that this body authorized in the Wet Weather Water Quality Act for fiscal year 2002, just last December. However, I am hopeful that in conference, more money will be found to fully fund the act at the level of \$750 million or, alternatively, at least at the President's budget request of \$450 million.

This amendment, which has bipartisan support, is about protecting the health of our citizens from untreated sewage, helping communities provide safe and clean drinking water to tens of millions of Americans, and protecting the environment. The families, residents and businesses who are subjected to sewer overflows nationwide deserve nothing less.

Fundamentally, this amendment is about our collective commitment to ensuring the availability of safe, clean, potable water to communities throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of the Members who share that commitment, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), my colleague and good friend who has worked tirelessly on this issue. I appreciate his continued leadership. I would also like to especially thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and all of the Members who have expressed support for fully funding the grant program. I also want to especially recognize and thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member, in continuing to work with us to find opportunities like this to fund the CSO, SSO grant program.

Mr. Chairman, every community, from Seattle, Washington, to Wheeling, West Virginia, to Syracuse, New York, to Indianapolis, Indiana, stands to benefit from this program. I have heard from many communities, and this is just a small representation of the communities who have written to me expressing their strong desire to have this program fully funded.

President Bush also acknowledged the real problem facing communities in his budget stating, "To address Federal mandates to control the biggest remaining municipal waste water problem, funds should be used for the newly authorized sewer overflow control grants."

□ 2000

I spoke with a constituent just last week, Craig Tetreau from Marquette, Michigan. They have a \$3 million problem. Around here, \$3 million may not sound like a lot of money. However, 763 families live in the city of Marquette, and they have an annual budget of \$2 million for all city services. If they do not make the upgrades, the State has threatened to construct the necessary upgrade at a cost of \$11,000 per household.

Similarly the village of Fairgrove, with 233 families, has \$1.5 million in upgrading costs.

In Saginaw, Michigan, sewer rates jumped from \$10.40 a month in 1989 to over \$39 a month in 1999. Another 50 percent rate increase is anticipated. Recently, sewer rates were 2.64 percent of the median household income alone. This is an enormous burden for which Saginaw, like so many other communities across the country, needs help in the form of Federal grant funding assistance that would be provided by this amendment.

I urge every Member to support this critically important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will clarify that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) was recognized for 10 minutes for this debate, and a Member in opposition will have 10 minutes for this debate.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA). We have worked very, very closely with him on a number of issues within this bill. I know he is deeply concerned about water quality in the Great Lakes and about the quality of drinking water in his own community. These are things that he has worked very hard on and cares deeply about.

But what he is asking us to do is to choose which way, almost equivalent to asking us which way would we like to die, would we rather be hung or burned to death. This is a tough choice.

The Superfund program is terribly important, and it is very, very strongly supported by Members. We all know the combined sewer overflow problem this Nation has is in the hundreds of billions of dollars. We cannot take from one and give to the other either way. We have funds set aside for Superfund. There is not enough money, but we have done the best we could.

There is money set aside for combined sewer overflows through the Clean Water grants and special grants, close to \$1.5 billion. It is not enough. There is more need out there. We all understand that. But we cannot take from Superfund \$150 million, or \$140 million. If we did, it would dramatically reduce the pace of Superfund clean-ups across the country. Every aspect of the Superfund program, but particularly the cleanup or Response program, would be impacted, and none of the agency's Superfund goals would be met, so the program would suffer dramatically. Funding to State programs would be reduced; communities would wait longer for their sites to be addressed.

I know there are a number of Members who feel very strongly about

Superfund issues. Superfund sites do a lot of damage to the land, air and water. We have to make these projects a priority. We would lose 50 to 100 ongoing cleanup projects which would be slowed or stopped. The EPA would be unable to start toxic waste clean-ups at dozens of Superfund sites. Construction and completion would fall by one-third. Up to 150 potential sites identified by States would not be evaluated for their potential risks to human health and the environment.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Superfund program is funded at \$1.2 billion, which is barely enough. It is at the President's request, and barely enough to cover the responsibilities which Superfund is charged to cover. We are talking about toxic waste cleanup; we are talking about carcinogenic substances that are real hazards to people.

I know the gentleman from Michigan had a terrible time in finding offsets in this bill. If we try to do it, it is extremely difficult. Even though he has gone to this account, I know he strongly supports the Superfund program.

Having said that, the gentleman raises a very important issue here. The funding need for water infrastructure is one of the most pressing issues addressed in this bill. A needs survey conducted by the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates our wastewater needs to be approximately \$12 billion annually to replace aging facilities and comply with existing and future Federal water regulations. The funding in this bill does not even begin to touch that need.

Controlling sewer overflows continues to be a priority mandate imposed on communities by the EPA regulatory and enforcement programs, and it will continue to be a financing issue that communities around the country will have to confront.

It is terribly difficult for communities to even begin to contemplate being able to marshall the resources to solve this problem. So I understand the issue that the gentleman is bringing before the Congress today. It is an important issue. I compliment him bringing it to our attention.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) has been at the forefront of fighting for funding for water projects and for wastewater overflow projects, and he is to be commended for that.

However, I am reluctantly going to oppose his amendment because of the offset that he proposes, and hope that in the future we will find additional funds to address the very excruciating need that he brings to our attention.

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I want to voice my strong support for his amendment seeking to provide relief for local communities that today are shouldering up to 90 percent of the burden of revamping their wastewater treatment facilities.

The American Waterworks Association unveiled its new study that predicts required spending of more than \$250 billion over the next 30 years to take care of this problem. In the last Congress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) led the charge in the Congress with the Wet Weather Quality Act, together with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL). The language is included in the Labor-HHS bill over in the Senate that provided a landmark 2-year grant program to be administered by the EPA.

We are not alone. We had a little hearing in front of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment earlier this year, and Administrator Whitman was in front of us. We said they have to provide money for the State revolving loan fund and this grant money as well, because communities cannot take it across the country.

The President put in \$450 million in his budget for this program. While I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), who certainly understands the program and the problems as well as anybody in this Congress, the fact is that while the subcommittee has funded the State revolving loan fund and is willing to give loans to communities, there is no grant program in place that would take care of this problem across the Nation.

I want to just bring up one example, not in my district, but it is in Worcester, Massachusetts. To build a single-family home, one has to pay a \$16,000 tap-in fee. Who in this Congress, Mr. Chairman, could pay \$16,000 to flush the toilet to build a single-family new house? But that is the problem facing not only the folks in Worcester, Massachusetts; but it is the problem facing all of America today if we do not do something.

I would say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, if we go back to the Contract with America in the very first bill the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) introduced, the unfunded mandate legislation, this Congress, this Federal Government, has mandated all of these initiatives upon the wastewater treatment plants of the small municipalities in this country, but has not sent the money.

It is time to send the money. It is time to pass the Barcia amendment. It is too bad that the rules indicate we have to make an offset on the basis of the Superfund allocation, but this money needs to be sent to the small communities of America.

I praise the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), and I urge an aye vote.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin where the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) left off. The Clean Water Act provides very specific mandates for municipalities.

I was a mayor, mayor of the third largest city in the State of New Jersey. There is no way that the Patersons of this country, smaller, larger, can respond to this multibillion dollar need within our communities. Our clean water is threatened, is threatened if we do not begin to address, and we have, this problem.

I am positive that the chairman and the ranking member are sensitive to these needs. But being sensitive to the needs, we need to take it to the next level. We need to be in every mayor's office, in every council chambers throughout America when these issues are coming up.

Crumbling systems exist throughout America. We need to respond. The cost is great. If we do not do it, the cost will be even greater.

One segment of the President's proposed budget I was particularly pleased with, which was where the President expressed his support for the newly authorized sewer overflow control grants. H.R. 828, which passed the Congress, authorized \$750 million in fiscal years 2002 and 2003. We are trying to give cities and towns across America the resources they need to clean up their sewer systems and comply with the Clean Water Act.

I am hopeful that we can work with the committee to ensure that full funding is included in the final bill to address this issue, which is important in every district and in every State in this Nation. We must follow through on our commitment to local governments to assist in their wet-weather infrastructure challenges, and I support this critical down payment.

I recognize the hard work of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this amendment. Grant funding to help communities control sewer overflows was approved and authorized in the last Congress; but in this Congress, in this House, in this budget, no funds have been set aside at all. Congress must follow through and fund this important program.

Back home in my district, I can point to the city of Everett, Snohomish, Anacordis, three cities with some of the highest sewer rates in my district.

Everett alone has invested in excess of \$12 million since 1990 towards reducing and controlling CSOs; and despite the substantial financial commitment, nearly \$20 million more is required for the city to reach full compliance with all local, State, and Federal mandates.

Federal funding will be crucial to the city's efforts to reach full compliance, so it is my hope that this Congress can step up to help our communities by providing this funding.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of their communities, to vote in favor of this amendment. I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for his work on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in closing. I have discussed this with my ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). We both appreciate not only the sentiment but the leadership that has been provided on this issue. It is a real big issue for the country.

But to force us to choose between Superfund and CSOs is just too tough a choice to make. We would urge the gentleman, with all due respect, to withdraw the amendment; and he should continue to work with the authorizing committee and with the Committee on Appropriations to see if we can do a better job of meeting this commitment. It is a question of allocation and choices, and we just cannot justify the choice he is asking us to make. I would ask again that he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I rise today in support of the Barcia/Latourette amendment to HR 2620. This amendment would increase the bills funding for EPA Water Improvement Grants—with the intention that these funds would be used for grants for combined sewer overflows.

Mr. Chairman, the condition of our Nation's wastewater collection and treatment facilities is alarming. In its 1999 clear water needs survey, the EPA estimated that nearly \$200 billion will be needed over the next 20 years to address wastewater infrastructure problems in our communities.

In Lynchburg, Virginia, the cost of improving 174 miles of combined sewers that serve 11.4 square miles exceeds \$275 million in 2000 dollars. This equates to \$16,875 per ratepayer in a city whose average income is \$27,500. These CSO improvements are by far the largest capital projects the city has ever undertaken.

Given this great need, I believe the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist communities that are trying to fix their problems and comply with Federal water quality mandates.

I strongly urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment which will increase funding for the Clean Water Revolving Loan Program and help cities in need of meeting Federal mandates.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project, \$72,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$15,000,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,433,899,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$1,200,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the "Act"); \$850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; \$75,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; \$30,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; \$200,000,000 shall be for making grants for the construction of wastewater and water treatment facilities and groundwater protection infrastructure in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the report accompanying this Act; and \$1,078,899,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public

Law 104-134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities of which and subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, \$25,000,000 shall be for making grants for enforcement and related activities (in addition to other grants funded under this heading), and \$25,000,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2002 and hereafter, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104-182 shall remain in effect: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2002 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2002, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to section 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2002, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under Title VI of the Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language beginning with "except that" on page 64, line 12, through "drinking water contaminants" on line 17 violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House prohibiting legislating on an appropriations bill.

The language I have cited says that notwithstanding the provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act, none of the money in the fiscal year 2002 VA-HUD appropriations bill or even previous appropriation acts may be reserved by the EPA administrator for health effect studies on drinking water contaminants.

The language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill, and as such, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

I therefore insist on my point of order.

□ 2015

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds that this provision ex-

plicitly supersedes existing law. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2002, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California at this point?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the original amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 37 Offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 92, strike lines 3 through 9.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI: Page 67, line 22, strike "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification offered by the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment, as modified, is as follows:

Page 67, line 22, strike "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$20,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California Ms. PELOSI, and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would ensure that the Environmental Protection Agency's program for registering pesticides and reassessing pesticide tolerances are funded at the same level in fiscal year 2002 as in the current year. These programs are important to ensure that pesticides used in our crops, on our pets, and in our homes and businesses are thoroughly reviewed, and tolerances are set at safe levels.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with further discussion of the amendment, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), for his extraordinary leadership in taking what might have been a controversial amendment and having us come to some peace on this issue among all the various equities that must weigh in this.

I certainly wish to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership and cooperation, and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the original author of the Food Quality Protection Act for their leadership. Certainly, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) for his representing the balances between the environment and ag concerns, which are now in harmony, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his participation and leadership.

And before I go on, I would like to say that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) took the time to do this while playing a very active leadership role as a named sponsor of the legislation that is very important to all of us, the Patients' Bill of Rights. So I particularly wanted to acknowledge his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, it is especially important that we protect the health of infants and children by ensuring that pesticide exposure levels safeguard their health. The Food Quality Protection Act was designed with special protections for children in mind. We support this funding to ensure that EPA has adequate resources to review chemicals and ensure that they meet new safety standards set by the FQPA, the Food Quality Protection Act.

This amendment would ensure that the EPA has an additional \$3 million to ensure that pesticides are adequately assessed for safety. I have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle on this amendment and believe that any controversy has been resolved, as I mentioned earlier. It is my understanding that this amendment is acceptable to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York.

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

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. The gentlewoman's amendment will maintain current funding levels for EPA's pesticide reregistration and tolerance assessment programs and is acceptable to the committee.

Collection of \$20 million in maintenance fees will ensure that reregistrations and tolerance reassessments are completed in a timely manner with appropriate scientific analysis, ensuring that our farmers have the tools they need, and that human health is protected.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the dis-

tinguished chairman for his statement and for agreeing to this amendment.

I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman regarding EPA's program to register new, reduced-risk pesticides. It is my understanding that there are negotiations underway to provide an additional \$6 million in funding for assessing reduced-risk pesticides and strengthening EPA's scientific analysis on exposure of farm workers and exposure in drinking water.

We would like to continue discussions on these issues with the intention of addressing them in conference on the fiscal year 2002 bill. We would also ask that the chairman consider providing his support for funding of these programs for 5 years, but we are addressing the fiscal year 2002 bill now.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I thank her for bringing this matter to our attention.

Reduced-risk pesticides can displace pesticides that present higher risks, and they help ensure that our farmers have a complete toolbox to control the pests that attack our crops. I look forward to working with the gentlewoman to consider additional funds for reduced-risk pesticides in the conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the chairman for his support of this amendment and for agreeing to work together to ensure that EPA can proceed with these programs that are so important to our farmers and to the safety of our food supply.

I wonder if our distinguished ranking member wishes to weigh in on this subject. Does the gentleman have any objection to the colloquy?

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I have no objection and compliment the gentlewoman for her efforts in this area. She has been very effective, as is evidenced by the chairman's accepting her amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member. And I want to once again acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the author of the Food Quality Protection Act; the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), for his leadership; the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM); and others, who have worked to resolve some of the controversy in this.

It is our anticipation that if we have this full funding, the \$20 million for this year, that the EPA will be able to meet its statutory requirement. We, of course, want the additional \$6 million and look forward to working with the chairman and the ranking member to get that in conference with the support that I mentioned here in a bipartisan way, and hope that the EPA can, over the course of the next year, demonstrate that these were sufficient

funds to meet their statutory requirements under the Food Quality Protection Act.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to rise in support of this amendment offered by my friend and colleague, Ms. PELOSI.

As many of my colleagues know, I am a relatively new grandmother. My grandson, Teddy, is eighteen months old—old enough to sit at the table with his parents and eat many of the things they eat.

But Teddy is, of course, much smaller than his parents and his vital systems are not fully developed. According to a report by the National Academy of Sciences, that means that Teddy, and all other children, are "more susceptible to permanent damage" from exposure to pesticides and other chemicals in foods.

That landmark National Science Report, "pesticides in the diets of infants and children" was the main reason that Congress passed the food quality protection act in 1996 with strong bipartisan support.

This was the first law to require that the standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency for pesticide traces in our foods take into account the special vulnerabilities of growing children.

Members from both sides of the aisle agreed that we wanted the food our children—and grandchildren—eat to be as safe as possible.

That's why I was shocked to learn that H.R. 2620 will make it impossible for the Environmental Protection Agency to develop these standards.

And it does this in a really sneaky way. Section 421 of this Bill prohibits the EPA from issuing the final rule to increase the user fee that the pesticide industry pays to help finance pesticide tolerance studies.

OMB has estimated that increasing the user fee would give EPA an additional \$50 million dollars that the EPA needs, in order to find out what levels of pesticides children can safely tolerate.

Section 421 makes it impossible for EPA to collect that money.

The Pelosi Amendment strikes Section 421, giving EPA the authority it needs to begin collecting increased user fees from the pesticide industry.

I can't imagine that there is a parent or a grandparent, or anyone in this house who cares about the health of a young child, who doesn't want to make sure that the food that child eats is safe from dangerous levels of pesticides.

That's what the Pelosi Amendment does, it protects the foods our children eat, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order of the House, a Member opposed also may control 15 minutes. Is there such Member?

If not, the question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

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

Section 136a-1 of title 7, United States Code is amended—

(1) in subsection (i)(5)(C)(i) by striking “\$14,000,000” and inserting “\$17,000,000”; and, by striking “each” and inserting “2002” after “fiscal year”;

(2) in subsection (i)(5)(H) by striking “2001” and inserting “2002”;

(3) in subsection (i)(6) by striking “2001” and inserting “2002”; and

(4) in subsection (k)(3)(A) by striking “2001” and inserting “2002”; and, by striking “ $\frac{1}{4}$ ” and inserting “ $\frac{1}{10}$ ”.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601 and 6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$5,267,000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, \$2,974,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$33,660,000, to be derived from the Bank Insurance Fund, the Savings Association Insurance Fund, and the FSLIC Resolution Fund.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY DISASTER RELIEF

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), \$1,369,399,000, and, notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 5203, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$2,900,000 may be transferred to “Emergency management planning and assistance” for the consolidated emergency management performance grant program; up to \$15,000,000 may be obligated for flood map modernization activities following disaster declarations; and \$21,577,000 may be used by the Office of Inspector General for audits and investigations.

In addition, for the purposes under this heading, \$1,300,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount 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: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, \$405,000, as authorized by section 319 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assist-

ance Act: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed \$25,000,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program, \$543,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including hire and purchase of motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343; uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with the work of emergency preparedness; transportation in connection with the continuity of Government programs to the same extent and in the same manner as permitted the Secretary of a Military Department under 10 U.S.C. 2632; and not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$227,900,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$10,303,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall also serve as the Inspector General of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, and the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, as amended (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, as amended (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.), the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2061 et seq.), sections 107 and 303 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended (50 U.S.C. 404–405), and Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1978, \$404,623,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mrs. CAPPS: In title III, in the item relating to “FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY—EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT PLANNING AND ASSISTANCE”, strike the period at the end and insert the following:

: *Provided*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$25,000,000 shall be available for purposes of predisaster hazard mitigation pursuant to section 203 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5133).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will earmark \$25 million of FEMA’s Emergency Management Planning and Assistance Account for the successful Project Impact.

Project Impact is a commonsense public-private partnership designed to help communities prepare for natural disasters by funding predisaster hazard mitigation. The goal is to help communities become disaster resistant. This funding allows communities to build partnerships with businesses, industry, public works, utilities, volunteer groups, and the local State and Federal Government. These partnerships assess their community’s risks and vulnerabilities to natural disasters, identify priorities for mitigation, and begin implementing them. And the Federal funding works to leverage support from private sources, magnifying its effectiveness.

Mr. Chairman, over the last decade, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has spent \$20 billion to assist communities to recover from disasters. This does not include the billions spent by other agencies, like HUD, the Small Business Administration, as well as State and local governments. And not all damage can be repaired. People lose their jobs; businesses close. In fact, 40 percent of small businesses are never able to recover or reopen. And, of course, most tragically, lives are lost. Project Impact recognizes that we can spend a fraction of the money we spend now to avoid some of those costs and save many of those lives. It seems imprudent not to take this step.

Project Impact is a classic example of the adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. For example, earlier this year we saw the effectiveness of Project Impact. In January, Washington State and the City of Seattle were struck by the worst earthquake to hit the Pacific Northwest in 52 years. But according to press accounts, injuries were only about 15 percent of what FEMA expected from a 6.8 magnitude, and costs were only about half of what the agency projected. This was in no small part because of Project Impact.

In 1977, Seattle was able to turn a \$1 million grant from Project Impact into \$7 million with private support, and they set about to make Seattle disaster resistant. They enforced building codes, strengthened existing buildings, and educated their citizens about prevention measures they could take. FEMA and Seattle took the initiative and their work ahead of time and made a terrible tragedy significantly less tragic.

No less an expert on the matter of disaster relief and mitigation than former FEMA Director James Lee Witt pointed this out. In a letter he sent to me in support of this amendment to fund Project Impact, Mr. Witt says, and I quote, “Despite FEMA’s quick response, the reality is that without prevention efforts, thousands of families

will continue to lose their homes and precious possessions, and hundreds of small businesses will be destroyed, resulting in the loss of thousands of jobs. Seattle has shown the United States that prevention works. Other communities deserve the opportunity to replicate Seattle's success."

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply appreciative that the committee has increased the funding for Emergency Management Planning and Assistance by nearly \$35 million. It is clear that this funding is needed. But it is also clear that we should be spending some of that money on Project Impact and its preventive measures. My home county of Santa Barbara received a Project Impact grant to model potential wildfires and to look at ways to mitigate their impact. These efforts have allowed the county to better develop emergency plans which will save lives if, or more likely when, that catastrophe strikes. Besides Seattle and Santa Barbara, nearly 250 communities have received Project Impact grants since the program was established in 1997.

□ 2030

Let us give the next 250 communities that same chance.

It simply does not make sense for us to keep pouring money into communities after the fact and not try to help them before a disaster. This is especially true in light of FEMA's \$2.25 billion budget. All this amendment does is dedicate 1 percent of that funding to predisaster assistance. It does not increase the budget and it will save many lives.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York seek time in opposition?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman's amendment would designate \$25 million of the funds for FEMA emergency management planning and assistance to be used for predisaster mitigation activities.

For the past 4 years FEMA had had a program to raise the awareness within communities of the need to prepare for disasters. This program was called Project Impact and it made strides towards helping communities become better informed of how to prepare and respond to natural disasters.

While this budget does not continue Project Impact, in our hearings earlier this year the Director of FEMA expressed his desire to develop a full-fledged predisaster mitigation program building on the success that Project

Impact has had in raising the level of awareness within all communities.

I know that if such a program were developed and implemented after careful thought and deliberation, it would save money and lives. The biggest concern I have with the amendment is that it offers no way to pay for the program. The amendment designates \$25 million of the \$404 million in this account for the predisaster program. What programs currently funded in this account would the gentlewoman have us decrease?

Would the gentlewoman suggest a reduction in the budget for the Fire-fighter Assistance Grants? They are funded in this bill at \$100 million. We have had debate on the floor today that Members believe there is substantially more need and there is great demand. We had \$3 billion in requests for those \$100 million for fire fighters. Surely we cannot go there.

Should we reduce the allowance for salaries or grants to State and local emergency management officials? We are already asking FEMA to take a reduction in their salaries for fiscal year 2002. A further cut of this magnitude would make this agency very difficult, if not impossible, to manage.

Should we reduce the allowance for updating floodplain maps? There is currently a backlog in the number of maps which need to be updated, and it is estimated that it will cost over \$700 million to address this backlog. This bill contains a modest start to addressing this backlog. I know the gentlewoman is aware that flooding causes more damage nationwide than any other type of natural disaster, so I do not think she would want us to stop this effort in order to fund a public awareness campaign.

This bill is full of difficult choices, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes programs have to be canceled to make room for other more worthy programs. The budget request made such a decision with regard to predisaster mitigation, but with the ultimate goal of developing a more robust and focused program with well-defined and prioritized objectives. I think we ought to wait for such a program to be proposed and carefully considered in the context of all of FEMA's programs. For this reason I oppose the amendment and ask my colleagues to oppose it also.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

The issues of FEMA and Project Impact come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on which I serve. Through-

out the last administration I worked with FEMA and the White House to develop Project Impact. I think it has been a tremendous success.

Mitigation is the cornerstone of emergency management. Mitigation simply means efforts to lessen the impact of disasters on people and property. It keeps homes out of floodplains, designs bridges to withstand earthquakes, creates and enforces building codes to protect property from hurricanes, and many such creative initiatives all across the land.

It helps communities adapt their public facilities before disaster strikes in order to save lives, buildings and homes.

The gentlewoman has so well cited the case of Seattle, Washington. It has been a Project Impact city since 1997. Everyone participated in retrofitting homes, developing mapping projects for landslides and seismic vulnerability. Schools received funds to remove structural hazards and we saw what a success all of that was in the aftermath of the earthquake.

I understand that the issue of funding was not created by the chairman of the subcommittee. It is the Office of Management and Budget that chose to strike this funding from the budget in a move I just simply cannot understand.

I welcome the suggestion that the chairman made that the Director of FEMA would work with the Congress to develop a plan. He has never approached me with such a proposal. He has not come to my committee to my knowledge to propose such an initiative. I look forward to him doing so, but I want to see something more concrete than just a wish. Meanwhile, vote for the Capps amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, Project Impact really provides communities with the resources they need to combat natural disasters and make them less susceptible to future damages.

In my district, Stratford, Connecticut last year was hit by a devastating storm. It dumped 8 inches of rain in a 4-hour period. It resulted in over \$5 million in damage.

East Haven, another town in my district, has a long history of flooding, constantly ravaged by hurricanes and tropical storms. Every time there is a rain storm families fear they are going to be displaced.

East Haven was awarded grant money to take a proactive approach to help keep flood insurance rates lower. The grant helps to pay for an early warning storm system. It helps to pay for storm shutters for residents' windows and other weather precautions.

We have all stood in the rain witnessing these disasters. We have all met the crying homeowners, but it is

not the loss of property that is important. It is the lost dreams. That is why we need to take steps to get people help in such unavoidable circumstances. Project Impact does just that. It is a common-sense program. It protects property and saves lives. It identifies ways to prevent future tragedies and reduce property damage.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Capps amendment.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support for this amendment. I respect the gentleman from New York in talking about the difficult trade-offs that are being made and the prospects of having \$400 million of other programs of mitigation.

The fact is we do not have to wait to develop a practical, effective program. For heaven's sakes, this is one of the show pieces of the last FEMA Director, James Lee Witt, who everyone acknowledges has done an outstanding job. In just 5 years, starting with seven pilot projects, this has grown around the country. I was stunned to address their national conference last fall. I interacted with 2,500 people from around the country, private partnerships, NASA, local government, private business, and we are going to throw this away to develop something new?

Mr. Chairman, this is what frustrates people about the Federal Government. When we have a winning program that everybody likes, that reaches down to the grass roots, that is voluntary in nature, that we do not have to guess whether or not it is effective, we would throw that away? I beg the gentleman to reconsider. We can find \$25 million to keep this experience alive.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Capps amendment. The Peterson area became one of the first to participate in Project Impact, using a small amount of Federal funding provided by the program to leverage greater local funding, to retrofit schools, homes and small businesses. In the past 10 years FEMA has spent more than \$20 billion to help communities repair and rebuild after natural disasters. Project Impact in contrast costs the Federal Government only \$25 million. In this instance it likely saved several times that figure in the Seattle area by saving lives and preventing damage. We do not need the promise of a new program; we have a program. It is called Project Impact.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to pass the Capps amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for bringing her amendment because it highlights the importance of this very good program: Project Impact. Unfortunately, the amendment comes in a context which makes it very difficult for us to consider. There are a lot of excellent programs funded in this emergency management and planning assistance account. There are preparedness activities, for example, and early warning systems; flood mapping, which is an extremely important program; other mitigation efforts; and grants to States.

This is simply a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul, of taking money from good projects to put them in another good project. I think the better time to consider this issue is in conference where the Senate has already funded this activity. I think then we will be in a much stronger position to consider the merits of Project Impact vis-a-vis the merits of these other programs.

Mr. Chairman, at this point in the process, we simply do not have enough money to go around. Given that we are looking toward possible favorable consideration in conference, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment. Again, it is simply robbing Peter to pay Paul, taking money from very good programs to fund a very good program. We are not against Project Impact; it is simply the wrong point in the process to consider the amendment.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I come from a district which has had seven presidentially declared disasters. If there is anything that I have learned, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Everything we do in this country is to try to prevent injury and harm. One of the dumb things we do is keep going in after a disaster and allowing people to do the same old thing.

Mr. Chairman, this program gets people out of doing the same old thing that makes them involved in a disaster. I hope my colleagues march into conference very strongly supporting this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I would close by saying we had a budget that was \$35 million less last year, and instituted this Project Impact at that time. It has proven to be cost effective. It is already proven. We do not need to decide how to do it. I urge my colleagues to consider if we do not implement this program in this budget at this time, we will lose valuable ground and all of the networking that is going on in so many communities like my own with plans already in place.

Mr. Chairman, these dollars have saved lives. We know that. They will continue to save lives. I urge support for this amendment and ask that Project Impact be continued.

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

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

Just in closing, I restate that there is support. The concept is a good one. What we would like to do is give the new Director of FEMA the opportunity to develop a program that can go through the authorizing committee and garner the full support of the membership, be well-thought out and, as we said earlier, more robust. There is merit to this concept, but do not make us make this choice between fire fighters or mapping or salaries and expenses for FEMA, which is already very, very tight.

Mr. Chairman, I would reluctantly urge all members to oppose the amendment.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my colleagues Lois CAPPS and RICK LARSEN to earmark \$25 million of the \$404 million in FEMA's Emergency Management and Planning Assistance account to fund Project Impact.

As my colleagues are aware, Project Impact is a public-private partnership that funds emergency management preparation activities. It has been a relatively low cost way to save lives and prevent damage in the case of natural disasters and other emergencies. Created in 1997 by former FEMA Director James L. Witt, the program has helped 250 communities in all fifty states and the Insular Areas to prepare for and prevent disasters.

My home islands St. Croix has been a project impact site since 1998. As a direct result, the community has been extremely successful in both decreasing damages and injuries in the territory and reducing recovery costs to FEMA—in fact our efforts have been widely touted as a FEMA success story by the agency.

Mr. Chairman, the Capps/Larsen amendment and the Project Impact program deserves our support because it is a common sense approach to help our country deal with disasters. The increasing number and severity of natural disasters over the past decade demands that action be taken to reduce the threat of hurricanes, tornadoes, severe storms, flood and fires, which is where Project Impact comes in. It is unconscionable and very shortsighted in my opinion that this program was not included in this year's VA-HUD appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the Capps/Larsen amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Capps amendment to the VA-HUD Appropriations bill. This is a good amendment, and I applaud the gentlewoman from California, Ms. CAPPS, for offering it to a bill that clearly has missed the mark on its funding priorities.

The Capps amendment earmarks \$25 million to the Emergency Management Planning and Assistance account to continue funding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Project Impact. This amendment restores

the amount of funding to Project Impact at the same level this body approved last year. For the more than 250 communities in all fifty states who participate in Project Impact, it is essential that the House approve this amendment. In the nearly four years that this program has been in existence, it has been a low cost way to save lives and prevent damage in the case of natural disasters and other emergencies.

For the State of Florida, Project Impact is needed and utilized. In fact, in my district, the City of Deerfield Beach has been a beneficiary of Project Impact since the Project's creation in 1997. In addition, Miami-Dade County, just two months ago, was recognized by Project Impact for the county's ongoing efforts in dealing with local emergencies. Tampa, Jacksonville, and Pensacola, as well as Brevard and Volusia Counties, all participate in Project Impact. Any cut in funding will be felt state-wide.

Fortunately, the hurricane season has been kind to Florida since Project Impact began to assist South Florida. Regardless, if we do not fund this program today, I fear what will occur next time a Hurricane Andrew sweeps across South Florida. While we may not see the effects of out budget cuts today, the effects of Hurricane Andrew, which destroyed South Florida nearly a decade ago, are still seen and felt by my constituents.

When Project Impact was founded in 1997, former FEMA Director James Lee Witt recognized the importance of preparing for a natural disaster. While giving a speech in Miami, he noted, "We've got to change the way we deal with disasters. We have to break the damage-repair, damage-repair cycle. We need to have communities and businesses come together to reduce the cost and consequences of disasters."

Mr. Chairman, we have got to change the way we deal with disasters. Too many communities today are inadequately prepared to deal with natural disasters. Contrary to what some may believe, failing to adequately fund Project Impact is not an effective tool in changing the way we deal with disasters. By not funding this needed program, we risk the lives of thousands throughout this great country. This is unacceptable, and for these reasons, I urge my colleagues to recognize the importance of Project Impact and support the Capps amendment.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Capps amendment, which would earmark \$25 million for Project Impact, a FEMA program which helps communities establish pre-disaster hazard mitigation programs. Project Impact communities initiate mentoring relationships, private and public partnerships, public outreach, and disaster mitigation projects to reduce the damage from potentially devastating disasters.

South Florida is a wonderful place to live, but as you know, we are highly susceptible to hurricanes. The City of Deerfield Beach, Florida, has been diligently working to better prepare its residents for the next big hurricane by establishing a \$42 million multi-purpose public service facility, or Mitigation of Operation Center (MOC). The MOC would serve as a shelter in the event of a natural disaster, and would house the City's Department of Public Works, Emergency Operations Center, Fire & Rescue Center, a Broward County Emergency Communications facility, and satellite facilities for the Broward County Sheriff's Office and Flor-

ida Atlantic University. The MOC would also include a water treatment facility.

FEMA designated the City of Deerfield Beach, Florida, as our country's first Project Impact Community. Since its designation as one of the seven pilot Project Impact communities in 1997, Deerfield Beach developed a strong Project Impact initiative with over 100 small and large partners, completed with risk assessment and mitigation strategy. In fact, on November 20, 2000, Deerfield Beach was again recognized by FEMA with a Model Community Award.

The residents of Deerfield Beach demonstrated the importance they place on hazard mitigation when they passed an \$8 million bond issue in November, 1999, to build the MOC, one of the country's first. Another \$22 million has been committed toward this project over the last few years to upgrade the City's water filtration facilities. Moreover, FEMA awarded Deerfield Beach with a Hazard Mitigation grant in the amount of \$400,000.

An earmark of \$25 million for Project Impact would greatly help the efforts of communities like Deerfield Beach to be pro-active toward emergency preparedness. I am proud of the city's leadership on this issue, and I am hopeful that this Congress will recognize the commitment of communities like Deerfield Beach by providing these important and necessary funds.

I urge you to support the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) will be postponed.

2045

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RADIOLOGICAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND

The aggregate charges assessed during fiscal year 2002, as authorized by Public Law 106-377, shall not be less than 100 percent of the amounts anticipated by FEMA necessary for its radiological emergency preparedness program for the next fiscal year. The methodology for assessment and collection of fees shall be fair and equitable; and shall reflect costs of providing such services, including administrative costs of collecting such fees. Fees received pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the Fund as offsetting collections and will become available for authorized purposes on October 1, 2002, and remain available until expended.

EMERGENCY FOOD AND SHELTER PROGRAM

To carry out an emergency food and shelter program pursuant to title III of Public Law 100-77, as amended, \$140,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That total administrative costs shall not exceed 3½ percent of the total appropriation.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For activities under the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 ("the Act"), the Flood

Disaster Protection Act of 1973, as amended, not to exceed \$28,798,000 for salaries and expenses associated with flood mitigation and flood insurance operations, and not to exceed \$76,381,000 for flood mitigation, including up to \$20,000,000 for expenses under section 1366 of the Act, which amount shall be available for transfer to the National Flood Mitigation Fund until September 30, 2003. In fiscal year 2002, no funds in excess of: (1) \$55,000,000 for operating expenses; (2) \$536,750,000 for agents' commissions and taxes; and (3) \$30,000,000 for interest on Treasury borrowings shall be available from the National Flood Insurance Fund without prior notice to the Committees on Appropriations.

In addition, up to \$7,000,000 in fees collected but unexpended during fiscal years 2000 through 2001 shall be transferred to the Flood Map Modernization Fund and available for expenditure in fiscal year 2002.

Section 1309(a)(2) of the Act (42 U.S.C. 4016(a)(2)), as amended, is further amended by striking "2001" and inserting "2002".

Section 1319 of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4026), is amended by striking "after" and all that follows and inserting "after September 30, 2001".

Section 1336(a) of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4056(a)), is amended by striking "ending" and all that follows through the second comma thereafter and inserting "ending September 30, 2001".

Section 1376(c) of the Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4127(c)), is amended by striking "December 31, 2001" and inserting "December 31, 2002".

NATIONAL FLOOD MITIGATION FUND

Notwithstanding sections 1366(b)(3)(B)-(C) and 1366(f) of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, as amended, \$20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, for activities designed to reduce the risk of flood damage to structures pursuant to such Act, of which \$20,000,000 shall be derived from the National Flood Insurance Fund. Of the amount provided, \$2,500,000 is to be used for the purchase of flood-prone properties in the city of Austin, Minnesota, and any cost-share is waived.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION FEDERAL CONSUMER INFORMATION CENTER FUND

For necessary expenses of the Federal Consumer Information Center, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$7,276,000, to be deposited into the Federal Consumer Information Center Fund: *Provided*, That the appropriations, revenues, and collections deposited into the Fund shall be available for necessary expenses of Federal Consumer Information Center activities in the aggregate amount of \$12,000,000. Appropriations, revenues, and collections accruing to this Fund during fiscal year 2002 in excess of \$12,000,000 shall remain in the Fund and shall not be available for expenditure except as authorized in appropriations Acts: *Provided further*, That the Federal Consumer Information Center (FCIC) may not undertake any action that affects its organization, administrative location, or in any way alters its current function or mission mandate without first submitting a proposal to the Committees on Appropriations for approval: *Provided further*, That such proposal shall include the justification for such action, a description of all planned organizational realignments, the anticipated staffing or personnel changes, an assessment of the effect on the current operations of FCIC, and estimates of the proposed changes on future funding needs

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION
HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of

human space flight research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$7,047,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to the Science, Aeronautics and Technology account in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106-377.

For an additional amount for "Human space flight", for the development of a crew return vehicle with capacity for no less than six persons, for use with the international space station, \$275,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2005: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this paragraph may be obligated prior to August 1, 2002: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this paragraph shall be rescinded on July 15, 2002, unless the President requests at least \$200,000,000 in the fiscal year 2003 budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for continuation of the crew return vehicle program.

**SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND TECHNOLOGY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and technology research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, environmental compliance and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$20,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, \$7,605,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003, of which amounts as determined by the Administrator for salaries and benefits; training, travel and awards; facility and related costs; information technology services; science, engineering, fabricating and testing services; and other administrative services may be transferred to the Human Space Flight account in accordance with section 312(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended by Public Law 106-377.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. ROEMER: In title III, under the heading "NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION", before the item relating to "OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL", insert the following:

REDUCTION OF AMOUNTS FOR INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION

The amounts otherwise provided in this title for the following accounts and activities are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) "Human Space Flight", the aggregate amount specified in the first paragraph of such account, \$1,531,300,000.

(2) "Human Space Flight", the amount specified in the second paragraph of such account for the development of a crew return vehicle, \$275,000,000.

(3) "Science, Aeronautics and Technology", the aggregate amount, \$343,600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I have offered over the last several years that would eliminate all funding for the Space Station. I have done so over the last several years because this Space Station had an initial projected cost to the American taxpayers across this great country in 1984 of \$8 billion.

Today, in 2001, the General Accounting Office has come out with a study that says the total cost of this Space Station, for launching, for engineering, for technology, for construction, is not going to be \$8 billion, it is not going to be \$80 billion, it is going to be over \$100 billion, total cost to the American taxpayer.

That is a staggering sum of money. I would be the first one out there as a proponent for a Space Station if it was going to perform the great tasks that we envisioned, a stepping stone with a telescope, like Hubble, to help us understand the solar system, a telescope pointed to the Earth to help us with the environment, a stepping stone and a tether to other planets for exploration. Great scientific discoveries promised. It cannot do any of those things today. None of those things. But it has gone from \$8 billion to over \$100 billion.

I would say to my colleagues, if this was a welfare program, a public housing program, an education program, it would not be here today. It would have been canceled a long time ago, but it is not. It has got a lot of contractors out there building in some States, so it has been funded through the years.

Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues that even with the cost and the lack of science, that if we had a perfect budg-

etary situation and it was not starting to grow into other programs and hurting some other very good space programs, delaying and canceling them, I still might be for it. Or if we had not lost \$40 billion in our projected surplus in the last month, I might be for it.

But this body needs to make tough decisions about what the priorities will be in spending, in cuts, in taxes; and we have got to make those decisions in the next few months. So I would hope this body will belly up and make some of these difficult decisions and not go around saying we can afford to fund every single program, especially this one, who in the last few months, NASA officials just announced that they had a \$4 billion overrun, just announced for the next few years. \$4 billion for the next few years.

This is the bill, ladies and gentlemen. We line item in this bill how much we will spend on housing, how much we will spend on aeronautics, how much we will spend on national science. We do not then say, you can go over by \$4 billion, go do anything you want. The line items are there for a purpose. We have the job, our oversight, our responsibility, is to try to make sure these programs are run well.

The proponents on the other side of this I have the utmost respect for and served on the Committee on Science for several years with them, Members from Texas and Alabama and Virginia and Florida. I respect what they are doing, I respect the science that we are trying to achieve, and I like many of those Members personally that will be the proponents for this Space Station. But, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly hope that we can get the cost overruns under control so that this does not cannibalize the rest of very worthwhile NASA science programs and projects.

I will not offer this amendment for a vote. I have an amendment that will simply fence the total amount we spend on this project in the future that Senator McCAIN has passed in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment and wait for future debate on the next amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$23,700,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Human space flight", or "Science, aeronautics and technology" by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities as authorized by law, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated for institutional minor revitalization

and construction of facilities, and institutional facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Human space flight", or "Science, aeronautics and technology" by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 2004.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for "Office of Inspector General", amounts made available by this Act for personnel and related costs and travel expenses of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall remain available until September 30, 2002 and may be used to enter into contracts for training, investigations, costs associated with personnel relocation, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year. Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

No funds in this or any other Appropriations Act may be used to finalize an agreement prior to December 1, 2002 between NASA and a nongovernment organization to conduct research utilization and commercialization management activities of the International Space Station.

**NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION
CENTRAL LIQUIDITY FACILITY
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

During fiscal year 2002, gross obligations of the Central Liquidity Facility for the principal amount of new direct loans to member credit unions, as authorized by 12 U.S.C. 1795 et seq., shall not exceed \$1,500,000,000: *Provided*, That administrative expenses of the Central Liquidity Facility shall not exceed \$309,000: *Provided further*, That \$1,000,000 shall be transferred to the Community Development Revolving Loan Fund.

**NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES**

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; authorized travel; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; \$3,642,340,000, of which not to exceed \$306,230,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program; the balance to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the amount appropriated is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

**MAJOR RESEARCH FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION
AND EQUIPMENT**

For necessary expenses of major construction projects pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, including authorized travel, \$135,300,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and

human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, \$885,720,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: *Provided*, That to the extent that the amount of this appropriation is less than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for included program activities, all amounts, including floors and ceilings, specified in the authorizing Act for those program activities or their subactivities shall be reduced proportionally.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$170,040,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under "Salaries and expenses" in fiscal year 2002 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$6,760,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

**NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION
PAYMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD
REINVESTMENT CORPORATION**

For payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation for use in neighborhood reinvestment activities, as authorized by the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation Act (42 U.S.C. 8101–8107), \$105,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 shall be for a homeownership program that is used in conjunction with section 8 assistance under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Selective Service System, including expenses of attendance at meetings and of training for uniformed personnel assigned to the Selective Service System, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 4101–4118 for civilian employees; and not to exceed \$500 for official reception and representation expenses; \$25,003,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1341, whenever the President deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be expended for or in connection with the induction of any person into the Armed Forces of the United States.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Where appropriations in titles I, II, and III of this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this provision does not apply to accounts that do not contain an object classification for travel: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System; to travel performed directly in connection with care and treatment of medical beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to travel performed in connection with major disasters or emergencies declared or determined by the President under the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act; to travel performed by the Offices of Inspector General in connection with audits and investigations; or to payments to interagency motor pools where separately set forth in the budget schedules: *Provided further*, That if appropriations in titles I, II, and III exceed the amounts set forth in budget estimates initially submitted for such appropriations, the expenditures for travel may correspondingly exceed the amounts therefor set forth in the estimates only to the extent such an increase is approved by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 402. Appropriations and funds available for the administrative expenses of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Selective Service System shall be available in the current fiscal year for purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

SEC. 403. Funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development subject to the Government Corporation Control Act or section 402 of the Housing Act of 1950 shall be available, without regard to the limitations on administrative expenses, for legal services on a contract or fee basis, and for utilizing and making payment for services and facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Government National Mortgage Association, Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, Federal Financing Bank, Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, Federal Home Loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1811–1831).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 405. No funds appropriated by this Act may be expended—

(1) pursuant to a certification of an officer or employee of the United States unless—

(A) such certification is accompanied by, or is part of, a voucher or abstract which describes the payee or payees and the items or services for which such expenditure is being made; or

(B) the expenditure of funds pursuant to such certification, and without such a voucher or abstract, is specifically authorized by law; and

(2) unless such expenditure is subject to audit by the General Accounting Office or is specifically exempt by law from such audit.

SEC. 406. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency may be expended for the transportation of any officer or employee of such department or agency between the domicile and the place of employment of the officer or employee, with the exception of an officer or employee authorized such transportation under 31 U.S.C. 1344 or 5 U.S.C. 7905.

SEC. 407. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used for payment, through grants or contracts, to recipients that do not share in the cost of conducting research resulting from proposals not specifically solicited by the Government: *Provided*, That the extent of cost sharing by the recipient shall reflect the mutuality of interest of the grantee or contractor and the Government in the research.

SEC. 408. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used, directly or through grants,

to pay or to provide reimbursement for payment of the salary of a consultant (whether retained by the Federal Government or a grantee) at more than the daily equivalent of the rate paid for level IV of the Executive Schedule, unless specifically authorized by law.

SEC. 409. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties intervening in regulatory or adjudicatory proceedings. Nothing herein affects the authority of the Consumer Product Safety Commission pursuant to section 7 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2056 et seq.).

SEC. 410. Except as otherwise provided under existing law, or under an existing Executive Order issued pursuant to an existing law, the obligation or expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for contracts for any consulting service shall be limited to contracts which are: (1) a matter of public record and available for public inspection; and (2) thereafter included in a publicly available list of all contracts entered into within 24 months prior to the date on which the list is made available to the public and of all contracts on which performance has not been completed by such date. The list required by the preceding sentence shall be updated quarterly and shall include a narrative description of the work to be performed under each such contract.

SEC. 411. Except as otherwise provided by law, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be obligated or expended by any executive agency, as referred to in the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), for a contract for services unless such executive agency: (1) has awarded and entered into such contract in full compliance with such Act and the regulations promulgated thereunder; and (2) requires any report prepared pursuant to such contract, including plans, evaluations, studies, analyses and manuals, and any report prepared by the agency which is substantially derived from or substantially includes any report prepared pursuant to such contract, to contain information concerning: (A) the contract pursuant to which the report was prepared; and (B) the contractor who prepared the report pursuant to such contract.

SEC. 412. Except as otherwise provided in section 406, none of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to provide a personal cook, chauffeur, or other personal servants to any officer or employee of such department or agency.

SEC. 413. None of the funds provided in this Act to any department or agency shall be obligated or expended to procure passenger automobiles as defined in 15 U.S.C. 2001 with an EPA estimated miles per gallon average of less than 22 miles per gallon.

SEC. 414. None of the funds appropriated in title I of this Act shall be used to enter into any new lease of real property if the estimated annual rental is more than \$300,000 unless the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submits a report which the Committees on Appropriations of the Congress and a period of 30 days has expired following the date on which the report is received by the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 415. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such en-

tity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 416. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to implement any cap on reimbursements to grantees for indirect costs, except as published in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-21.

SEC. 417. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2002 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 418. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any program, project, or activity, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which the funds are made available that the program, project, or activity is not in compliance with any Federal law relating to risk assessment, the protection of private property rights, or unfunded mandates.

SEC. 419. Corporations and agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which are subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of such Act as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for 2002 for such corporation or agency except as herein-after provided: *Provided*, That collections of these corporations and agencies may be used for new loan or mortgage purchase commitments only to the extent expressly provided for in this Act (unless such loans are in support of other forms of assistance provided for in this or prior appropriations Acts), except that this proviso shall not apply to the mortgage insurance or guaranty operations of these corporations, or where loans or mortgage purchases are necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States Government.

SEC. 420. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the term "qualified student loan" with respect to national service education awards shall mean any loan determined by an institution of higher education to be necessary to cover a student's cost of attendance at such institution and made directly to a student by a state agency, in addition to other meanings under section 148(b)(7) of the National and Community Service Act.

SEC. 421. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to promulgate a final regulation to implement changes in the payment of pesticide tolerance processing fees as proposed at 64 Fed. Reg. 31040, or any similar proposals. The Environmental Protection Agency may proceed with the development of such a rule.

SEC. 422. The Environmental Protection Agency may not use any of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to implement the Registration Fee system codified at 40 Code of Federal Regulations Subpart U (sections 152.400 et seq.) if its authority to collect maintenance fees pursuant to FIFRA section 4(i)(5) is extended for at least one year beyond September 30, 2001.

SEC. 423. Except in the case of entities that are funded solely with Federal funds or any natural persons that are funded under this Act, none of the funds in this Act shall be used for the planning or execution of any program to pay the expenses of, or otherwise compensate, non-Federal parties to lobby or litigate in respect to adjudicatory proceedings funded in this Act. A chief executive officer of any entity receiving funds under this Act shall certify that none of

these funds have been used to engage in the lobbying of the Federal Government or in litigation against the United States unless authorized under existing law.

SEC. 424. No part of any funds appropriated in this Act shall be used by an agency of the executive branch, other than for normal and recognized executive-legislative relationships, for publicity or propaganda purposes, and for the preparation, distribution or use of any kit, pamphlet, booklet, publication, radio, television or film presentation designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, except in presentation to the Congress itself.

SEC. 425. All Departments and agencies funded under this Act are encouraged, within the limits of the existing statutory authorities and funding, to expand their use of "E-Commerce" technologies and procedures in the conduct of their business practices and public service activities.

SEC. 426. Section 104(n)(4) of the Cerro Grande Fire Assistance Act (Public Law 106-246) is amended by striking "beginning not later than the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act," and inserting in lieu thereof, "within 120 days after the Director issues the report required by subsection (n) in 2002 and 2003."

Mr. WALSH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, through page 93, 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. 25 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. BISHOP:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 629. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

Subtitle B of title VI of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5197-5197g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

SEC. 629. MINORITY EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program to research and promote the capacity of minority communities to provide data, information, and awareness education by providing grants to or executing contracts or cooperative agreements with eligible nonprofit organizations to establish and conduct such programs.

"(b) ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.—An eligible nonprofit organization may use a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section—

"(1) to conduct research into the status of emergency preparedness and disaster response awareness in African American and Hispanic households located in urban, suburban, and rural communities, particularly in those States and regions most impacted by natural and manmade disasters and emergencies; and

"(2) to develop and promote awareness of emergency preparedness education programs within minority communities, including development and preparation of culturally competent educational and awareness materials that can be used to disseminate information to minority organizations and institutions.

“(c) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—A nonprofit organization is eligible to be awarded a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section with respect to a program if the organization is a nonprofit organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, whose primary mission is to provide services to communities predominately populated by minority citizens, and that can demonstrate a partnership with a minority-owned business enterprise or minority business located in a HUBZone (as defined in section 3(p) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p))) with respect to the program.

“(d) USE OF FUNDS.—A recipient of a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement awarded under this section may only use the proceeds of the grant, contract, or agreement to—

“(1) acquire expert professional services necessary to conduct research in communities predominately populated by minority citizens, with a primary emphasis on African American and Hispanic communities;

“(2) develop and prepare informational materials to promote awareness among minority communities about emergency preparedness and how to protect their households and communities in advance of disasters;

“(3) establish consortia with minority national organizations, minority institutions of higher education, and faith-based institutions to disseminate information about emergency preparedness to minority communities; and

“(4) implement a joint project with a minority serving institution, including a part B institution (as defined in section 322(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1061(2))), an institution described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 326 of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1063b(e)(1)(A), (B), or (C)), and a Hispanic-serving institution (as defined in section 502(a)(5) of that Act (20 U.S.C. 1101a(a)(5))).

“(e) APPLICATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURE.—To be eligible to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, an organization must submit an application to the Director at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Director may reasonably require. The Director shall establish a procedure by which to accept such applications.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATION.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such funds as may be necessary for fiscal years 2003 through 2007. Such sums shall remain available until expended.”.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

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

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their hard work on this bill and also the Chair and ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the committee which has the authorizing jurisdiction.

I stand before Members today to ask for their support for my amendment to the VA-HUD appropriations bill. My

amendment appropriates no additional funds. It only authorizes the use of existing funds for an important program. In substance, it authorizes the director of FEMA to establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program utilizing grants, contracts and agreements with community-based 501(c)3 nonprofit corporations. The program will allow the nonprofits to research the status of emergency preparedness in minority households in urban, rural and suburban communities and to enhance emergency and disaster response preparedness. It would authorize the director to provide grants or to execute contracts and cooperative agreements with eligible nonprofit corporations to establish and to conduct these programs.

Mr. Chairman, in just this past year, 51 disasters were declared in 33 different States. In fact, this year already 23 disasters have already been declared in 22 different States. These disasters include tornadoes, winter storms, floods, spring storms, earthquakes, and ice storms. Unfortunately, these numbers do not include the hundreds of fires that occur annually. According to FEMA, the impact on minority communities is 2½ times more than on any other group.

It is my hope that all people in high-risk circumstances will benefit from this program which will document and make available information about the dangers that are present in different locations as well as the practical guidance on how to protect against these disasters. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it is good for America and it is good for the people.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I commend the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) and thank him for this amendment. The amendment would establish a new program within FEMA for the purpose of increasing the awareness of disaster preparedness needs within minority communities. He has very well stated the need. This is an amendment that we have checked with the chairman of the authorizing committee and the appropriate subcommittee Chair. They are in agreement that this is a good amendment.

While FEMA has existing programs structured to raise the general awareness within all communities of the need to prepare for disasters, I agree with the gentleman that focusing on special populations may be necessary. It is for this reason that I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

□ 2100

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for offering this amendment which establishes a Minority Emergency Preparedness Demonstration Program at FEMA.

In my home State of California, we have experienced more than our fair share of natural disasters, earthquakes, floods, fires and what have you, over the past decade. We are still recovering from the pain and devastation created by the Northridge Earthquake back in 1994. Minority communities like the one I represent need more information to help them prepare for these sorts of disasters. After Northridge, many people were left homeless. FEMA did an outstanding job of helping our community, but I think a Minority Emergency Preparedness Program could do even more, if this were funded through FEMA.

People in minority communities are often more heavily impacted by these types of disasters. People often live in poorly designed housing and have limited access to emergency preparedness materials that are printed in their own language. It makes sense to have information available to them in their own language. This would provide assistance to Latinos, Asian Americans, and African Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent amendment. It gives us an opportunity to really reach out to those communities that have been so severely impacted with natural disasters and emergency situations. I believe that this will be a real opportunity for our government to be user friendly to the individuals and to the communities that often bear the brunt of the worst that nature has to offer.

I would ask that we support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member of the committee, as well as the chairman and ranking members of the authorizing committees for their cooperation and support. We appreciate that very much; and we think that when we have completed our work on this bill, we will have done a day's work for the people of America. I urge passage.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, after having consulted with my ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), we agree this is a constructive amendment, that it is a positive idea, that it helps the bill, and we accept it. We urge its adoption.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Representative SANFORD BISHOP's amendment to authorize FEMA

to establish a minority emergency preparedness demonstration program, under which funding would be provided to eligible non-profit organizations to conduct research into the state of preparedness and disaster response awareness in African American and Hispanic households.

A number of my constituents in Watts, Compton, Lynwood, and Long Beach are minorities who have been affected by natural disasters. There is an ever-present threat of an earthquake and the looming potential of floods. It is essential that they have contingency plans based on timely information in order to prepare for potential disasters. It is critical that funding be made available to determine the degree to which communities of color are aware of and prepared to respond to impending disaster. I offer my support to my colleague for this very timely amendment, and commend him for his foresight.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR.

FREILINGHUYSEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation system.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), to prevent the Veterans Administration from using the existing Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation formula to allocate veterans medical dollars across the country. This is the 3rd year in a row that I have offered this amendment with the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

In 1997, Congress passed legislation that authorized the VA to develop a new formula for allocating veterans medical care dollars across the Nation. The resulting formula, VERA, has not worked as intended. VERA has had a terrible effect of restricting access to veterans medical care in my part of the Northeast, including my district in New Jersey, which is part of Veterans Integrated Service Network, or VISN, 3. This network, which serves parts of New York and New Jersey, has borne

the brunt of this funding shift. According to the VA's own figures, funding for VISN 3 has been reduced by 6 percent or \$64 million at a time when most other networks have received funding increases.

New Jersey has the second oldest veterans population in the Nation behind Florida. Our State has the fourth highest number of complex-care patients treated at our hospitals. Yet New Jersey's older, sicker veterans are routinely left waiting months for visits to primary care physicians and specialists or are denied care at our two VA nursing homes.

Something is fundamentally wrong with the VERA allocation formula if it continues to decrease funding for areas where veterans have the greatest medical needs. All veterans, regardless of where they live, have earned and deserve access to the same quality of medical care, care that is too often denied under the current formula.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to withdraw this amendment today, but this issue must be addressed.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member seeking time in opposition to this amendment?

If not, the gentleman from New Jersey still has time remaining.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN.

Congressman FREILINGHUYSEN, along with New York Representative MAURICE HINCHEY, have been tireless crusaders for the rights of our nation's veterans, and this amendment highlights this fact by forcing the VA to abandon its flawed funded formula for providing for the health care needs of America's veterans.

Under the current system, VERA bases its resource allocation on sending more dollars to areas where there are more veterans—not where the needs are the greatest.

While that may sound rationale—the result has been horrendous for areas of the country like Queens and the Bronx, which I represent.

The facts bare out that increasingly more VA dollars are going to the South and Southwest portions of the country where more veterans live—veterans who are often younger and healthier.

The result is less resources in the areas of the country, like New York City, where the veterans are older, sicker, and in more desperate need of care.

I heard a story from a constituent regarding a VA hospital he saw while on vacation in Florida. It was a state of the art facility, with plenty of doctors and nurses on call—and no patients.

He and his wife informed me that the place was virtually empty—but that facility had the best money can buy.

In New York City, meanwhile, we continue to see lay-offs of the professional doctors and nurses at our VA hospitals and clinics; long lines for care; and a far too high ratio of nurses per patient.

I am not saying that we should deprive our veterans in the South and Southwest part of the country their fair share of resources; all we

ask for this amendment is that the VA provide equal treatment and resources to all veterans regardless of where they reside.

It is a shame that the VERA system has pitted veterans in one region of the country versus veterans in other regions.

Therefore, I am supportive of the FREILINGHUYSEN amendment to prohibit any Federal funds from implementing or administering the VERA system.

I ask all of my colleagues from throughout the Nation to support this amendment that has caused so much pain for so many veterans.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

My congressional district in southern Nevada has the fastest growing veteran population in the country.

The medical facilities in my district have seen a 24.4 percent increase in the number of veterans that they serve over the past year. This is a phenomenal increase.

Unfortunately, veterans programs in southern Nevada do not receive sufficient funding to provide all the services that veterans need and this shortfall in funding has had a negative impact on the delivery of veterans health care services.

Clinics are short-staffed and veterans are still waiting far too long for medical appointments. Demands for veteran health care services in southern Nevada is increasing faster than the availability for facilities and providers. We need more resources.

The VERA system is a fair and equitable way to ensure that the distribution of VA funds is consistent with the distribution of the veterans population.

The implementation of this system is an essential step forward in the continued improvement of our VA health care system.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman I want to commend the gentleman for his strong advocacy on behalf of Veterans Networks that have a rapidly aging population and an aging infrastructure to maintain. The VA in the State of New Jersey has the tough challenge of providing quality health care services to a veterans population that is the second oldest on average in the Nation. And unlike many other States that have older populations, New Jersey has an aging health care infrastructure that is proven costly to maintain and to operate.

As the gentleman knows, we have been working for some time to find solutions to this problem so that our veterans are not shortchanged by VERA.

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

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I thank the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for his comments.

As the gentleman knows, I and nearly 30 of my colleagues have introduced legislation to address the problem of resource allocation within the VA health care system. Many of us believe that areas of the country with the high cost of living have been unfairly disadvantaged under the existing resource allocation formula. I also know that the gentleman is working on several VA health care initiatives that are designed to improve the VA health care system to provide better service for our veterans.

My question is, what is the best way to ensure that veterans health services, particularly specialty care services like spinal cord injury treatment, are adequately maintained for all of our veterans, and not just those in certain parts of our country?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I do thank my friend from New Jersey for his excellent question. I believe, like the gentleman does, that a veteran is a veteran is a veteran, no matter in what part of the country he or she happens to reside. As the gentleman knows, in some of our networks, there has been an erosion in certain specialty care services. For example, in 1996, we required the VA to maintain a certain level of capacity in specialized programs. We now know that despite this Congressional requirement, specialty care bed capacity has been reduced by as much as 65 percent.

I wish to reassure the gentleman that, in fact, I am working, as chairman of the full Committee on Veterans Affairs, on a comprehensive VA health care improvement and capacity restoration bill. Once that bill is finalized and I have a chance to share that proposal with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, including the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I believe he and others will find that it will appropriately and compassionately address many of the concerns which the gentleman has raised so adequately on the floor today.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his leadership, as well as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in supporting this amendment. VERA, the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation plan, is badly in need of what my colleague from New Jersey attempts to do with this, and my colleague from New York.

Under the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation plan, I have witnessed the results of

cuts that have effectively removed hundreds of millions of dollars from the lower New York area veterans network.

VERA is fundamentally flawed. These flaws permeate VERA's methodology, its implementation, and the VA's oversight of this new spending plan.

The veteran's network in our area has the oldest veterans population, the highest number of veterans with spinal cord injuries, the highest number of veterans suffering from mental illness, the highest incidence of hepatitis C in its veterans population, and the highest number of homeless veterans.

It is inconceivable and intolerable that the VA would continually reduce our region's funding.

VISN 3 has required reserve funding for the last 4 years because our veterans hospitals keep running out of money.

When will we realize that the VA should fund our hospitals properly the first time and leave reserve funds for emergencies?

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment and make the investment in our veterans hospitals necessary to keep our promise to our veterans. The veterans of this Nation were there is our time of need. We ought to do the same for them.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Frelinghuysen amendment, for the third year in a row.

Mr. Chairman, this Member rises today in strong support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) which would prohibit funds in the bill from being used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement or administer the Veterans Equitable Resource Allocation (VERA) system. Unfortunately this has turned into a regional legislative battle between northeastern states and especially low-population Great Plains and Rocky Mountain states' delegations on one hand, and on the other hand the Sunbelt states with their larger numbers of veterans retirees. Those of us representing the former see our veterans left out in the cold while the money flows to the populace Sunbelt states. Once again, we may be out-voted but it certainly isn't fair to veterans in our states.

From the time the Clinton Administration announced this new system, this Member has voiced his strong opposition to VERA because of its inherent flaws in inequitable distribution of funds, and has supported funding levels of the VA Health Administration above the amount the Clinton Administration recommended.

This Member is proud to have supported the increases in funding which Congress has provided for veterans health care recent years. However, the veterans health care system in Nebraska continues to experience growing service and funding shortfalls each year even after the forced closing of two of our three in-patient facilities, reducing the number of full time employees fourteen percent and completing integration of all three VA Medical centers. In fiscal year 1999, the VISN 14 area—

consisting of Nebraska and Iowa experienced a \$6 million shortfall. In fiscal year 2000, the shortfall was \$17 million. In fiscal year 2001, the shortfall was \$48 million. For the short-term, the VA Central Office has provided VISN 14 with a \$32 million loan, which it will be required to repay, and a \$16 million grant. While VISN 14 continues to experience growing shortfalls in funding, the number of patients continues to increase.

Clearly the VERA system has had a very negative impact on Nebraska and other sparsely populated areas of the country. All members of Congress should agree, Mr. Chairman, that the VA must provide adequate services and facilities for veterans all across the country regardless of whether they live in sparsely populated areas with resultant low usage numbers for VA hospitals. The funding distribution unfairly reallocates the VA's health care budget based strictly on a per capita veterans usage of facilities. There must be at least a basic level of acceptable national infrastructure of facilities, medical personnel, and services for meeting the very real medical needs faced by our veterans wherever they live. There must be a threshold funding level for VA medical services in each state and region before any per-capita funding formula is applied. That is only common sense, but the Clinton Administration had too little of that valuable commodity when it comes to treating veterans in our part of the country humanely and equitably.

In closing Mr. Chairman, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Frelinghuysen amendment and fulfill the obligation to provide care to those who have so honorably served our country—no matter where they live in these United States of America.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN) for his passionate advocacy on behalf of our Nation's veterans and veterans in his district. I am sympathetic to his concerns about VERA, being myself from the Northeast.

This is not an easy issue for every Member from the Northeast or Midwest, many of whom have a concern about the impact of medical dollars moving to growing regions. We hear from colleagues representing the South and the Southwest worried that not enough is being provided in their regions.

So I am hopeful that the new VA Secretary will give some attention to this issue, and that, together, we can find a solution. I thank the gentleman for withdrawing his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my leader on the subcommittee for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough that the veterans health care budget submitted by the Bush Administration is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of our veterans across the country, but because of the computer formula known as VERA, veterans in New York and other States will suffer disproportionately.

VERA and the inadequate funding levels in this bill will guarantee cuts in health care for many veterans across the country. While VERA purports to provide equitable health care in all regions, without question it has lowered the quality of care in many places. VERA is not equitable or fair to veterans in many parts of the country.

Since 1995, in the Hudson Valley Health Care System, area which serves part of New York, we have seen the following: there has been a cut in the number of employees by 34 percent; beds have been cut by 52 percent; while the number of unique patients has increased by 76 percent; and the number of visits has increased by 84 percent.

Despite increasing enrollment, our share of resources continues to shrink under VERA. VISN 3 and the region that I represent treats older and sicker veterans more so than any other VISN in the country. They have the highest fuel costs in the Nation, by far. We have the highest reported incidence of hepatitis C in the Nation and are treating the greatest number of hepatitis C patients, and have the highest rate of homeless veterans. VERA does not account for any of these costs.

Despite the cuts in services and efforts to maximize operating efficiencies, we are still facing even more funding shortfalls in this part of the country. All the cuts in personnel and facilities that can be conceived of have been made in our region, yet VA facilities are facing a \$32 million shortfall in the Hudson Valley area of New York, while VISN 3 as a whole is facing a \$160 million shortfall.

Under VERA, every year is a funding emergency, forcing us to beg for additional funding to address these shortfalls. This year, 4 VISNs are receiving emergency funds because of inadequacies in this VERA formula. My region, number 3, is receiving \$64 million, far short of what is needed. Because of VERA and this year's inadequate budget, it is an absolute certainty we will need emergency funding to get through this next year.

While those being injured the most under VERA are those who reside in the Northeast and Midwest areas of our country, other regions have suffered in the past and may do so again under VERA in the immediate future. In fiscal year 2002, the losses would include VISNs serving the following regions: the Bronx, New York; Ann Arbor, Michigan; Chicago, Illinois; Long Beach, California; Baltimore, Maryland; Phoenix Arizona; Albany New York; and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

□ 2115

Our veterans should not be penalized because of where they live, but as long as the Veterans' Administration is allocating resources in the name of this VERA formula, we will continue to have these inadequacies and injustices that do a great disservice to veterans in my part of the country and in many others.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 41 offered by Mr. WAXMAN: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Veterans Affairs to implement any provision of the April 2001 report entitled "Plan for the Development of a 25-Year General Use Plan for Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Healthcare Center".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

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

This is a noncontroversial amendment clarifying that an April 2001 report entitled "The Plan for the Development of a 25-Year General Use Plan" for the VA West Los Angeles Health Care Center is a preliminary plan in the development of a master plan for the lands on that property. There is concern about the status of this preliminary plan because it contains some controversial provisions strongly opposed by the local residents, community groups, and public officials. This might have been avoided, but no local, county, and State officials, and only a very small number of community organizations in the area were allowed to participate in the process to develop this plan. The West L.A. VA also opposes parts of the plan.

The VA will make its decisions for the future use of the West L.A. VA lands under the existing CARES (Capital Assessment Realignment for Enhanced Services) process that was initiated in 1999. Under this process, the VA will conduct a detailed analysis of VA property throughout the country to determine the best option for serving veterans in each area.

This amendment would bar the use of Federal funds to implement any of the April 2001 plan's provisions. Its intent is simply to clarify that it is only a preliminary report and that this final plan for use of the land will be developed under the CARES process.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing controversial about this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I am not in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment. We have discussed this with the gentleman. The request is to put the implementation of this study on hold until there is more input from the community and with the local representatives. We would be

prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. RANGEL: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 4 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the requirement under section 12(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437j(c); relating to community service).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

The amendment would strike the funding for the redundant provision that is in the 1998 Public Housing Act that requires tenants in public housing to do community work. It has taken about 3 years for HUD to put together the regulations in order to guide this, and HUD does not oppose the striking of the funds that are imposed upon the tenants in public housing, because there is no other provisions for other people that receive Federal funds to do this type of thing.

In addition to it, the local and State communities are all working hard under the welfare reform legislation to see that people who are able to work can work, and it is an unfunded mandate, and I am certain that HUD could be using the funds for other purposes. I understand the authorizing committee has no objections to this.

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent any HUD funding to be used to implement the community service requirements that we passed as part of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I worked with my colleagues on this provision and know it to be very fair with a great deal of flexibility for those subject to it.

This amendment seeks to reverse an important initiative that was part of

our welfare reform effort. In approving the Community Service Initiative, we sought to create a mutuality of obligation between the provider of the housing and the recipient of the housing. This obligation is not overwhelming, it only calls for 8 hours a month of assistance from the resident; that is only 2 hours a week. It is a very flexible requirement.

The initiative was crafted to have no real limits to what can be considered community service so that it can be satisfied by planting and maintaining a garden, voter registration efforts, or can be work with the big brothers or big sisters programs. Under the language of the provision we give the individual Housing Authorities full authority to make the determination for what is an allowable activity.

This initiative enjoys bipartisan support and was not only supported by the Clinton administration, it was included in former President Clinton's own public housing reform proposal which he sent to the Hill prior to our consideration of the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998.

Who is required to comply with this initiative? Residents of public housing who have the time. The language of the law clearly exempts the elderly, the disabled, the employed, those who are in school, and/or are receiving training, those in a family receiving assistance under a State program, and those who are involved in the welfare reform program. With all of those exceptions, who is left? Individuals who are unemployed, those who have dropped out of school, those who are fully capable and have the time to give something back to the communities in which they live.

What happens if these individuals choose not to comply with this community service provision? They are not immediately tossed out on the street. However, noncompliance can be grounds for nonrenewal of the public housing lease at the end of the 12-month lease term, which can lead to eviction.

This issue comes down to one of personal responsibility. This was a major theme of the welfare reform laws we successfully changed. President Clinton signed those laws; they were good laws. This is one of them. The language from the Senate committee report seems to best sum up, and I am quoting: they say, "The provision is not intended to be perceived as punitive, but rather considered as a rewarding activity that will assist residents in improving their own and their neighbors' economic and social well-being and give residents a greater stake in their communities."

In recent years we have made great progress in an effort to reform welfare and reform public housing. This initiative has a strong link in this effort. Recently, I saw residents of the Housing Authority of New Orleans buildings outside cleaning up yards after the weekend. They were patrolling areas that might not otherwise have been

clean. They would have been filled with trash. They told me, the residents who were cleaning them up, that they had been cleaning a lot of trash up. Now the yards are clean on a Monday morning, the children are outside playing in the grassy areas, grandmas are walking their grandchildren around, helping them learn to ride their bikes.

Mr. Chairman, this initiative works. I think we have to preserve the community service provisions of the 1998 Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to please consider this opposition to the Rangel amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from New York is right in dealing with the exceptions that are under this law. After we get finished with all of that, the only people that are left are the elderly, working families, and the disabled, and those who are in school.

This is not a part of welfare reform. We have legislation that deals with welfare reform. We have legislation that deals with communities and States that require working for those people who are able to work. This is the only type of allowing the indignity of putting this type of burden on poor folks in public housing when there is no such requirement for any other type of Federal assistance, including Section 8.

Now, HUD knew how difficult it would be for them to superimpose their standards on the welfare standards. This is a housing bill; this is not a welfare reform bill. That is the reason that they took so long in getting these regulations that are almost unenforceable, and that is the reason why they do not object to having this stricken from the record.

Mr. Chairman, we have cut a lot of good services out of the HUD programs to be able to give assistance to kids to get education and recreation and to avoid drug addiction. But this is also an unfunded mandate that forces the public housing people to take a look at this and to put this burden on people when we have the cities departments of welfare, the State departments of welfare to do it. The Housing Authority is no place to enforce the welfare laws.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I had a conversation with the gentleman prior to this debate. I had no knowledge that anyone on our side would oppose him and based on the conversation we had and right at this very moment, I still feel that this is an amendment that I can support. The agency from New York, in conversation with the gentleman, has agreed with him on this. So I continue to support the gentleman's amendment and I would be prepared to accept it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Rangel amendment.

This is an amendment that respects the dignity of public housing residents.

In 1998 the Congress passed legislation that essentially says that public housing residents aren't as good as other Americans.

It requires residents to fulfill community service because they receive the benefit of public housing.

Mr. Chairman, this provision was mean spirited when it was passed and we should overturn it today.

Residents of public housing do receive a government benefit. In that way they are similarly situated to hundreds of millions of other Americans.

They receive a benefit just as home owners are allowed to deduct mortgage interest from their taxes.

They receive a benefit just as FHA and VA home loans receive a benefit.

They certainly do not receive a benefit as great as those that huge multinational corporations are granted on taxes from federal, state, and local governments.

I could stand on the floor of this House and name thousands of special interests that receive some sort of special government benefit because they have been determined to be worthy of such treatment by Congress.

Just as many of these residents are moving from welfare to work we have singled out public housing residents has having to justify themselves by completing community service.

We should be ashamed of such shoddy treatment of people with lower incomes.

How will we administer this mess of a requirement?

In New York City, NYCHA administers housing for 426,000 residents—30 percent of whom are elderly.

This community service requirement, even with exemptions for the elderly, will require a huge amount of resources to monitor compliance.

In the context of a housing bill that already under funds housing—administration will simply take additional much needed resources away from where they are needed.

This is truly meddling by the federal government in the affairs of local citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and repeal this belittling requirement of public housing residents.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 40 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

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

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act shall be made available to any person or entity that has been convicted of violating the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

The trade deficit in America has risen to \$30 billion a month. It now approaches close to \$360 billion a year. That is unbelievable. I think the least that we can do is wherever possible in expending Federal dollars, and certainly there are quite a few dollars being expended in this bill, would be to look for the probability and the possibility of spending those funds on American-made goods.

This amendment not only does that, but it would disallow and prohibit anyone who is violating the Buy American law from being eligible for grant money under the bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment. We are very much prepared to accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2130

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their hard work in putting this bill together.

I rise for the purpose of engaging the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Given the subcommittee's overall funding allocation, the task of the chairman and the ranking member was a daunting one, to say the least. This bill funds many of our Nation's priorities: veterans, housing, the environment, FEMA, NASA, and science.

Unfortunately, the subcommittee's overall allocation was too low to meet all of these priorities. One of those underfunded priorities in this bill is clean water.

I was prepared to offer an amendment tonight to restore funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund back to its current-year level. Our country's water infrastructure and environmental needs are not diminishing. In fact, EPA's own estimates show that our local communities are facing a \$330 billion gap in water infrastructure investments over the next 20 years. Now is not the time to reduce the Federal commitment to these communities.

Mr. Chairman, the State Revolving Funds are an important financing tool that helps them meet their growing clean water needs. I want to commend NUCA, the American Oceans Campaign, the Sierra Club, NRDC, the League of Conservation Voters, and others for helping to highlight our country's environmental and infrastructure needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and his staff for agreeing to work to increase the overall funding for the Clean Water SRF as this bill goes to conference with the other body.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for raising this important issue, and I remain committed to work to increase the allocation for the Clean Water SRF as we go to conference with the Senate. I agree that our communities face growing environmental and infrastructure challenges, and we must maintain our Federal commitment to them. It is the right thing to do for our environment as well as the economic development of these communities.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for a colloquy.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just wanted to continue along the venue the gentleman had with the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER). I just wanted to commend the chairman for his personal interest and leadership in helping us zero in on these issues dealing with water and infrastructure.

I am particularly interested in the gentleman's willingness to work with us on the State Revolving Fund, because this is an area that, from my perspective, ought to be able to bring together a wide variety of opinions because of the fact that it is a revolving fund that deals with loans rather than grants; that requires more of an investment from local communities; the fact that for some instances where people do not have the start-up money, it actually is better than a grant, and that it has money over time.

I want to express my appreciation for the gentleman's focus on this and offer any help that I can give to help reinforce this as it works its way through the legislative process, because it

means so much to the livability of our communities.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman for his thoughts on this issue, Mr. Chairman. I spoke earlier on the Barcia amendment. I know he feels very strongly, as do I. There is a tremendous, tremendous void out there in our ability to deal with combined sewer overflows, with clean water issues throughout the country.

Clearly, the Congress needs to step up and take this issue on head on. We are looking for direction from the authorizing committee. I would be more than happy to work with the gentleman to help to reorder some of the priorities, because this is something that I certainly rely on in my community, and I know the gentleman does. There is broad interest throughout the Congress on this. I thank the gentleman for his interest.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for a colloquy.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I join my colleague in supporting the increased funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. Investment in wastewater infrastructure may not be a glamorous issue, but it is a fundamental component of efforts across the country to create and maintain livable communities.

The Clean Water State Revolving Fund has been the Federal Government's primary and most effective tool in helping communities meet wastewater and infrastructure needs. The needs are enormous. Even under the most conservative estimates, we are still not investing enough in wastewater infrastructure. We wonder how our water gets dirty. We need to fix our wastewater problems.

The EPA estimates that we face over \$300 billion of wastewater infrastructure needs over the next 20 years. New figures have been coming out showing significantly higher figures. The longer we wait to address these needs, the worse the problem will become. It is imperative that we do everything we can now to assist our communities in building environmental infrastructure.

I commend the chairman for putting in funding for the State Revolving Fund which is significantly higher than the level proposed by the administration, but I do believe that an even higher funding level will be necessary in the coming years.

I offered, with my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, a bill, H.R. 668, which calls for \$3 billion in funding for the State Revolving Fund. I do understand the constraints faced by the chairman in funding the many programs in this bill; but I hope, at the very minimum, that we will be able to reach the fiscal year 2001 level of \$1.35 billion in this bill.

I look forward to working with the chairman and trying to achieve a funding level in this bill that more accurately represents the tremendous needs of our communities across the Nation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her strong support for this program and for her leadership in helping to make the Hudson River fishable, swimmable, and even more beautiful than we found it.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—

(1) to obligate amounts for the International Space Station in contravention of the cost limitations established by section 202 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2000 (Pub. L. 106-391; 42 U.S.C. 2451 note); or

(2) to defer or cancel construction of the Habitation Module, Crew Return Vehicle, or Propulsion Module elements of the International Space Station.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I would start off by explaining to this prestigious body what this amendment does do and what it does not do.

First of all, what it does not do: it does not eliminate funding for the Space Station. This is not a killer Space Station amendment. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a fencing, a capping amendment.

This simply states, and it reiterates what they have done in the United States Senate, language offered by Senator MCCAIN, and passing the Senate, that there will be \$25 billion allocated for the life of the Space Station for construction costs, \$17 billion for Space Station shuttle launch costs, for a total of \$42 billion, \$42 billion.

Mr. Chairman, where I come from and where most Americans come from, that is a lot of money. That is not a killer amendment. That is just simply saying, you guys have to build the Space Station for this cost, and you cannot continue to go over it with inefficiencies and delays and overruns, because that hurts other precious programs: housing programs for our poor, feeding programs for our hungry, education programs for our children. We are going to be fighting for every dollar we can get this fall in our budget.

I would say to the Members, \$42 billion, is that enough? Is that enough, when we have 18 percent of our children in this country in poverty? When we have some soldiers who are on food stamps, is \$42 billion enough? We will see.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is because, according to a

Bush administration Office of Management and Budget document, here is what they say about the international Space Station: “Recent cost growth on the Space Station is estimated at approximately \$1 billion for 2001 and 2002 and \$4 billion for the next 5 years.” That is recent cost growth. That is a total of \$5 billion in recent cost growth.

Mr. Chairman, that is Washington parlance, for those out there, saying that we have a humongous cost overrun, \$5 billion. So that is why we are saying that we have to fence the money, \$42 billion they have in NASA to spend on the Space Station, and that is it.

Now, we will probably have some proponents say, well, that is not enough. What if we go over by \$3 billion or another \$10 billion? No other program gets that latitude. We do not have education programs that come back to the Government and say, well, we had more hungry kids in the school lunch program, Mr. Congressman. Can you give us another \$5 billion? It does not happen. It happens here. So what we are saying, like the Senate said, put a fence around it and cap the costs.

I continue, Mr. Chairman, to be very worried about this program. We continue to be very concerned about it because the science is dwindling. Instead of sending up scientists to the Space Station, we are sending up tourists to the Space Station. We need people, if they are going to be up there, performing the kind of science that will help our citizens and lead to good discoveries to cure people of disease, rather than selling the Space Station to the highest bidder, \$15 million today, \$25 million tomorrow. We cannot afford to do that. That tourist takes up valuable space that we need to perform science.

Mr. Chairman, the science is dwindling; the cost is going through the roof. Let me read to the Members what scientists are saying about the Space Station.

In Florida Today on June 16 of this year, they said, “Now, a year since construction began in earnest on the station, it is still hard to find a scientist outside of NASA who expects much progress from the station research.”

Robert Park, a researcher for the American Physical Society, says this: “It is impossible to name a field of science that has been changed or even altered by this kind of research. You finally end up with a Space Station that does not do science.”

I can go on. Kenneth Baldwin, with the Department of Biophysics at the University of California, says, “If you are going to use the justification for the Space Station to have science as the primary product, should you continue to build up and maintain it with a 3-person crew when you cannot have any science?”

Mr. Chairman, I am going to shortly reserve some of my time and come

back after we hear from some of the proponents of the Space Station who have some good and compelling arguments. But I sure hope they are not arguments about limiting them to \$42 billion. That is \$42 billion.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) seek time in opposition?

Mr. WALSH. I rise in opposition, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the Committee on Science.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, let me say that I have the deepest admiration for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and this body will be certainly not as bright and not as profound a place when he no longer is with us. And I know that he is not planning to run for reelection. We will miss him very much.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with the gentleman in the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics. Over the years, he has been a voice for prudence and a voice for, yes, for second thoughts about the Space Station.

Let me say that in the beginning of his term, his arguments made a lot of sense, a lot more sense. As the years have gone by, however, and we have invested billions and billions of dollars into this program, yes, in the beginning it might have made sense to postpone the Space Station for a number of years. The voice of the gentleman from Indiana was there saying, Do not waste the money.

But sometimes once you have made a commitment, it is actually more responsible then to move forward and make sure that the project in which you are involved is a success, rather than turning back.

If we support the Roemer amendment now, what it will mean is we will not have science on the Space Station. That is what it will mean. The laboratory will not work. We will not have the science experiments. Yes, there is some question whether or not, and from the beginning, whether or not we were going to have great achievements in space in these science labs; but one way to ensure that there is never any great achievement or breakthrough for mankind on this in the microgravity research being conducted in the Space Station is to pass the Roemer amendment, which fences off this money.

Yes, we are now in a crisis at the Space Station. There has been an overrun, and we are going to need to come up with \$5 billion. It does not mean it has to come from us. I am going to Ireland; I am going to Italy. I am speaking to other allies.

□ 2145

I will be traveling over the break to those other countries and will be speaking to leaders, for example in the Gulf region, to try to find other people who might want to invest in this incredible, historic engineering project in space.

If we look into the sky, we see a bright shining object that was not there before. We can either turn out that light and say that it is a failure and it represents the failure of mankind, or we can work at this moment, now, and make sure that we succeed in this endeavor. It is not time to turn back, it is not time to just fence things off, to put shackles on the hands of those of us who are trying to make this project succeed. Together, Democrats and Republicans, and it has always been a bipartisan project, can work together to make sure that that light in the sky is a symbol of progress and hope and, yes, even overcoming bureaucratic obstacles and great hardships, and overcoming them together.

The gentleman from Indiana has had a great career. It has been an honor serving with him. But I ask my colleagues not to support his amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my good friend from California for the kind words. I very much not only enjoyed serving with him but learning a great deal from him as well; learned about science and learned about surfing as well too.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE), a Republican sponsor of this amendment.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Chairman, I commend my colleague from Indiana for his persistence on this amendment. We have had this debate a lot. Before I came to Congress in 1995, a few years before that, there was a huge debate on this, and the space station only stayed in existence by, I think it was about a one-vote margin. It was very, very close.

At that time, opponents to the space station pointed out basically what has happened, and that is that we have had these tremendous cost overruns. The science was questionable. We are now down to a module that will hold three people. It takes two-and-a-half people to keep the thing running, so that leaves about 10 hours a week for somebody to do science in the space station.

We are looking at Russia not having kept its commitments. Cost overruns. This amendment would cap the space station funding at \$25 billion for construction costs and \$17 billion for related launch costs. It would not cancel the space station funding for fiscal year 2002, but the space station is expected to be \$4 billion over budget by 2006. That puts it substantially over the \$25 billion budget cap imposed in

the fiscal year 2001 NASA authorization act. NASA has proposed cutting scientific research to pay for the construction cost overruns.

I think it is time for this body to realize that we are just not getting the benefit for the cost. Will it make a difference in terms of what this body decides to do for the gentleman from Indiana and myself to have brought this amendment back up again tonight? Probably not. But I would still urge my colleagues to do the right thing and vote for the Roemer-Ganske amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman who is offering the amendment in a little discussion about his amendment, but first I want to join the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) in commending the gentleman for his sincere interest in this issue and for his bringing the issue to the Congress in the past, and his persistence in doing it. I think the station is a much better enterprise because of his efforts. We all need challenged, and certainly NASA needs challenged in many areas. So before we start a debate, I want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. ROEMER. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman's first International Space Station amendment here. It was an amendment much like the amendments he has offered in the past, I think the last 5 years, as a matter of fact. It was a straight-up cut; was it not?

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. The gentleman is correct, the amendment I offered earlier and withdrew was a kill amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That would have straight-out eliminated the station program. I understand why the gentleman did that. It has been defeated on this floor a number of times and the body has spoken pretty overwhelmingly with regard to that issue.

I frankly do not quite understand this amendment, and that is why I want to engage the gentleman in a discussion of it at the front of this overall debate. I have the amendment here before me and it says, "None of the funds made available in this act may be used by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to obligate amounts for International Space Station in contravention of cost limitations established in section 202 of the 2000 authorization for NASA." Correct?

Mr. ROEMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, and if he is reading the amendment, then that is the way it is written.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That is the first paragraph. "None of the funds may be used to obligate amounts in contravention of that act. Then it says, "or defer

or cancel construction of the habitat module crew return vehicle propulsion module." As I understand that, the gentleman is saying they cannot expend above the authorization on the one hand; is that correct?

Mr. ROEMER. Is the gentleman yielding to me to explain my amendment?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, I am, in an ongoing discussion.

Mr. ROEMER. I will be happy to explain the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. No, no. If the gentleman will just answer the question.

Does the first paragraph say, that to obligate amounts under here, that "none of the funds made available may be expended in excess of the authorization in section 202."?

Mr. ROEMER. The first part of the amendment, as the gentleman knows, simply states what the United States Senate has passed as a cap for what can be spent according to the authorization levels for both launch and construction costs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time. In the second paragraph, the gentleman prohibits deferment or cancellation of construction of three pieces to the station, the habitation module, the crew return vehicle, and the propulsion module. Is that correct?

Mr. ROEMER. I am delighted my friend is so interested and intrigued with the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Well, it is the amendment we are debating here on the floor, so I am quite intrigued with it.

Mr. ROEMER. The amendment states they shall not exceed an authorized bill for a cap; they cannot go over what we have already approved and passed as a Congress and been signed into law for a cap. And then it says do not jeopardize the lives of the scientists and the astronauts on that by cutting life-sustaining or life-threatening equipment that may get them off the space station that is in danger. Do not cut an escape vehicle needed to get those people off.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. And that is a really good cause. I acknowledge that, and I agree with the Member on that. But the Member is setting up here an impossible situation. The gentleman is taking the flexibility away from NASA to manipulate funding between these projects, to engage the international community to help fund these projects, to delay projects in order to stay within the authorization.

Mr. ROEMER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the flexibility is there. I simply say they have \$42 billion, \$42 billion, to decide what to do to build a safe and scientifically worthwhile space station.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I understand that, but the gentleman understands, because he is a real student of this, that the dollars are just too far in excess of the authorization and that complying with both paragraph one and paragraph two is impossible.

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

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Just to note that in terms of flexibility, the crew return vehicle and the habitation module, which the gentleman just mentioned, those are two areas we are working with right now to see if our allies could pick up the cost for these. Under the Roemer amendment, we would have to pay for them ourselves rather than if we could pick up an extra \$2 billion from our allies. Why not let them pay for a crew return vehicle or habitation module?

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Every time we have engaged these other countries in trying to help us, like the Russians, we end up paying for everything they were supposed to pay for. It is yet another cost overrun for us.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said in his opening remarks that it is not a killer amendment. I think it is a killer amendment for the reasons that I have tried to bring out here in our discussion. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Science.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here and to join in the accolades for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER). It is an annual group of accolades, and I am very pleased that the vote on the amendment will not reflect the veneration that we have for this Member that is leaving.

We are a Nation of slogans. I think MacArthur said "the object of war was victory," I think Franklin Roosevelt said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," but Billy Graham said one that I can use here. He said, "Love the sinner but hate the sin." And here I really love the gentleman from Indiana, but I absolutely hate this amendment.

I have the amendment memorized because I think this is the fifth or sixth straight time that the gentleman has come with this god-awful amendment, and I just hope that my colleagues will listen carefully and vote their conscience.

As crafted, this amendment could eventually force unwise choices to NASA's human space flight program, which includes both the shuttle program and the space station program. It is a bad amendment. It is an amendment that looks reasonable at first glance, but it really creates more difficulties than it solves.

Actually, simply put, the Roemer amendment would deny NASA the ability to make any adjustments to the space station program that might be needed to live within the funding cap

contained in last year's NASA authorization bill. We already have a cap. There is a cap. It would also prevent NASA from making the adjustments to the space station program included in the President's fiscal year 2002 budget. I think the President was a little conservative in his budget, and we are working with him on that. I think it is short of the needs we need.

So I think we should oppose this amendment and once again wish the gentleman from Indiana good sailing. May the wind be at the gentleman's back when he goes back to Indiana and becomes, maybe, the next governor or the United States Senator from there. God bless the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I would echo the great respect for my neighbor and colleague from Indiana expressed in the Chamber today. I am more convinced than ever that the gentleman from Indiana is one tough customer, but I will rise as a new member of the NASA Committee on Science to express my opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague.

Now, my colleague's amendment seems to be predicated on the assertion that we cannot spend additional money because we cannot afford to make mistakes in the space program. Mr. Chairman, there has certainly been some growing pains associated with the space station over the last year in particular. But original ground-breaking research is, by its very nature, fraught with failure and disappointment. We should expect a project of this magnitude to benefit from an environment defined by academic freedom. Adopting this measure will be ignoring the original intent of the Congress that has always supported full funding of the space station to produce a world-class research facility.

Mr. Chairman, if we want great science, we must defend the programs that make it possible.

□ 2200

The amendment authored by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), Mr. Chairman, today would not so much kill the Space Station as he has attempted to do before perennially in this Chamber, but it may well wound it and wound it mortally. But I would offer this conclusion, that this debate is not just about dollars and sense, Mr. Chairman; all Americans are descendants of pioneers who journeyed to or prevailed in this wilderness Nation.

More than any other people in modern times, we are a Nation of explorers and adventurers. Let us not, in this day, abandon the most compelling aspect of American character. Our ancestors led the world into the unknown with faith and courage. Let us continue to lead the world with that same faith and courage into unimaginable riches of space.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer amendment to cap funding for the International Space Station. I rise to thank our good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his leadership on this issue and many other very important issues here in the House of Representatives. He will be missed.

When I came here 9 years ago, the gentleman was leading the effort in proving the point that the Space Station was too costly for what we were going to get out of it for this Nation. I was with him then, and I am as convinced today as I was 9 years ago that the gentleman is absolutely right on this issue.

I am a member of the House Committee on Science. It is hard to be a member of the House Committee on Science and not support the Space Station. But I can say as a member, I am respectful of the very valuable work that NASA does to push the envelope of technology for the aeronautical field and for understanding our universe in general.

I support the Roemer amendment, however, because I believe one NASA project, the Space Station, has cast too large a shadow over our Federal budget. When the Space Station was proposed in 1984, the estimated price tag was about \$8 billion. Can we all imagine \$8 billion?

Now the construction price alone has quadrupled the original price tag. On the Committee on Science we are still holding periodic hearings that discuss the continuing cost overruns for the Space Station.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest we can do better by our budget and we can do better by our children. By voting to cap the construction and launch costs for the Space Station, we can invest this money in as worthy but more reliable programs, both at NASA and other areas of our Federal budget. In this time of tight Federal funding, I believe now is the time to put the reigns on the Space Station. Invest in our country.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to add to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), that I have enjoyed serving with him.

We have fought this battle many years now. I happen to disagree with him over this particular issue. We have agreed on a lot of other issues. He has offered this House a valuable service. Frankly, he has offered NASA a valuable service by keeping the pressure on NASA.

I have to say, though, I hope the gentleman will withdraw this amendment much like he withdrew the other

amendment. This is a very ill-advised amendment.

The chairman and ranking member of this subcommittee have done an outstanding job of making sure that NASA's budget was kept within the perspective of this particular bill. The ranking member has made excellent points in arguing why this amendment today does not work.

The Roemer-Capps amendment is a Catch-22 for NASA. It is a wolf in sheep's clothing. The gentleman is trying to put a cap on this, but a cap already exists and the committee has worked within that cap. Do not support this ill-advised amendment. It does not provide NASA with the flexibility to deal with the cost issues that it must deal with. I hope the gentleman will withdraw this amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

The Space Station is in orbit. We have research going on up there right now. As we all know, NASA recently recorded significant cost overruns. The administration responded appropriately by canceling three elements.

I think there are some serious problems with the proposal the administration has put forward. I certainly agree with the sentiment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that we need to work with our European allies to see if we can get at least the crew return vehicle and the module built.

The proposal the gentleman from Indiana is putting forward essentially says we have to stay within the cap, and we already have a cap, but we have to go ahead and build all those elements.

That is like your spouse comes home and says, Honey, we are over budget. We cannot screen in the porch and buy that new car. Then you were to respond, we are going to stay on budget and we are going to screen in the porch and buy that new car. Your spouse might turn to you and scratch her head and say, Gee, honey, how the heck are we going to do that?

This is in many ways a very clever amendment, but it is a totally unworkable amendment. I believe it is just another attempt to try to kill the Space Station program. I would strongly encourage all my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

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

I think the basis most clearly articulated by our ranking member, who pointed out that by operation of the first half of the amendment NASA is precluded from going over the cap and by operation of the second portion of the amendment NASA is precluded from deferring or delaying enhance-

ments that would, in effect, force it to exceed the cap. It is unfortunately a Catch-22 that takes away the flexibility that NASA needs to sustain this program.

The Space Station holds out great promise in terms of science, the advancement of science and the development of commerce. I urge my colleagues to reject this Catch-22 amendment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I am for the amendment, so I do not have to say anything nice about the gentleman from Indiana. But I would anyway if it were relevant.

We have been sitting here for 3 days on this bill. In area after area important to the most needy people in our society, we have had a large degree of agreement that we have not been able to do what is required. We have cut funds for fighting drug-induced crime in public housing. We have not got enough in Section 8. We are about to have a rollcall in which veterans in one part of the country will be pitted against veterans in another for health care.

The list of pressing unmet basic needs is very long. That is why I am for this amendment. The Space Station is a good thing in itself; but in the context in which we are operating and which we have not got the funds to provide some people with the basic necessities of housing, of health care, of a decent education, I do not think it is justified to continue to spend as much as we have been spending on the Space Station.

I was a supporter of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) when we tried to stop it. It is obviously too late to stop it. But it is not too late to impose very stringent fiscal controls. The reason is, I would hope, clear to anyone who has been following this debate. We have not got enough money to meet the mandate of the Clean Water Act. We have not got enough money for people to be decently housed in the face of a housing crisis. We cannot provide veterans health care everywhere we want. This is an amendment that does not say the Space Station should not happen. We have lost that fight. But rather, that we have to impose fiscal restraints. If we do not impose them here, we impose them in housing, we impose them in veterans health care, and we impose them in the environment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Chairman, one of the people who I think about when I listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) speak is Keely Woodruff, a 6-year-old girl who has a developmental age of only 2½ because of epileptic seizures, who now is progressing nicely because of a device invented through our efforts in space.

The contributions NASA has made to our country and the world are absolutely priceless.

This is an ill-conceived, ill-thought-out amendment. It actually works against the apparent interest of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) of holding down costs as it requires construction without a thoughtful plan, a construction effort, I might add, comparable to our first trip to the Moon. It could actually cause deeper cuts in the station itself and cause the so-called cap to be a killing blow. Is that not the real intention?

The annals of great events of history are not filled by those content to live in the present without vision, but by those who sought to understand the unknown and change their future. If we cancel this program, what will we say and what will that say to our partners in the international community about U.S. leadership in the 21st century?

How can we begin to place a dollar value on the improvements and quality of life for all humanity that we know from the last 20 years of experience will come from space research. Vote down this killing amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roemer capping amendment. I will reiterate all of the compliments previously stated, having served with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment. The International Space Station is something that is working; but regarding the capping of it, Mr. Chairman, we do not have enough money to do everything we want to. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) talked about that. We need to continue what we should be doing in the space program, and the International Space Station is a great example of international cooperation. It had some rough sledding, but it is on schedule now. We have had crews up there since October 2000. They have made so much long-term progress in research in biotechnology, radiation, health, and such classroom-friendly lessons as Earth and near-object observation.

Mr. Chairman, that is why this amendment should be defeated, because there are so many other things that we can talk about.

The ISS has been a model of multinational coordination between Europe, Russia, Canada, Japan, Brazil and the U.S. If Congress eliminates or even caps funding for the station by passing one of these amendments, it would be a betrayal of our international partners.

Since October 2000, two crews have occupied the station and brought many of the early scientific experiments on-line. These experiments include research into long-term space

flight on humans, biotechnology, radiation, health, and such classroom-friendly lessons as earth and near object observation.

The space station is on track and operating, with several missions already complete. This NASA budget maintains that momentum and builds on the successes of this program.

Critics have charged that funding the space station will push out any smaller space exploration endeavors like the Mars Pathfinder Mission or the Hubble Space Telescope, which have had enormous success.

This simply is not true. NASA, with the development of the space station, will have a platform from which future space exploration and research can be launched.

Members of the shuttle crews, along with station inhabitants, have been able to overcome all of the problems that they have encountered, showcasing their ingenuity, creativity and skill. The ground support personnel have also played crucial roles in overcoming these obstacles.

We are standing on the brink of the twenty-first century. Capping funding for the international space station would be irresponsible.

It would cost us billions of dollars, along with countless hours of hard work and effort by NASA scientists, researchers, astronauts, and engineers. We would be best cripple and at worst lose our foothold to future space exploration and a valuable platform for scientific research.

Again, I am opposed to the amendment and support the funding for the international space station in this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let me say as everybody else has said that I have nothing but the greatest respect for the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), although I suspect he will be here 1 more year, so we may have to do this one more time. Having said that, I hope that the gentleman's amendment is defeated.

Mr. Chairman, this is something of a red herring amendment. We have already decided we are going to build the Space Station. We have already invested tremendously in it, and we have a cap that exists in the law and we have the ultimate cap that exists on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other body. Ultimately Congress decides how much money we are going to spend, regardless of whether we put some rhetorical cap in or not.

This is a program which is already up and running. It would be a mistake to pass this type of amendment which would actually be counterproductive to the program. Quite frankly, it could ultimately result in further cost overruns as you delay projects going forward. I hope my colleagues will look at this amendment, see that it is unworkable and defeat it.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is written in the Bible that without vision the people shall perish. Certainly vision in our great society means technology and

science. It means that bright, shining star in space that is our Space Station. But vision also means justice. Justice for all of the people in this great country. Vision means hope and dreams for the great people called Americans in the United States.

And in this bill which these two gentlemen have worked so hard to craft, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), we need even more justice and hopes and dreams for veterans that are not getting sufficient health care in this country, and risked their lives for this country overseas. For children, for children being raised in some of our public housing that is despicable, that is rat-infested. Yet we will go \$5 billion over budget without blinking an eye for 3.5 people in space.

□ 2215

Where is the vision and the justice and the fairness in that kind of allocation of resources?

When we talk in the Bible, Mr. Chairman, about vision and fairness for these great people, we mean for AmeriCorps, which is not funded in this budget; we mean for public housing, which is not adequately funded for the poorest of the poor in this great country; and we mean to help us fight the scourge of drugs which are especially hurting the most vulnerable people in inner city areas.

I would hope that we would at least cap and fence the funds on this program.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Houston, Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members of this body to oppose this amendment because it will seriously damage our space program.

I say to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Chairman, that our vision is circling the Earth. The vision is the Space Station that is circling the Earth. I say a fully functioning Space Station is the linchpin of our vision of human space flight. The intention of this amendment, make no mistake about it, is to kill the Station. It effectively denies NASA its flexibility to ensure that the Station remains viable.

The prohibition against deferring the habitation module, the crew return vehicle, and the propulsion module seems designed to help the Space Station; but in fact it does not. This amendment requires NASA to develop these parts of the Station under a cap, without the flexibility of working within their budget. And this amendment, make no mistake about it, kills the Station. The fact is we have an obligation to our international partners. The United States is the leading pioneer in space travel, and we ought not renege on agreements we have made to the na-

tions that are following us into space through the International Space Station team. More importantly, we have an obligation to protect the investment of American taxpayers and the vision that we see in space travel.

I implore Members to reject this amendment. I hope they will support the underlying bill, because it will provide the necessary resources to achieve our human space flight goals.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK:

Page 93, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 427. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are hereby revised by reducing the aggregate amount made available for "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND", reducing the amount specified under such "PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND" item for the Inspector General for Operation Safe Home, reducing the aggregate amount provided for "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL", and reducing the amount specified under such "OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL" item that is to be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home, and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fix, establish, charge, or collect mortgage insurance premiums for mortgage insurance under title II of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1707 et seq.) made available under any multifamily housing mortgage insurance program affected by the interim rule issued by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on July 2, 2001 (66 Federal Register 35070; Docket No. FR 4679-I-01), in an amount greater than the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of such program, by \$5,000,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

I want to talk here in this amendment about the Federal Housing Administration, the FHA. Earlier this year, this House passed a bill to reduce the fees that were charged to people trading in stocks. The rationale was that the stock fees charged through the SEC were bringing in more than it cost to administer the program, and so we put through a substantial reduction in that cost.

In fact, what happened is that the FHA is following a similar pattern. The FHA statute, which I reference in this

amendment, defines cost. Cost is the break-even point for the FHA. We have been told that the FHA cannot engage in subsidizing programs. In fact, and it is a mark of great disappointment to many that this Congress and this administration have allowed the multifamily FHA programs to lapse for want of a \$40 million credit subsidy as it is called. And what has happened is that we now learn that while the FHA is claiming it has to shut down some programs for credit subsidy, it is in fact overcharging elsewhere.

This amendment simply says that the FHA can no longer overcharge and make a profit for the Treasury on these multifamily programs but must stay at cost.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. FRANK for offering this amendment to prevent unnecessary rent increases in affordable housing and I urge my colleagues to support it.

We are in a housing crisis. The economic expansion of the past few years has been accompanied by skyrocketing home prices and rents. There is a severe shortage of affordable housing, and in many areas, any type of housing.

In my home state of California, about half of renter households pay more than the recommended 30 percent of their income toward shelter. However, 91 percent of low income renter households, with annual incomes less than \$15,000, spend more than 30 percent of their income toward rent. These low income households outnumber low cost rental units by a ratio of more than 2-to-1, both statewide and in Los Angeles County.

About two-thirds (66 percent) of senior renter households pay more than 30 percent of their income toward shelter. 85 percent of low income senior renters pay more than 30 percent toward rent. And with the aging of our population, these percentages will soon translate into much higher numbers.

Furthermore, the rising tide of the recent economy has failed to lift all boats. Household incomes of renters in my state have failed to keep pace with inflation, falling significantly between 1989 and 1999 in inflation adjusted terms. The inflation adjusted income of poor renters fell nearly 14 percent, and the median income for renters with children fell 11 percent.

Overcrowding and substandard housing conditions continue to be a severe problem, particularly in Los Angeles County.

The Federal Housing Administration's (FHA) multifamily mortgage insurance programs support new construction and substantial rehabilitation of apartments by both private and non-profit developers. These units are crucial to meet the critical need for affordable rental housing. In my home state of California, there is a shortfall of almost 600,000 affordable units.

These programs, which require federal budget appropriations in the form of a credit subsidy allocation, have been shut down since April because funding for fiscal year 2001 has been exhausted. This has jeopardized more than \$3 billion in construction loans for more than 50,000 rental units across the country. This shutdown impacts more than \$53 million

in loans for 827 units in my home state of California, where, as I have stated, the need for such units is dire.

In addition, this Administration has refused to use \$40 million dollars in emergency funds that were appropriated at the end of last year to keep these programs open. An additional \$40 million was allocated by the House in this year's supplemental appropriations bill, but the money was stripped in the Conference Committee. As a result, the program is unlikely to reopen until the next fiscal year. Furthermore, the Administration's budget request for FY 2002 is also inadequate.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) as well as most of the housing industry agree that the current system of calculating credit subsidy needs is fundamentally flawed. Currently, there is a HUD study underway in conjunction with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that is likely to show that these programs are self-supporting without congressional appropriations. This study is expected to be completed by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

In the meantime, to address the credit subsidy shortage, HUD plans to increase the mortgage insurance premium for these programs by 60 percent, from 50 basis points to 80 basis points. This will relieve the alleged need for credit subsidy but will undercut the ability of the programs to provide affordable rental housing.

This premium increase will raise rents in the affected housing developments by 4 or 5 percent, by HUD's own estimate, and may reduce the production of affordable rental units.

This amendment by my colleague from Massachusetts will prohibit HUD from raising premiums in excess of what they need to run the program without a credit subsidy. The Frank amendment will prevent a build up of surplus funds that are not used for housing and would end up returning to Treasury for other purposes. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to prevent unnecessary rent increases for affordable housing.

We should not penalize those who can least afford it for the Administration's failure to address this issue.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. WALSH. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of Budget Totals for fiscal year 2002 on July 26, 2001, House Report 107-165. This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee suballocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(f) of the act.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I understand this point of order. Just in case, I did have a second version that is allowed which we will get to if this point of order is sustained.

I did want to make clear to people what the basis of the point of order is. The Congressional Budget Office has apparently ruled that the FHA has been making a profit off the multifamily programs; and, therefore, an amendment which would say that the FHA in the future must not make a profit, must in fact in the future set these premiums only at cost, is out of order because it is a budget charge. In other words, the basis of the point of order is a CBO ruling that the FHA has been making a profit, not the FHA, the Treasury has been making a profit off multifamily housing. That is why the National Association of Homebuilders and Realtors and others have been supportive of my amendment.

But the sad fact is that given the way our rules are, I do acknowledge that my amendment requiring the FHA to set these fees at a break-even price will cost some money and it would stop the FHA from making a profit for the Treasury off multifamily housing, regrettably.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The Chair is authoritatively guided by an estimate of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act, that the net fiscal effect of this amendment would be an increase in budget authority of \$20 million and that this amendment would therefore cause the level of budget authority provided in the bill to exceed its section 302(b) allocation.

As such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act and the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK: Page 93, after line 25, insert the following new section:

SEC. 427. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are hereby revised by reducing the aggregate amount made available for "PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING—PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND", reducing the amount specified under such "PUBLIC HOUSING OPERATING FUND" item for the Inspector General for Operation Safe Home, reducing the aggregate amount provided for "MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL", and reducing the amount specified under such "OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL" item that is to be provided from the amount earmarked for Operation Safe Home, and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fix, establish, charge, or collect mortgage insurance premiums for mortgage insurance made available pursuant to the program under section 221(d)(4) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715(l)(d)(4)) in an amount greater than the cost (as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990) of such program, by \$5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, July 27, 2001, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a more limited amendment and it is in order because it has an offset. The offset comes from a program which has been severely criticized by the General Accounting Office. It is a program called Operation Safe Home which is run inappropriately, many of us feel, including, I must say, the General Accounting Office, by the Inspector General of HUD. Inspectors General should be checking up on other people's programs, not running their own. So it takes \$5 million.

What this amendment says, and it builds on what I said before, we have one of the multifamily housing programs in the FHA and it is known as 221(d)(4). The FHA is planning to raise the premiums on the 221(d)(4) program telling us that it is now running at a deficit. Remember, other multifamily programs are running at a surplus. That is why my first amendment was ruled out of order, because I tried to recapture that surplus by lowering the fees.

What this amendment simply says is that when the administration raises the fees on the 221(d)(4) program, they can only raise them to break even, they cannot make a profit. The legislation defines cost, cost being what you break even at, including, obviously, an estimate of losses.

This amendment is very simple. Again, it is strongly supported by the homebuilders, by the Realtors, by I think most organizations concerned with housing supply. What it says is when people go out to build housing, and we are talking here about private profit-making entities under the (d)(4) program doing unsubsidized housing, this is not housing for the very poor but housing for middle-income people, for working people, the FHA should not charge them for insurance more than the cost of that insurance. The Federal Government should not deter the construction of multifamily housing at this time of great housing crisis by charging an extra fee over and above what is needed for the program to break even.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, we do not make money on this program, a program that benefits only for-profit developers to build moderate- and high-income housing, not low-income housing. In fact, the taxpayer through this appropriation bill, has repeatedly subsidized this program. In fact, last year, we subsidized the program to the tune of over \$80 million.

Even that was not sufficient to satisfy the industry's demands, and the program has been shut down since that time.

To put it in perspective, the amount of money the gentleman now says we are, quote, "making off this program next year" is less than \$3 million compared to the \$80 million it cost the taxpayer in fiscal year 2001. Making money in the sense that the gentleman explains it is nothing more than somebody's estimate about a series of economic factors that may or may not occur over a period of time.

Lord knows, we have seen OMB and CBO make bad estimates, not to mention the Members of our own committees. So I think it is a little disingenuous for the gentleman to argue that we have been using this program to pay for other things when in fact it is just not generating funds.

As a practical matter, this amendment would have little impact on the amount of the premium increase charged. In fact, HUD estimates that this amendment would increase the premium by a mere two one-hundredths of 1 percent.

I believe the real intent behind the gentleman's amendment is to try to somehow stop these premiums from going forward. There is broad opposition among the special interest groups to stop this premium increase. But in order to make this program work and in order to prevent further appropriations against this bill, FHA needs to go forward with this premium increase.

We have seen the kinds of hellacious decisions that we have had to make, the trade-offs that we have had to make throughout this bill. If this premium increase does not go forward, we could be back here next year trying to find an additional \$230 million somewhere in this bill to offset the cost of this program.

Mr. Chairman, the choice is relatively simple. Do we continue to allow the program to remain shut down, or do we allow the premiums to go into effect? I think we should allow the premiums to go into effect and let the program run. If we adopt this amendment, at a minimum we would delay the restart of the program, because HUD would have to reissue new rules to change their premium for what amounts to less than two one-hundredths of 1 percent of an increase. We would also be giving a break to a single group of for-profit developers, including nonprofit developers. These are all nonprofit developers.

□ 2230

I believe it is inequitable and it sets a terrible precedent that causes further delays in the restart of the (d)(4) program. I would urge this amendment be defeated.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, first, I believe my friend from New York may have con-

tradicted himself. First he said we are not making money off this program, but then he said we would only be making a little.

What HUD has told us is they raise it not two-tenths of a percent, but three-tenths of a percent. Now, that may not seem like a lot, but, I do not know, if your mortgage went from 7.2 percent to 7.5 percent, would you shrug that off? Costs are cumulative. It is millions of dollars.

By the way, the argument, and I want to make it very clear, the structure of this amendment, the amendment says they can only charge what the statute describes as break even, as cost. And who says that that will be a money loser? CBO.

In other words, the Congressional Budget Office scored my amendment. I did not ask them to. I did not run to CBO and say, boy, I really wanted you to tell me this is going to cost money. If I never heard from CBO again for the rest of my life, I would be very happy. But CBO says, wait a minute; if you tell the FHA that it can only charge break even, we are going to lose money. This is what CBO says.

Then the gentleman says I am doing this for these special interests. I did notice he talked a little unkindly it seemed to me about profit-making institutions.

I like one thing about housing. In almost every debate, people on the other side criticize us for not understanding the beauty of capitalism and the importance of the profit motive. But when it comes to housing, all of a sudden respect for the profit motive disappears, and the gentleman says, oh, these people want to make a profit.

I am glad there are people trying to make a profit trying to build multifamily housing for working families. And these special interests, yes, there are some special interests. Let me read them. I confess. Mea culpa. The Mortgage Bankers Association of America, the National Association of Home-builders, the National Association of Realtors, the National Apartment Association, the National Multi-Housing Council, yes, they are special interests. They are especially interested in getting housing built, and that is why they support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think it is a simple, straight forward, commonsense amendment that would simply prohibit HUD from overcharging users of the FHA multifamily insurance program.

Now, no credit subsidy funding has been provided in this bill for the multifamily for-profit program, and I understand the committee's decision to eliminate that subsidy. Unfortunately, however, elimination of the subsidy requires an increase in the premiums

that are paid by program users. That could translate into higher debt service and up-front costs for owners and higher rents for families that depend on this housing.

Many users of the for-profit program think that the credit subsidy formula that HUD is currently using to calculate premiums may not accurately reflect the actual risk to the government of the loans as they are now being underwritten. In other words, the premiums next year could be higher than are necessary to fully support this program.

HUD has reportedly initiated a reassessment of the credit subsidy formula to see if this is the case. This amendment simply makes clear that if, based on its reassessment of the credit subsidy formula, HUD determines that the formula should be changed, then program premiums should not be higher than is necessary to support the program. It is as simple as that. It makes good sense. It simply underscores what I hope HUD would do on its own.

I urge support for this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively arcane amendment. I do not suspect there are even 10 Members in the Congress who have a full grasp of what is going on here.

We are governed by the Budget Act. We are governed by credit reform. We cannot make changes in those rules. What we have to do is respond to the program. What we traditionally do to respond to the needs in the program is appropriate additional funds.

This program should be pay-as-you-go. I want to be clear: if this amendment were to pass and this language is added to this bill, we would have to go to conference and find another \$230 million for an offset to fund the program.

Now, you have seen the choices we have had so far. There is not a good choice that we have seen in the 3 days we have been working on this bill. But I submit we will have to come back in conference, we will have to come back and look for additional funds to come up with \$230 million. There are only so many places you can go. You can go to the Veterans Administration, you can go to NASA, you can go to HUD, you can go to National Science Foundation, you can go to FEMA, but those are not good choices.

I would urge the House to stick with the committee bill, to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Please do not put us in a position where we have to go out and find an additional \$230 million in an already tight allocation. Reject the gentleman's amendment and let us go forward to conference with the bill.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friend from New York. I think he may have qualified if we gave out

Academy Awards for the best original screen play.

The gentleman says \$230 million. CBO says \$5 million. I mean, CBO scored this amendment. Now, there was one version which they said was going to cost hundreds of millions. Yes, to do what I would most like to do across-the-board with the FHA would cost several hundred million.

But this amendment deals only with the (d)(4) program where HUD has proposed to raise it by 30 basis points, three-tenths of a percent, and I got a CBO score, and it says, which is why this is in order, I have a \$5 million offset. If I only had a \$5 million offset for \$230 million, obviously I would be out of order.

Secondly, I would say the gentleman says we have to work with the Federal Credit Reform Act. I agree. That is what the amendment says. The amendment says do not raise the premiums in an amount greater than the cost, as such term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. So what this says is, live by the Federal Credit Reform Act definition of cost, and CBO says this particular amendment only costs \$5 million.

I had an earlier amendment that might have cost more. The gentleman succeeded in getting that one knocked out of order. This one is \$5 million. It does set the principle that they should not be making a profit. Five million dollars is not a huge amount of money, but it is more than they should be getting out of multi-family housing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

First of all, I think the point the chairman makes and the author of the amendment makes is this should not be handled in an appropriations bill. The Committee on Financial Services ought to be looking at this. If FHA wants to raise the fees, it ought to come under the Federal Credit Reform Act, and that is where it ought to be dealt with.

Second of all, the reason why I support the gentleman's amendment, and there is a lot of confusion of how these credit subsidy programs work, and the chairman is well aware of how they work, he understands how they work, but there is a problem in the (d)(4) program and in the (d)(3) program, and part of the problem is that Congress appropriated money for the current fiscal year, but part of that had emergency designation. The Office of Management and Budget has held up that money, and that is why the program is not working at this point in time.

In my State, and I would assume in most States, there are a lot of projects, nonprofit projects, that utilize both the (d)(3) and can utilize the (d)(4) program, which have been shut down, and that affects the housing stock for middle-income and lower-income families around the country.

Finally, I think it is unconscionable that the administration, on the one hand, wants to receive money for the general fund in the form of offsetting receipts through raising the premiums, while at the same time they will not release money that the Congress has already appropriated that was done for the current fiscal year. Yet, in the budget that we passed and through legislation which we have not taken up on the floor of the House, but went through the Committee on Financial Services, and legislation that I supported, we are making reductions in excess or offsetting fees for the Securities and Exchange Commission registration fees and investor fees in there. Now, I support that, but that is counter to what this does.

So, I think the gentleman is on the right track. We ought to pass his amendment. The administration ought to release the additional subsidy allocation that is in the current fiscal year's budget so the (d)(3) and (d)(4) programs can get back up and running, and let the authorizing committee address this problem going forward.

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused by the chairman's position on this proposed amendment. The amendment says do not raise FHA premiums above what it would cost to actually insure.

Now, when I first heard the chairman's argument, he said well, we are not making any profit on FHA premiums. Then, by the time I got to the floor I heard that if we did this, it was going to cost us \$280 million. The CBO says that it would cost \$5 million, which is what the gentleman from Massachusetts has found as an offset to make the budget back in balance.

The problem is that if FHA premiums are raised beyond the actual cost of the insurance, people who are buying houses will pay that extra cost. It is that simple. No funny business, no fuzzy math. If the premium is higher than the actual cost of the insurance, that extra cost is going to be borne by homeowners or home buyers. In a market where people are trying to acquire homes, that could be the difference between somebody being able to afford a home and somebody not being able to afford a home.

So, I think this is just simple, straightforward math here. It cannot be that the provision is redundant, which is what the chairman of the committee said originally, because we are not making any profit on this. If that were the case, the amendment that the gentleman from Massachusetts has offered would simply be a redundant provision, because what his amendment says is we do not want you to make a profit. If it is as the CBO has indicated, that the offset required is \$5 million, then he has found a \$5 million

offset, and it is an appropriate offset. If the premiums are raised \$280 million, then home buyers are going to bear that cost.

Whatever the case, the gentleman from Massachusetts should have his amendment passed, and we should not pass the cost on to home buyers.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say in fairness to the gentleman from New York, it is true, my concerns do not deal only with the 221(d)(4) multiple family housing program. I do object to the FHA's pricing in general. But, under the rules, the only one that could be in order now, because I needed an offset, was this narrow one.

□ 2245

I do agree, as the gentleman from Texas has said, that this is an issue that ought to be addressed in the authorizing committee. The fact is we have a situation in which multifamily programs of the Federal Housing Administration were shut down because they said they needed \$40 million more in credit subsidy, while the totality of programs in the FHA were returning many times that to the Treasury, and the analogy of the gentleman from Texas about the SEC was appropriate. So I hope the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity will address this.

Getting the FHA out of the business of making a profit is a very simple and straightforward way to reduce the cost of housing, multifamily, single family, across the board. That is up to the authorizing committee. But here we can set a precedent which says, to the extent that we can control it, we will tell the FHA, live by the definition of cost in the bill, do not charge more for the insurance premium than is necessary for you to break even, and do not burden the people who are going to live in multifamily housing or any other patrons of the FHA by charging them more than would otherwise be necessary.

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

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

Let me just state that the Administration is strongly opposed to this amendment. There are a number of special interest groups who have contacted Members on this amendment, but the Administration is clearly in opposition.

This is a very complicated issue that not a lot of Members have spent a lot of time with. Let me just try to make it as clear as I can.

The intent of this amendment is to kill the premium increase. There was a lot of discussion about this earlier in the year, about attaching additional appropriations to the supplemental; the industry was lobbying for more money, no premiums; more money, no premiums. The intent of this amendment is to kill that premium increase.

We want this program to be successful, but we want it to pay as it goes. If it is going to pay as it goes, we have to increase the premium. If Members support this amendment, it will kill that premium increase and if that is the case, we go to conference looking for \$230 million in additional outlays and allocation.

Do not put us in that position, I would say to my colleagues. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

Mr. FRANK. 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 Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) will be postponed.

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 No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA); Amendment No. 6 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS); and an amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. BARCIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on Amendment No. 24 offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 99, noes 325, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 293]

AYES—99

Allen	Davis (IL)	Honda	Cummings	McCarthy (MO)	Pickering	Smith (MI)
Baird	Delahunt	Hoyer	Cunningham	McCarthy (NY)	Pomeroy	Smith (WA)
Ballenger	Dicks	Inslee	Davis (CA)	McGovern	Rivers	Souder
Barcia	Dingell	Jackson (IL)	Davis (FL)	McKinney	Rogers (MI)	Strickland
Barr	Doyle	Kanjorski	Davis, Jo Ann	Meehan	Rohrabacher	Stupak
Bartlett	Duncan	Kelly	Davis, Tom	Minh	Rothman	Tauscher
Berry	Edwards	Kennedy (RI)	Deal	Moore	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Bonior	English	Kerns	DeFazio	Moran (KS)	Rush	Terry
Boswell	Etheridge	Kildee	DeGette	Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Thompson (CA)
Brady (PA)	Farr	Langevin	DeLauro	Morella	Sandlin	Thune
Camp	Fossella	Larsen (WA)	DeLay	Neal	Sawyer	Tierney
Cantor	Frank	Larson (CT)	DeMint	Olver	Scott	Udall (CO)
Capuano	Gephardt	LaTourette	Deutsch	Otter	Sensenbrenner	Upton
Cardin	Goodlatte	Levin	Diaz-Balart	Pascarell	Sherman	Waxman
Carson (IN)	Hall (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Doggett	Petri	Shows	Woolsey
Castle	Harman	Maloney (NY)	Doolley			
Chabot	Hart	Markey	Doolittle			
Coyne	Hayworth	Mascara	Dreier			

NOES—325

Abercrombie	Dunn	Kirk
Ackerman	Ehlers	Kleckzka
Aderholt	Ehrlich	Knollenberg
Akin	Emerson	Kolbe
Andrews	Engel	Kucinich
Armeny	Eshoo	LaFalce
Baca	Evans	LaHood
Bachus	Everett	Lampson
Baker	Fattah	Lantos
Baldacci	Ferguson	Largent
Baldwin	Filner	Latham
Barrett	Flake	Leach
Barton	Fletcher	Lee
Bass	Foley	Lewis (CA)
Becerra	Forbes	Lewis (KY)
Bentsen	Ford	Linder
Bereuter	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Berkley	Frost	Lofgren
Berman	Gallegly	Lowey
Biggart	Ganske	Lucas (KY)
Bilirakis	Gekas	Lucas (OK)
Bishop	Gibbons	Luther
Blagojevich	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Blumenauer	Gillmor	Manzullo
Blunt	Gilman	Matheson
Boehlert	Gonzalez	Matsui
Boehner	Goode	McCullom
Bonilla	Gordon	McCrary
Bono	Goss	McDermott
Borski	Graham	McHugh
Boucher	Granger	McInnis
Boyd	Graves	McIntyre
Brady (TX)	Green (TX)	McKeon
Brown (FL)	Green (WI)	McNulty
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	Meek (FL)
Brown (SC)	Grucci	Meeks (NY)
Bryant	Gutierrez	Menendez
Burr	Gutknecht	Mica
Burton	Hall (OH)	Millender
Buyer	Hastings (FL)	McDonald
Callahan	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)
Calvert	Hayes	Miller, Gary
Cannon	Hefley	Miller, George
Capito	Herger	Mollohan
Capps	Hill	Murtha
Carson (OK)	Hilleary	Myrick
Chambliss	Hilliard	Nadler
Clay	Hinchey	Napolitano
Clayton	Hinojosa	Nethercutt
Clement	Hobson	Ney
Clyburn	Hoefel	Northup
Coble	Hoekstra	Norwood
Collins	Holden	Nussle
Combest	Holt	Oberstar
Condit	Hooley	Obey
Cooksey	Horn	Ortiz
Costello	Hostettler	Osborne
Cox	Houghton	Ose
Cramer	Hulshof	Owens
Crane	Hunter	Oxley
Crenshaw	Hutchinson	Pallone
Crowley	Hyde	Pastor
Cubin	Isakson	Paul
Culberson	Israel	Pelosi
Davis (IL)	Cummings	Pence
Delahunt	Cunningham	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Davis (CA)	Peterson (PA)
Dingell	Davis (FL)	Phelps
Doyle	Davis, Jo Ann	Pitts
Duncan	Deal	Platts
Kanjorski	DeFazio	Pombo
Jackson (IL)	DeGette	Portman
Jackson (PA)	DeLay	Price (NC)
Larsen (WA)	DeMint	Pryce (OH)
Larson (CT)	DePompa	Putnam
LaTourette	Deutsch	Quinn
Levin	Diaz-Balart	Rahall
Lewis (GA)	Doggett	Rangel
Maloney (NY)	Doolley	Regula
Markey	Doolittle	Rehberg
Hayworth	Dreier	Reyes

Reynolds	Simmons	Traficant	Capuano	Jackson (IL)	Owens	LoBiondo	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
Riley	Simpson	Turner	Cardin	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Pallone	Lucas (OK)	Putnam	Stenholm
Rodriguez	Skeen	Udall (NM)	Carson (IN)	John	Pascarella	Manzullo	Quinn	Stump
Roemer	Skelton	Velazquez	Castle	Kaptur	Pelosi	Mascara	Ramstad	Stupak
Rogers (KY)	Slaughter	Visclosky	Clay	Kelly	Peterson (MN)	McCrary	Regula	Sununu
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)	Vitter	Clayton	Kildee	Pomery	McHugh	Rehberg	Sweeney
Ross	Smith (TX)	Walden	Clement	Kildee	Price (NC)	McInnis	Reynolds	Tancredo
Roukema	Snyder	Walsh	Condit	Kind (WI)	Rahall	McKeon	Riley	Tanner
Royal-Allard	Solis	Wamp	Conyers	Klecka	Rangel	McNulty	Rodriguez	Tauzin
Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Waters	Costello	Kucinich	Reyes	Mica	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Ryun (KS)	Stearns	Watkins (OK)	Coyne	Lampson	Rivers	Miller (FL)	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Sabo	Stenholm	Watson (CA)	Crowley	Langevin	Roemer	Miller, Gary	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Sanders	Stump	Watt (NC)	Cummings	Lantos	Rothman	Mink	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (MS)
Saxton	Sununu	Watts (OK)	Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Royal-Allard	Mollohan	Ross	Thornberry
Scarborough	Sweeney	Weiner	Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Rush	Morella	Roukema	Tiaht
Schaffer	Tancredo	Weldon (FL)	Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Sabo	Murtha	Royce	Tiberi
Schakowsky	Tanner	Weldon (PA)	DeFazio	Lee	Sanchez	Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Toomey
Schiff	Tauzin	Weller	DeGette	Levin	Sanders	Ney	Ryun (KS)	Traficant
Schrock	Taylor (NC)	Wexler	Delahunt	Lofgren	Sawyer	Northup	Sandlin	Visclosky
Serrano	Thomas	Whitfield	DeLauro	Lowey	Schakowsky	Norwood	Scarborough	Vitter
Sessions	Thompson (MS)	Wicker	Deutsch	Lucas (KY)	Schiff	Nussle	Schaffer	Walden
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wilson	Dicks	Luther	Scott	Otter	Schrock	Walsh
Shaw	Thurman	Wolf	Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Shaw	Oxley	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Shays	Tiahrt	Wu	Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Sherman	Pastor	Serrano	Watkins (OK)
Sherwood	Tiberi	Wynn	Dooley	Markey	Shows	Paul	Sessions	Watts (OK)
Shimkus	Toomey	Young (AK)	Dunn	Matheson	Simpson	Pence	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Shuster	Towns	Young (FL)	Edwards	Matsui	Skelton	Peterson (PA)	Shays	Weller

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers	Jefferson	Radanovich	Emerson	McCarthy (MO)	Slaughter	Norwood	Shimkus	Whitfield
Hansen	Lipinski	Spence	Engel	McCollum	Smith (WA)	Phelps	Shuster	Wicker
Istook	Payne	Stark	Eshoo	McDermott	Snyder	Pickering	Simmons	Wilson

□ 2311

Messrs. BACA, KING, KUCINICH and WEINER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. CANTOR, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York, Messrs. TAYLOR of Mississippi, BARTLETT of Maryland, MOORE, DICKS, PICKERING, and BAIRD changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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. 6 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 6 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) 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 190, noes 231, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—190

Abercrombie	Becerra	Bono	Combest	Greenwood	Kolbe	Abercrombie	Bishop	Clayton
Ackerman	Bentsen	Borski	Cooksey	Grucci	LaFalce	Ackerman	Blagojevich	Clement
Allen	Bereuter	Boswell	Cox	Gutknecht	LaHood	Allen	Blumenauer	Clyburn
Baca	Berkley	Boyd	Cramer	Graham	Kilpatrick	Andrews	Bonior	Condit
Baird	Berman	Brady (PA)	Crane	Granger	King (NY)	Baca	Borski	Conyers
Baldwin	Berry	Brown (OH)	Crenshaw	Graves	Kingston	Bachus	Boswell	Costello
Barr	Blagojevich	Bryant	Cubin	Hastings (FL)	Kirk	Baird	Boucher	Coyne
Barrett	Blumenauer	Camp	Culberson	Hastings (WA)	Knollenberg	Baldacci	Boyd	Cramer
Bartlett	Boehlert	Capito	Cunningham	Hayes	Kolbe	Baldwin	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Bass	Bonior	Capps	Davis (FL)	Hayworth	LaTourette	Barcia	Brown (FL)	Cummings

NOES—231

Aderholt	Davis, Tom	Herger	Aderholt	Davis, Tom	Herger	Aderholt	Bishop	Clayton
Akin	Deal	Hill	Akin	Deal	Hill	Akin	Blagojevich	Clement
Andrews	DeLay	Hilleary	Andrews	DeLay	Hilleary	Andrews	Blumenauer	Clyburn
Armey	DeMint	Hilliard	Armey	DeMint	Hilliard	Armey	Bonior	Condit
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hobson	Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hobson	Bachus	Borski	Conyers
Baker	Doolittle	Hoekstra	Baker	Doolittle	Hoekstra	Baker	Boswell	Costello
Baldacci	Doyle	Holden	Baldacci	Doyle	Holden	Baldacci	Boucher	Coyne
Ballenger	Dreier	Holt	Ballenger	Dreier	Holt	Ballenger	Boyd	Cramer
Barcia	Duncan	Horn	Barcia	Duncan	Horn	Barcia	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Barton	Ehrlich	Hostettler	Barton	Ehrlich	Hostettler	Barton	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Biggert	English	Hulshof	Biggert	English	Hulshof	Biggert	Brown (OH)	Davis (CA)
Bilirakis	Evans	Hunter	Bilirakis	Evans	Hunter	Bilirakis	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Bishop	Everett	Hutchinson	Bishop	Everett	Hutchinson	Bishop	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Blunt	Ferguson	Hyde	Blunt	Ferguson	Hyde	Blunt	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Boehner	Flake	Isakson	Boehner	Flake	Isakson	Boehner	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Bonilla	Fletcher	Issa	Bonilla	Fletcher	Issa	Bonilla	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Boucher	Foley	Jenkins	Boucher	Foley	Jenkins	Boucher	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson (CT)	Brady (TX)	Forbes	Johnson (CT)	Brady (TX)	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Brown (FL)	Ford	Johnson (IL)	Brown (FL)	Ford	Johnson (IL)	Brown (FL)	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.	Brown (SC)	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.	Brown (SC)	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Burr	Freilinghuysen	Johnson, Sam	Burr	Freilinghuysen	Johnson, Sam	Burr	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Burton	Frost	Jones (NC)	Burton	Frost	Jones (NC)	Burton	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Buyer	Gekas	Jones (OH)	Buyer	Gekas	Jones (OH)	Buyer	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Callahan	Gilcrest	Kanjorski	Callahan	Gilcrest	Kanjorski	Callahan	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Calvert	Gillmor	Keller	Calvert	Gillmor	Keller	Calvert	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cannon	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)	Cannon	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)	Cannon	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cantor	Goode	Kennedy (RI)	Cantor	Goode	Kennedy (RI)	Cantor	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Carson (OK)	Goss	Kerns	Carson (OK)	Goss	Kerns	Carson (OK)	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Chabot	Graham	Kilpatrick	Chabot	Graham	Kilpatrick	Chabot	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Chambliss	Granger	King (NY)	Chambliss	Granger	King (NY)	Chambliss	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Clyburn	Graves	Kingston	Clyburn	Graves	Kingston	Clyburn	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Coble	Green (TX)	Kirk	Coble	Green (TX)	Kirk	Coble	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Collins	Green (WI)	Knollenberg	Collins	Green (WI)	Knollenberg	Collins	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Combest	Greenwood	Kolbe	Combest	Greenwood	Kolbe	Combest	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cooksey	Grucci	LaFalce	Cooksey	Grucci	LaFalce	Cooksey	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cox	Gutknecht	LaHood	Cox	Gutknecht	LaHood	Cox	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cramer	Hall (TX)	Largent	Cramer	Hall (TX)	Largent	Cramer	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Crane	Hart	LaTourette	Crane	Hart	LaTourette	Crane	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Leach	Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Leach	Crenshaw	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Lewis (CA)	Cubin	Hastings (WA)	Lewis (CA)	Cubin	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Culberson	Hayes	Lewis (GA)	Culberson	Hayes	Lewis (GA)	Culberson	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Cunningham	Hayworth	Lewis (KY)	Cunningham	Hayworth	Lewis (KY)	Cunningham	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)
Davis (FL)	Hefley	Linder	Davis (FL)	Hefley	Linder	Davis (FL)	Brown (OH)	Davis (IL)

NOT VOTING—12

Gallegly	Lipinski	Sherwood
Hansen	Payne	Smith (MI)
Istook	Radanovich	Spence

□ 2319

Mr. ROTHMAN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) 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 212, noes 212, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—212

Abercrombie	Bishop	Clayton
Ackerman	Blagojevich	Clement
Allen	Blumenauer	Clyburn
Baca	Bonior	Condit
Baird	Borski	Conyers
Baldwin	Boswell	Costello
Barr	Boucher	Coyne
Barrett	Boyd	Cramer
Bartlett	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Bass	Brown (FL)	Cummings
Becerra	Brown (OH)	Davis (CA)
Bentsen	Capps	Davis (FL)
Berkeley	Capuano	Davis (IL)
Berkley	Cardin	Davis (IL)
Berman	Carson (IN)	DeFazio
Berman	Carson (OK)	DeGette
Berry	Clay	Delahunt

DeLauro Lampson Rahall Miller, Gary Rogers (KY) Sweeney
 Deutsch Langevin Ramstad Moran (KS) Rogers (MI) Tancredo
 Dicks Lantos Rangel Myrick Rohrbacher Tauzin
 Dingell Larsen (WA) Reyes Nethercutt Ros-Lehtinen Taylor (NC)
 Doggett Larson (CT) Rivers Ney Roukema Terry
 Dooley Lee Rodriguez Northup Royce Thomas
 Doyle Levin Roemer Norwood Ryan (WI) Thornberry
 Edwards Lewis (GA) Ross Nussle Ryun (KS) Thune
 Engel Lofgren Rothman Osborne Scarborough Tiahrt
 Eshoo Lowey Roybal-Allard Ose Schaffer Tiberi
 Etheridge Lucas (KY) Rush Otter Schrock Toomey
 Evans Luther Sabo Oxley Sensenbrenner Traficant
 Farr Maloney (CT) Sanchez Paul Sessions Upton
 Fattah Maloney (NY) Sanders Pence Shadegg Vitter
 Filner Markey Sandlin Peterson (PA) Shaw Walden
 Ford Mascara Sawyer Petri Shays Walsh
 Frank Matheson Schakowsky Pickering Sherwood Wamp
 Frost Matsui Schiff Pitts Shimkus Watkins (OK)
 Gephardt McCarthy (MO) Scott Platts Shuster Watts (OK)
 Gonzalez McCarthy (NY) Serrano Pombo Simmons Weldon (FL)
 Goode McCollum Sherman Portman Simpson Weldon (PA)
 Gordon McDermott Shows Pryce (OH) Skeen Weller
 Green (TX) McGovern Skelton Putnam Smith (MI) Whitfield
 Gutierrez McIntyre Slaughter Quinn Smith (NJ) Wicker
 Hall (OH) McKinney Smith (WA) Radanovich Smith (TX) Wilson
 Hall (TX) McNulty Snyder Regula Souder Wolf
 Harman Meehan Solis Rehberg Stearns Young (AK)
 Hastings (FL) Meek (FL) Spratt Reynolds Stump Young (FL)
 Hill Meeks (NY) Stenholm Riley Sununu
 Hilliard Menendez Strickland
 Hinckley Millender Stupak
 Hinojosa McDonald Tanner
 Hoeffel Miller, George Tauscher
 Holden Mink Taylor (MS)
 Holt Mollohan Thompson (CA)
 Honda Moore Thompson (MS)
 Hooley Moran (VA) Thurman
 Hoyer Morella Tierney
 Inslee Murtha Towns
 Israel Nadler Turner
 Jackson (IL) Napolitano Udall (CO)
 Jackson-Lee Neal Udall (NM)
 (TX) Oberstar Velazquez
 Johnson, E. B. Obey Visclosky
 Jones (NC) Olver Waters
 Jones (OH) Ortiz Watson (CA)
 Kanjorski Owens Watt (NC)
 Kaptur Pallone Waxman
 Kennedy (RI) Pascrell Weiner
 Kildee Pastor Wexler
 Kilpatrick Pelosi Woolsey
 Kind (WI) Peterson (MN) Wu
 Kleczka Phelps Wynn
 Kucinich Pomeroy
 LaFalce Price (NC)

NOES—212

Aderholt Deal Hilleary Hobson
 Akin DeLay Hoekstra
 Armey DeMint Hoekstra
 Baker Diaz-Balart Horn
 Ballenger Doolittle Hostettler
 Barr Dreier Houghton
 Bartlett Duncan Hulshof
 Barton Dunn Hunter
 Bass Ehlers Hutchinson
 Bereuter Ehrlich Hyde
 Bigert Emerson Isackson
 Blunt English Issa
 Boehlert Everett Jenkins
 Boerner Ferguson Johnson (CT)
 Bonilla Flake Johnson (IL)
 Bono Fletcher Johnson, Sam
 Brady (TX) Foley Keller
 Brown (SC) Forbes Kelly
 Bryant Fossella Kennedy (MN)
 Burr Frelinghuysen Kerns
 Burton Gallegly King (NY)
 Buyer Ganske Kingston
 Callahan Gekas Kirk
 Calvert Gibbons Knollenberg
 Camp Gilcrest Kolbe
 Cannon Gillmor LaHood
 Cantor Gilman Largent
 Capito Goodlatte Latham
 Castle Goss LaTourette
 Chabot Graham Leach
 Chambliss Granger Lewis (CA)
 Coble Graves Lewis (KY)
 Collins Green (WI) Linder
 Combest Greenwood LoBiondo
 Cooksey Grucci Lucas (OK)
 Cox Gutknecht Manzullo
 Crane Hart McCrery
 Crenshaw Hastings (WA) McHugh
 Cubin Hayes McInnis
 Culberson Hayworth McKeon
 Cunningham Hefley Mica
 Davis, Tom Herger Miller (FL)

Rogers (KY) Sweeney
 Tauzin
 Taylor (NC)
 Terry
 Thomas
 Thornberry
 Thune
 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)
 Stark

NOT VOTING—9

Hansen John Saxton
 Istook Lipinski Spence
 Jefferson Payne Stark

□ 2329

Ms. HART, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PICK-
 ERING, and Mrs. KELLY changed their
 vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. HARMAN changed her vote from
 "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

□ 2330

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read
 the final lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Depart-
 ments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and
 Urban Development, and Independent Agen-
 cies Appropriations Act, 2002".

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in
 strong opposition to the VA/HUD appropri-
 ations bill. This bill severely under-funds public
 housing and other critical programs. At a time
 when 5.4 million families are paying more than
 half of their income to live in substandard
 housing throughout the country, the Bush ad-
 ministration has decided that public housing
 programs are no longer a priority for our coun-
 try.

The VA/HUD appropriations bill approved by
 the Appropriations Committee cuts public
 housing and community development pro-
 grams by \$1.8 billion.

This budget is clearly headed in the wrong
 direction. More than 34,000 households are on
 the waiting list for housing vouchers in the city
 of Chicago, and under this budget, and under
 this budget they will have to continue to wait
 for a long time.

This bill reduces Section 8 reserves by cut-
 ting \$640 million. This cut will result in as
 many as 30,000 families losing Section 8
 vouchers. The bill also reduces the number of
 Fair Share Section 8 vouchers by 78 percent.

In addition, this bill eliminates funding for
 the Public Housing Drug Elimination Fund.
 This is a crucial initiative, and Chicago and
 other cities have used it successfully to com-
 bat drugs in public housing to give public
 housing residents a safe place to live.

This bill further endangers those most in
 jeopardy, our homeless, by cutting almost

\$100 million from homeless prevention and
 shelter programs.

Under the bill we are debating today, Com-
 munity Development Block Grants funds are
 cut by over \$300 million and zeroes out fund-
 ing for empowerment zones—a \$200 million
 cut. These are the resources upon which our
 cities rely to perform important economic and
 community development. They should be re-
 stored.

I find it unconscionable that the Bush ad-
 ministration would declare a surplus and con-
 sider our country well off enough to provide its
 richest 1% the bulk of a \$1.3 trillion tax cut,
 but in the same breath finds it appropriate to
 cut \$1.8 billion that would provide housing for
 our nation's most needy.

No American family would ever declare a
 surplus if they can't afford to put a roof over
 their head. However, as an American family,
 we are doing just that with this bill. I urge all
 Members to support amendments that will at-
 tempt to restore funding for public housing and
 other programs that were cut in the adminis-
 tration's request and the underlying bill. And,
 if it is not amended, I urge a no vote on the
 VA/HUD bill.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in
 support of H.R. 2620, the Fiscal Year 2002
 Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and
 Urban Development and Independent Agencies
 Appropriations Act. This bill provides
 \$112.7 billion for these agencies, seven per-
 cent more than current funding and \$2.1 billion
 more than the President's budget. Most impor-
 tantly, I support this bill because it provides
 \$1.3 billion in disaster relief for FY 2002,
 which will be needed in Houston and many
 other current and future disaster areas.

In a normal appropriations year, the Na-
 tional Aeronautics and Space Administra-
 tion, housing, scientific research and the Veterans
 Administration are my largest concerns in the
 VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Approp-
 riations Act. However, this year is extra-
 ordinary because on June 5, Tropical Storm Alli-
 son, which formed spontaneously in the Gulf
 of Mexico, dropped up to 40 inches of rain on
 parts of my district over a week-long period.
 Harris County, Texas experienced an esti-
 mated \$4.8 billion in damages, over 90,000
 people in Texas have sought federal assist-
 ance, and the Texas Medical Center, the
 world's largest medical center, experienced
 over \$2 billion in damages, shutting down
 Houston's three largest hospitals for weeks.

As a result of this unexpected calamity,
 FEMA's FY 2001 funds are expected to run
 out or barely cover expenses for this year.
 FEMA expects their responsibility for Texas
 alone to reach \$2.4 billion, which the FEMA
 and the Office of Management and Budget re-
 alize will require additional funding over the
 \$2.3 billion initially provided by the Sub-
 committee. We are in the midst of hurricane
 and wildfire season for 2001 and we will ex-
 perience those dangerous times again in 2002.
 31 federal disaster declarations have been
 made this year and as many will surely be
 made again next year. Just the declaration of
 Tropical Storm Allison will claim the majority of
 disaster relief funds for this year and next. As
 such, I ask all my colleagues to support the
 effort to provide an extra \$1.3 billion for
 FEMA's Disaster Relief Fund.

As a final note on FEMA, I support the effort
 led by Representative Lois CAPPS to restore

funding for Project Impact, a pre-disaster mitigation program that has provided warning radios to schools in my district, among other useful damage prevention measures. All too often, we neglect prevention and only focus on recovery. I would remind my colleagues that every dollar spent on prevention like Project Impact reduces the bills of disasters like Allison.

Many may be upset that my colleagues and I from the Southeast Texas area are requesting approval from the House for this emergency request to aid our area recover when many other emergency requests have been denied. However, I believe that this \$1.3 billion is absolutely necessary, not only for Allison victims, but for all of this year's disaster victims, next year's disaster victim, and all victims of major disaster in many past years. During the FY 2001 Supplemental debate, my colleague from North Carolina, Representative WALTER B. JONES pointed out that victims of Hurricane Floyd in 1996 are still receiving disaster aid to complete the recovery of that area from one of the decade's worst storms.

Again, this emergency disaster relief request is not earmarked for Texas or Tropical Storm Allison, it is for recovery aid for all current and future disaster victims. Again, FEMA and OMB publicly state there is a need for additional FEMA funds. The Senate has proposed \$2 billion, \$700 million more than the House Appropriations Committee. From my firsthand experience in my district, I believe that the \$2 billion figure is a conservative estimate of what will be needed.

Besides including additional disaster relief funding, I commend the chairman and the entire Appropriations Committee for correcting a major flaw in the President's budget regarding research on the International Space Station. The entire bill provides \$15 billion in total for NASA, 5 percent more or \$666 million more than current funding and also \$440 million over the President's budget request. Importantly, this legislation fully funds the space station at the \$1.8 billion budget request. While the President's budget did not reduce NASA funding, it kept the increase below inflation, reducing purchasing power, and zeroed out the crew return vehicle (CRV) and habitation module. These two integral parts of the space station are necessary to have a research presence on the station, which is why we have constructed this orbiting microgravity laboratory.

I commend the Subcommittee and Committee members, especially Chairman WALSH and Representative BUD CRAMER for their commitment to restoring the CRV. The scientific and international communities were worried back during the Spring budget season that the new Administration was going to preclude significant research activities on the station by targeting necessary components for elimination. Since we have made this unparalleled investment in the betterment of mankind, it would be folly to abandon our goals now, after we have gone through all the work to get a near complete station orbiting the Earth. The subcommittee is also to be commended for increasing funding for biological and physical research activities and academic research programs.

I am relieved that the committee reversed the President's request for scientific research and increased it by 8% or \$414 million. This bill includes \$4.8 billion federal funding for re-

search through the National Science Foundation. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I cosponsored an amendment to the House budget resolution to increase scientific research funding through the National Science Foundation, NASA, and DOE by \$1 million over the House leadership's budget for 1 year and by \$11 billion for the next 10 years. I am convinced of the necessity of increasing federal basic scientific investments from hearing from scientists in my district at the Texas Medical Center, Rice University, the University of Houston, and Texas Southern University.

While I am pleased with many of the changes that the subcommittee and full committee have made to this legislation, I am concerned that this measure does not provide enough funding for veterans programs. I have consistently supported expanding the health benefits for our nation's veterans, many who have made incredible sacrifices in order to preserve our freedom. While I am pleased that this bill would provide \$4.3 billion more for the veterans' health care programs than was available in 2001, I join Veterans' Affairs Ranking Member LANE EVANS in his criticism that this bill does not do enough for improvement and modernization of veterans' health facilities the delivery of that care. In a time when many of our nation's veterans are aging and seeking more health care services, it is vitally important that these facilities are modernized to provide cutting-edge treatments for those who have served, without demeaning these men and women with delays.

In my home state of Texas, we have a growing veterans population who will not be served until we find the additional resources which Mr. EVANS is calling for. However, I have to reluctantly oppose his amendment removing \$1.52 billion from the space station. As a member of the House Budget Committee, I opposed the Republican leadership's budget, which has led us to unreasonable subcommittee allocations. Now, at the last moment, this budget has forced Mr. Evans to turn on other productive programs to make up shortfalls in the administration's request for the Veterans Administration. Congress' budget, in a time of healthy revenue, should not force Members like myself to choose between the NASA research necessary to maintain America's technological and scientific superiority and funding for veterans' care in their districts.

I am concerned that this legislation does not provide sufficient funding for housing programs. This bill provides \$1.4 billion or five percent more than last year. However, this \$1.4 billion budget is \$600 million less than the President Bush's request for housing program. One good example is that this bill reduces funding by five percent for the Community and Development Block Grant (CDBG) which has helped many communities to redevelop in areas where our capital markets have failed to invest. This bill also eliminates all funding for the urban empowerment zones, which means that the city of Houston will not receive any funds next year in their efforts to rebuild the fifth ward. This bill also eliminates public housing drug-elimination grants which have helped many public housing project to reduce the use of drugs in their communities.

It also eliminates funding for AmeriCorps, a program that has been shown to help our nation's youth. This public service programs helps to meet the needs of communities by encouraging young people to donate their time

in exchange for earning college scholarship funding. For many people who are not ready to enter college, this volunteer program has been a good alternative to simply going to work directly and giving them valuable skills to compete in our workplace. I urge my colleagues to insist on the Senate's language on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, while this bill could be better, it is a good bill under the circumstances. In particular the FEMA emergency funding is terrible important to my constituents and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman. I rise to commend the chairman and ranking member of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee for the funding levels in this bill for veterans programs.

This measure provides \$51.4 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, and fully funds Veterans Medical Health Care by providing a \$1 billion increase over last year. This increase comes on the heels of a \$3.1 billion funding level for VA health care over the last two years. This funding is crucial to the veterans facilities in my district in Marion and Crown Point, and more importantly, to the veterans who utilize these facilities.

This measure also increases veterans medical and prosthetic research by \$20 million over FY02, to bring the FY02 funding to \$371 million. The measure fully funds current and new cemetery operations and the National Shrine Initiative. It fully funds cost of living increases in compensation and pensions. The bill provides \$300 million in new funding for the Veterans Hospital Emergency Repair Act, which passed this House on March 27.

Over the last several years, Congress has worked hard to ensure that veterans and their families receive the benefits they have earned. As a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I continue to stress and advocate adequate funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs to meet the standards and quality of health care that our veterans deserve. At a time when medical costs are rising and aging veterans health care needs are increasing, I am pleased that this Chamber continues to provide the necessary funding for veterans programs.

The increase in funding is a testament to our commitment to the men and women who have served our nation proudly, sacrificing so much for the good of our country. I fully support this legislation on behalf of our nation's veterans, knowing that it is well deserved.

This is a good bill for our veterans and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no other amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAMP) 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, pursuant to House Resolution 210, he reported the bill back to the House

with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BOYD

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOYD. I am, in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOYD moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2620, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the House promptly with an amendment which increases funding for veterans medical care programs by an amount adequate to fund the full cost of all currently authorized services including those authorized by the Veterans Millennium Health Care Act, Public Law 106-117.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of this House feel very strongly about keeping commitments that they and this Government makes to its citizens. That is why I am asking the House to recommit this bill to the committee for the purposes of adding \$500 million to the Veterans Administration medical programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is the amount above the funding level contained in this bill that was unanimously recommended by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to the Committee on the Budget for the purposes of meeting the obligations and the commitment that we have and we have provided in the authorizing bills for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us in this House have the greatest respect for the two gentlemen who lead this subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN). I do not think there is any doubt about that. I think we also have a great deal of respect for the gentlemen who lead the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS) and the previous chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP).

Mr. Speaker, the additional funds that we are asking for in this motion will not be used to provide additional services or new services to our Nation's veterans. These funds, Mr. Speaker, are simply required to provide the services

that are already authorized, they are already committed, and they are already promised to our veterans. But they will not be provided at the funding levels contained in this appropriations bill.

This motion, Mr. Speaker, is really about whether we want to stand behind our commitments to our citizens or whether we are willing to make promises in one bill, that is, the Veterans' Affairs authorization, and then when it comes time to pay for those services we are going to say to those folks, Well, we didn't really mean it. It was just all for show. I do not think that is right.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, there are more than 3.6 million veterans who use the VA health care system. As a group, these people are much older than the average American and their health needs are much greater. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has made a real effort to address the problem of the rising cost of providing health care to these individuals. But the 4.9 percent increase contained in this bill is about half of the increase required to meet the national average rate of increase in health expenditures. The number of physicians now employed by the Veterans Administration is simply not adequate to meet the needs of those eligible for VA medical services. The time it takes to see a doctor is already too long; and if we do not act, it will grow longer.

It is an unfortunate fact, Mr. Speaker, but it is a fact that a significant number of those who have served in uniform suffer from chronic mental disorders and that we are simply not providing adequate mental health services to a significant number of these individuals. While we have also promised to cover pharmacy costs, this appropriation does not provide enough money to fully meet that promise. We will also not be meeting our commitments with respect to veterans in need of long-term care or veterans in need of emergency medical services.

In a letter dated July 16, 2001, the major veterans service organizations stated that the funding levels in this bill "are simply inadequate to meet the needs of the sick and disabled veterans at a time of skyrocketing health care costs and rising demand from an aging veterans population."

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Congress and this Nation to meet the commitments that it has made to the veterans, to the folks who have served in the uniform of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues tonight to send this bill back and add these additional needed funds.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, let me read from the bill report language: "The committee stands behind the commitments Congress made in the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, Public Law 106-117, to

provide veterans with additional long-term care and emergency care services."

The subcommittee stands behind the authorizing committee and the commitments that it made.

"The committee urges the administration to include full funding for the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act in its fiscal year 2003 budget request."

In this year's bill, the 2002 bill, the President's budget fully supports the provisions of the Millennium Health Care Act. In addition to the President's budget request, we added another \$1 billion, building on our commitment, providing a \$4 billion increase over the last 3 years in health care.

Mr. Speaker, there is \$51 billion in this bill for veterans. Clearly, clearly that expresses the priorities of this body. Last year, we provided the President's request plus \$1.3 billion for VA medical care, fully funding the provisions of the Millennium Health Care Act.

□ 2340

However, the VA could not spend all that money. Over \$300 million provided in fiscal year 2001 was not spent on Millennium Health Care Act activities. On our subcommittee, in fact, the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), questioned the VA Secretary extensively on this subject; and the Secretary testified that \$548 million estimated in the budget was adequate to meet the Millennium Health Care mandates. The Secretary and the Under Secretary for Health testified that a number of provisions that are already implemented, and a number are delayed in the final notice in rule process.

There are a number of reasons for this delay, primarily because VA and OMB have not been able to promulgate and vet the rules in a timely manner. Some of the delay is simply the rule process, it is long and complicated. Some of the delay is due to the new administration carefully reviewing the rules before publication and notice. Regardless, the VA is not able to spend the money we have already provided because they cannot.

So, to add additional money to this bill begs the question of what is the purpose of this motion to recommit. Clearly the motion to recommit would send the bill back to committee; in effect it would kill the bill.

Now, we want to pass this bill. We worked very hard on it. My ranking member and I have tried to do this in a bipartisan way. There are lots of Member requests in this bill. The priorities of the Members are clearly expressed in this bill. We provided \$400 million more for construction for veterans hospitals as a direct response to the Members. We think this is a good bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would strongly urge support of this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from

New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just say I certainly appreciate and empathize with the motion to recommit; but the committee has, in my opinion, tried to carefully and painstakingly craft a budget that fully funds a number of very important veterans' programs. I believe Chairman WALSH and Ranking Democrat MOLLOHAN have produced a generous allocation of Federal funds for veterans' programs. VA construction gets more—and much needed monies—under the bill. As a matter of fact it fully funds the first year of my bill, passed by the House—H.R. 811—Emergency Hospital Repair Act of 2001. The Walsh bill provides approximately \$1.6 billion over and above last year in the area of discretionary spending, and a significant \$1 billion more in VA medical care funding.

Sure, I would like to increase VA appropriations beyond what is in this bill. We would all like to spend more. But we have to live within at least some budget restraints. No budget or appropriations bill is ever perfect, Mr. Speaker, but is the result of careful compromise and a weighing of competing priorities.

Tomorrow I will bring to the floor the Veterans Benefits Act of 2001, which provides a \$2.7 billion increase over 5 years, to boost COLAs for more than 2.3 million disabled vets. And to assist Gulf War vets and for insurance and other purposes. This plus H.R. 1291 the doubling of the 61 education benefit—from \$23,400 to \$36,900—and H.R. 801, the Veterans Survivors Benefit Improvement Act of 2001 signed into law demonstrates are commitment to vets.

So I just ask Members, however well-intended this motion is, I think it breaks the budget; and I would urge that it be voted down. Both the chairman and ranking member care deeply about veterans and have done their level best within their allocation to fund veterans programs.

I just would ask for a no vote on this.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his support on this. Please vote no on the motion to recommit and let us move the bill forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair

will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 296]		
AYES—196		
Ackerman	Green (TX)	Moore
Allen	Gutierrez	Nadler
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Napolitano
Baca	Hall (TX)	Neal
Baird	Harman	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hastings (FL)	Obeiy
Baldwin	Hill	Oliver
Barcia	Hilliard	Ortiz
Barrett	Hinchey	Owens
Becerra	Hinojosa	Pallone
Berkley	Hoefel	Pascrell
Berman	Holden	Pastor
Berry	Holt	Pelosi
Bishop	Honda	Peterson (MN)
Blagojevich	Hooley	Phelps
Blumenauer	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bonior	Inslee	Price (NC)
Borski	Israel	Reyes
Boswell	Jackson (IL)	Rivers
Boucher	Jackson-Lee	Rodriguez
Boyd	(TX)	Roemer
Brady (PA)	John	Ross
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Rothman
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Royal-Allard
Capps	Kanjorski	Rush
Capuano	Kaptur	Sanchez
Cardin	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Carson (IN)	Kildee	Sandlin
Carson (OK)	Kilpatrick	Sawyer
Clay	Kind (WI)	Schakowsky
Clayton	Kleckzka	Schiff
Clement	Kucinich	Scott
Clyburn	LaFalce	Serrano
Condit	Lampson	Sherman
Conyers	Langevin	Shows
Costello	Lantos	Skelton
Coyne	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lee	Snyder
Cummings	Levin	Solis
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Lofgren	Stenholm
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Strickland
DeFazio	Lucas (KY)	Stupak
DeGette	Luther	Tanner
Delahunt	Maloney (CT)	Tauscher
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Deutsch	Markey	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	Mascara	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Matheson	Thurman
Doggett	Matsui	Tierney
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Towns
Doyle	McCarthy (NY)	Turner
Edwards	McCollum	Udall (CO)
Engel	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	McGovern	Velazquez
Etheridge	McIntyre	Visclosky
Evans	McKinney	Waters
Farr	McNulty	Watson (CA)
Fattah	Meehan	Watt (NC)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	Waxman
Ford	Menendez	Weiner
Frank	Millender-	Wexler
Frost	McDonald	Woolsey
Gephardt	Miller, George	Wu
Gonzalez	Mink	Wynn

NOES—230

[Roll No. 297]		
YEAS—336		
Abercrombie	Brady (TX)	Crane
Aderholt	Brown (SC)	Crenshaw
Akin	Bryant	Cubin
Armey	Burr	Culberson
Bachus	Burton	Cunningham
Baker	Buyer	Davis, Jo Ann
Ballenger	Callahan	Davis, Tom
Barr	Calvert	Deal
Bartlett	Camp	DeLay
Barton	Cannon	DeMint
Bass	Cantor	Diaz-Balart
Bentsen	Capito	Doolittle
Bereuter	Castle	Dreier
Biggert	Chabot	Duncan
Bilirakis	Chambliss	Dunn
Blunt	Coble	Ehlers
Boehlert	Collins	Ehrlich
Boehner	Combest	Emerson
Bonilla	Cooksey	English
Bono	Cox	Everett
Ferguson	Flake	Foley
LaHood	Gutierrez	Ganske
Largent	Hall (OH)	Gillman
Latham	Harmar	Goodlatte
Roukema	Hastaings (FL)	Gordon
Royce	Hill	Goss
Ryan (WI)	Hilliard	Graham
Sabo	Hinchey	Granger
Saxton	Hinojosa	Graves
Scarborough	Hoeffel	Green (WI)
Schaffer	Holden	Greenwood
Sensenbrenner	Holt	Grucci
Sessions	Honda	Gutknecht
Shadegg	Hooley	Hart
Shaw	Hoyer	Hastings (WA)
Shays	Inslee	Hayes
Sherwood	Israel	Hayworth
Shimkus	Jackson (IL)	Hefley
Shuster	Jackson-Lee	Herger
Simmons	(TX)	Hilleary
Simpson	(VA)	Hobson
Skeen	Jackson-Lee	Hoekstra
Smith (MI)	Jones (OH)	Horn
Smith (NJ)	Jones (NC)	Hostettler
Smith (TX)	Jones (WA)	Houghton
Souder	Kanjorski	Hulshof
Stearns	Kaptur	Hunter
Stump	Kildee	Hutchinson
Sununu	Kilpatrick	Hyde
Sweeney	Kind (WI)	Isakson
Tancredo	Kleckzka	Jissa
Tauzin	Kucinich	Keller
Taylor (NC)	LaFalce	Jenkins
Terry	Lampson	Johnson (CT)
Thornberry	Langevin	Johnson (IL)
Thomas	Lantos	Johnson, Sam
Watkins (OK)	Larsen (WA)	Jones (NC)
Watts (OK)	Larson (CT)	Kahall
Weldon (FL)	McCarthy (MO)	Ramstad
Weldon (PA)	McCarthy (NY)	Rangel
Weller	McCollum	Regula
Whitfield	McDermott	Kerns
Wicks	McGovern	Rehberg
Wilson	McIntyre	King (NY)
Wolf	McKinney	Kingston
Young (AK)	McNulty	Kirk
Young (FL)	Meehan	Rogers (KY)
Young (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher	Menendez	Knollenberg
	Menendez	Kolbe

NOT VOTING—7

Hansen	Lipinski	Stark
Istook	Payne	
Jefferson	Spence	

□ 2358

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 89, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]		
YEAS—336		
Abercrombie	Bass	Bono
Aderholt	Becerra	Borski
Akin	Bentsen	Boswell
Armey	Bereuter	Boucher
Bachus	Brinkley	Brady (PA)
Baker	Baca	Brady (TX)
Ballenger	Berman	Brown (FL)
Barr	Berry	Brown (SC)
Bartlett	Biggert	Bryant
Barton	Baker	Baldacci
Bass	Biggs	Bishop
Bentsen	Bilirakis	Blunt
Bereuter	Bilirakis	Burton
Biggert	Bilirakis	Buyer
Bilirakis	Bilirakis	Boehner
Blunt	Bilirakis	Boehner
Boehlert	Bilirakis	Boehner
Boehner	Bilirakis	Boehner
Bonilla	Bilirakis	Boehner
Bono	Bilirakis	Boehner
RECORDED VOTE	Bilirakis	Boehner
Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.	Bilirakis	Boehner
A recorded vote was ordered.	Bilirakis	Boehner
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair	Bilirakis	Boehner

Cannon	Hunter	Pickering
Cantor	Hutchinson	Pitts
Capito	Hyde	Platts
Carson (OK)	Inslee	Pombo
Chabot	Isakson	Portman
Chambliss	Israel	Price (NC)
Clay	Issa	Pryce (OH)
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Putnam
Clement	(TX)	Quinn
Clyburn	Jenkins	Radanovich
Coble	Johnson (CT)	Rahall
Collins	Johnson (IL)	Ramstad
Combest	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Cooksey	Jones (NC)	Rehberg
Cox	Jones (OH)	Reynolds
Coyne	Kanjorski	Riley
Cramer	Kaptur	Rivers
Crane	Keller	Rodriguez
Crenshaw	Kelly	Rogers (KY)
Crowley	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (MI)
Cubin	Kennedy (RI)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kerns	Ros-Lehtinen
Cummings	Kildee	Ross
Cunningham	Kilpatrick	Roukema
Davis (FL)	King (NY)	Royal-Allard
Davis, Jo Ann	Kingston	Royce
Davis, Tom	Kirk	Ryun (KS)
Deal	Knollenberg	Sanchez
DeFazio	Kolbe	Sandlin
DeGette	Kucinich	Sawyer
DeLay	LaFalce	Saxton
DeMint	LaHood	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	Lampson	Schiff
Dicks	Langevin	Schrock
Dingell	Lantos	Scott
Dooley	Largent	Serrano
Doolittle	Larsen (WA)	Sessions
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Shaw
Dreier	Latham	Sherman
Duncan	LaTourette	Sherwood
Dunn	Leach	Shimkus
Edwards	Levin	Shows
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Ehrlich	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
Emerson	Linder	Skeen
Engel	LoBiondo	Skelton
English	Lowey	Slaughter
Etheridge	Lucas (KY)	Smith (MI)
Evans	Lucas (OK)	Smith (NJ)
Everett	Luther	Smith (TX)
Farr	Maloney (CT)	Snyder
Fattah	Manzullo	Solis
Ferguson	Mascara	Souder
Fletcher	Matheson	Spratt
Foley	Matsui	Stearns
Forbes	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Fossella	McCullum	Stump
Frelinghuysen	McCrary	Sununu
Frost	McHugh	Sweeney
Gallegly	McInnis	Tauzin
Ganske	McIntyre	Taylor (MS)
Gekas	McKeon	Taylor (NC)
Gibbons	McKinney	Terry
Gilchrest	Meehan	Thomas
Gillmor	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Gilman	Meeks (NY)	Thornberry
Gonzalez	Mica	Thune
Goode	Millender-	Tiahrt
Goodlatte	McDonald	Tiberi
Gordon	Miller (FL)	Traficant
Goss	Miller, Gary	Turner
Graham	Mink	Udall (NM)
Granger	Mollohan	Upton
Graves	Moran (KS)	Visclosky
Green (TX)	Moran (VA)	Vitter
Green (WI)	Morella	Walden
Greenwood	Murtha	Walsh
Grucci	Myrick	Wamp
Gutknecht	Napolitano	Watkins (OK)
Hall (TX)	Neal	Watson (CA)
Harman	Nethercutt	Watt (NC)
Hart	Ney	Watts (OK)
Hastings (WA)	Northup	Waxman
Hayes	Norwood	Weldon (FL)
Hayworth	Nussle	Weldon (PA)
Herger	Ortiz	Weller
Hill	Ose	Whitfield
Hildeary	Otter	Wicker
Hobson	Oxley	Wilson
Hoefle	Pallone	Wolf
Holden	Pascarella	Woolsey
Holt	Pastor	Wu
Hooley	Pelosi	Wynn
Horn	Pence	Young (AK)
Houghton	Peterson (MN)	Young (FL)
Hoyer	Peterson (PA)	
Hulshof	Phelps	

NAYS—89

Ackerman	Hilliard	Pomeroy
Allen	Hinchey	Reyes
Baldwin	Hinojosa	Roemer
Barrett	Hoekstra	Rothman
Blagojevich	Honda	Rush
Blumenauer	Hostettler	Ryan (WI)
Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Sabo
Brown (OH)	John	Sanders
Capps	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Capuano	Kleczka	Schakowsky
Cardin	Lee	Sensenbrenner
Carson (IN)	Lewis (GA)	Shadegg
Castile	Lofgren	Shays
Costello	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Rangel	Markey	Stenholm
Regula	McCarthy (MO)	Stupak
Rivers	Davis (IL)	Tancredo
Riley	McDermott	Tanner
Ross	Delahunt	Tauscher
Roukema	DeLauro	Tierney
Royal-Allard	Deutsch	Toomey
Royce	Doggett	Towns
Ryun (KS)	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Sanchez	Miller, George	Thurman
Sandlin	Eshoo	Velazquez
Sawyer	Hall (OH)	Waters
Saxton	Hefley	Weiner
Scarborough		Wexler
Schiff		
Schrock		
Scott		
Serrano		
Sessions		
Shaw		
Sherman		
Sherwood		
Shimkus		
Shows		
Shuster		
Simmons		
Simpson		
Skeen		
Skelton		
Slaughter		
Smith (MI)		
Smith (NJ)		
Smith (TX)		
Snyder		
Solis		
Souder		
Spratt		
Stearns		
Strickland		
Stump		
Sununu		
Sweeney		
Tauzin		
Taylor (MS)		
Taylor (NC)		
Terry		
Thomas		
Thompson (CA)		
Thornberry		
Thune		
Tiahrt		
Tiberi		
Traficant		
Turner		
Udall (NM)		
Upton		
Visclosky		
Vitter		
Walden		
Walsh		
Wamp		
Watkins (OK)		
Watson (CA)		
Watt (NC)		
Watts (OK)		
Waxman		
Weldon (FL)		
Weldon (PA)		
Weller		
Whitfield		
Wicker		
Wilson		
Wolf		
Woolsey		
Wu		
Wynn		
Young (AK)		
Young (FL)		

extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. TRANDAHL, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1954. An act to extend the authorities of the Iran and Libya Sanctions Act of 1996 until 2006, and for other purposes.

□ 0010

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes a.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Tuesday, July 31, 2001 at 9 a.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 075-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3180. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3181. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the Annual Management Report of the Federal Financing Bank for FY 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3182. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Amendment 13 [Docket No. 001030303-1127-02; I.D. 091800E] (RIN: 0648-AO41) received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3183. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1013-01; I.D. 071901B] received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3184. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and