

the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the committee are constrained by the dollars which have been allocated to their subcommittee for expenditure.

Having said that, that was the initial error. This bill ought not to be supported, because it is in the context, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, of being constrained by what the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and others have said is the 1997 Act. Yes, we voted on that act; but the fact is when we voted on that act we thought last year and this year would be in deficit. We thought we would not have balanced the budget by this time, consistent with OMB and CBO hypothesis at that time.

The context is different, and we ought not to do what we are doing, in my particular case, to NASA, basic science research.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 2684. Over the past 7 years, NASA has restructured, reduced personnel without layoffs and reduced its costs over those 7 years by \$35 billion. This is not an agency that did not give at the office and at home. I know the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) knows that.

I am extraordinarily concerned. The agency has kept America at the forefront of science research. This bill severely cuts NASA by a billion dollars and undermines our role, in my opinion, as the world leader in science and technology.

In fact, according to administrator Dan Golden, two centers, if this budget were carried into place and followed, would have to be closed. The reduction of the research program will eliminate an estimated 600 grants to universities, NASA centers, and other agencies in every State, not just mine.

Bill Brody, the President of Johns Hopkins University, wrote to me expressing his concern about the NASA cuts. In his letter he states that 75 percent of Hopkins' applied physics laboratory space department is funded through sources cut by this bill, basic, top flight, world-class research.

I know the chairman does not want to cut that, but his bill does that.

Brody estimates that within the next year, Hopkins' ability to maintain core engineering capabilities will be crippled for years to come, and the bill threatens the loss of ongoing research and analysis.

According to the National Business Coalition for Federal Research, who also contacted me, and I quote, "Republican cuts to scientific research under this bill are a recipe for failure."

I agree. NASA funding made tracking the 1997 El Nino weather pattern easier and possible because of the satellite that followed its movement across the Pacific ocean. Clearly, our Nation's quality of life benefits from NASA's commitment to earth science research.

In my district, space science research programs are carried out by Goddard.

Because my time is short, I will not be able to fully explain the consequences to Goddard, but let me say that this bill funds certain science and says to NASA Goddard, information can be collected through the Earth observation system but it then cuts the funding for the dissemination of that information on the Internet and throughout the country so that universities and scientific organizations can utilize the information we are collecting. That makes no sense.

I would say to my colleagues, we ought to reject this bill. We ought to send it back to committee, not because the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) or the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) have done anything wrong, but the constraints and the parameters that they were given were inappropriate, wrong, constrained, I would say, and add that as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) did, by a \$792 billion tax cut proposal. If we have \$792 billion, surely we have the money, surely we have the money, to fund, as my friend from New Jersey says, veterans adequately and surely basic science adequately.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the committee, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, for deleting the \$24.5 million for the selective service system. That was a good move. To me it was a heroic step in the direction of more liberty for the individual.

There is no place in a free society to have a program of conscription and drafting of young people to fight unconstitutional wars. It saves \$24 million, and I urge my colleagues not to support the funding for the selective service.

Ronald Reagan was a strong opponent of the draft. He spoke out against it. We do not need it. It is wasted money. It is absolutely unnecessary. The Department of Defense has spoken out clearly that it is not necessary for national security reasons to have a selective service system, and yet we continually spend \$24.5 million annually for this program. So I urge all Members, all my colleagues, to oppose putting this money back in for the Selective Service System.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO).

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. A month has passed since it has been delivered to

the floor with some last-minute emergency modifications to fund various popular programs, but as time passes, all the defects and shortcomings of the bill, in spite of the efforts of the subcommittee to try to rationalize its actions, serious problems are very apparent in this bill.

I would just point out the serious shortfall in terms of funding for housing, based on obviously cooked numbers apparently from the committees and from the Committee on the Budget, and arguable numbers from the administration, some of which I agree and disagree with within this bill. There is \$945M nearly 1 billion dollars less than in 1999 for housing. It is like the House is participating in a continued sham in terms of the Budget Act. The fact of the matter is that the public is rejecting the policy path that has been laid out by the Congress but the majority insists on getting up and passing bills that seriously underfund programs and seriously underfund housing.

This is almost a billion dollars less than what was actually funded last year based on trying to use standardized numbers, several billion dollars less than the administration has requested. I would say looking at what the need is that the serious problems of the past have now turned into a crisis with regards to housing. We cannot continue to use housing as the honey pot to take money out and spread it around to programs that have more popular support.

In my community, in Minnesota, we have about a 1 percent vacancy rate. In fact, vouchers that are often provided as an answer very often do not work and will not work. So even though all the facts change, all the circumstances change, the Congress acts as if in 1999, is still on a 1997 budget rationale. Funds are being split off for various purposes here, for an \$800B in tax breaks for Pentagon spending, for other matters, and yet we do not respond to the various and the deep needs of the low income people in our communities and their housing crisis. The homeless funds are cut, lead paint abatement funding cut, community development, housing funds, those of the least powerful in our society are short-changed. I urge my colleagues to reject this bill. I hope we could get to work and be in reality rather than remain in a state of denial. Regard the needs of people for shelter in safe sanitary housing.

Once again, the GOP leadership is relying upon gimmicks to hide their fiscal year 2000 appropriations process train wreck. By turning their backs on funding needs for important people programs and failing to invest in important social, housing, and community development programs, the Republicans have all but ensured a major confrontation this fall with congressional Democrats and the administration. The rush to provide tax cuts for special interests and the wealthy have clouded the need to address social program funding realities.