

munity Development Block Grant (CDBG) program.

The Administration has proposed reducing the funding level for the CDBG program from \$3.2 billion in Fiscal Year 1991 to \$2.9 billion in Fiscal Year 1992.

The CDBG program has allowed communities like Louisville and Jefferson County, Kentucky, which I am proud to represent, to conduct a variety of activities promoting revitalization, economic development and improved community facilities and services. The flexibility of the program has enabled communities to find innovative solutions to their own, unique problems.

Mr. Chairman, my next topic is the President's proposal for mass transit spending. The President is correct in putting transportation at the top of the domestic agenda. Unfortunately, the transportation budget, especially the mass transit portion of the budget is seriously flawed.

Through the past decade, with inflation taken into account, federal spending on mass transit has decreased by 50%. And, the Administration would only increase mass transit spending from \$3.25 billion in Fiscal 1991 to \$3.32 billion in Fiscal 1996.

In a time when new transit projects should be encouraged, the proposal to lower the 75% cap on the federal share of new starts to 50% would only serve to discourage new initiatives. Furthermore, reducing the federal share for capital projects from 80% to 60%, in a time when transit systems need more help, is a terribly misguided plan.

Urban areas depend on affordable, reliable mass transit for serving their populations. The Transit Authority of River City (TARC) in Louisville, Kentucky, which serves the people of my district and surrounding communities, is just one of those transit systems on which many depend.

Mr. Chairman, out of concern for those who rely on public transportation, and out of concern for energy conservation and reducing congestion and pollution, I respectfully request that your committee strongly consider the need for the federal government to do much more for mass transit.

Another budget topic in great need of consideration is funding for homeless and affordable housing programs.

I fully supported the adoption of last year's National Affordable Housing Act, the first major overhaul of federal housing programs since 1974. However, funds for two major new programs incorporated into the act—HOPE and HOME—have not yet been appropriated. Fortunately, the Administration's ill-conceived plan for paying for these two programs by shifting funds from public housing was rejected by the House.

HOPE, designed to help current residents of public housing buy their units, and HOME, which helps low-income people rent homes on the private housing market, deserve to be funded. I ask that the committee work towards that goal, taking a balanced approach under the restraints of the current budget.

Homelessness, which, in my view, is rooted in a number of causes including the lack of affordable housing, continues in crisis proportion. I deeply appreciate the past support that Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act programs have received from this Committee. The reauthorization of the McKinney Act created three new homeless programs and, it is my hope that everything possible will be done to provide funds to begin implementation.

Mr. Chairman, with last year's passage of the Clean Air Act amendments, my last priority I hope the Budget Committee will address is providing federal support and assistance to states and localities as these governments go about the task of complying with

EPA targets. Communities across the country have a major responsibility for reaching these goals of clean air, water and land, and I believe it is only appropriate that the federal government do its part in providing financial help.

Mr. Chairman and Committee Members, thank you for your time and this opportunity to appear before you.

NO RETREAT FROM SANCTIONS

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1991

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, recently, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Herman Cohen, indicated that the Bush administration is nearing a decision on lifting the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 [CAAA] against the Republic of South Africa.

In a April 5, 1991, Washington Times article, Secretary Cohen noted that the CAAA set five conditions South Africa must meet in order to lift sanctions. Secretary Cohen and the Bush administration believe that reforms that Pretoria has imposed are irreversible and the United States can best foster further progress by easing, conditioning, or lifting sanctions.

Personally, I believe that this is not the proper posture to assume at this juncture. I believe that international sanctions and South Africa's diplomatic and economic isolation have greatly influenced the Government's decision to reform the status quo.

While I applaud the release of Nelson Mandela, the unbanning of 30-plus political organizations, and preliminary talks about a non-racial postapartheid order, I am not convinced that the reform process is anything close to being irreversible. Nor do I believe that Pretoria has created a climate for peaceful political participation and voting rights for South Africa's blacks. In short, South Africa is by no means a democracy.

Today, I along with Representative MAXINE WATERS and several of our colleagues introduced a House concurrent resolution which states that the United States Government should not lift sanctions until the South African Government repeals all racial laws and all repressive legislation that maintain the intricate system of apartheid. This legislation also calls upon the South African Government to release all political prisoners, terminate the policy of detention without trial, cease all executions of political prisoners, and grant all black South Africans exiles the opportunity to return home.

Additionally, my House concurrent resolution urges the President through the Secretary of State to investigate the South African Government's role in the factional fighting affecting the black townships and reports of official South African death squads; and urges the President not to ease or lift sanctions imposed under the CAAA of 1986 until all the preconditions for lifting sanctions are met and the process toward the establishment of a non-racial democracy is irreversible.

Yesterday, the European Economic Community [EEC] decided to lift sanctions as a reward for the limited reforms that South Africa has initiated. While I have heard the EEC's rationale, I do not necessarily agree

with their decision or the timeliness of the decision.

Uncategorically, we must hold the Republic of South Africa to the same standards that we held Namibia, Poland, Nicaragua, and Panama. Simply, no easing of economic, cultural, or diplomatic sanctions until the country holds free and fair elections and all South Africans are allowed to participate in the political process.

We must have uniformity and consistency in American foreign policy toward nondemocratic nations. South Africa must not be an exception at this critical juncture in that country's history.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and all of our colleagues will support the resolution and encourage substantive, irreversible reforms in South Africa.

DRUG RAIDS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 16, 1991

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have read the articles regarding the drug raids at the University of Virginia with great interest. These drug busts have illuminated a very sensitive subject—that the drug war's boundaries don't stop at the tenement house—or the fraternity house—there is no safe haven for drug users.

The new drug czar, Gov. William Martinez, truly understands this concept. He knows that the scourge of drugs—the lost potential, the destruction of families, the loss of hope—must be stopped—and the war can't spare those whose socioeconomic status allows them to escape America's ghettos.

The lessons of modern warfare learned in the Persian Gulf must be translated into the war on drugs here at home. The drug war must not use the Vietnam war as a prototype—it must be an all-out effort on every front. And, we cannot surrender with dignity.

I would like to submit a column written by Carl Rowan regarding the war on drugs and the effect the raids at the University of Virginia have had on heightening the awareness of this effort. Mr. Rowan understands that each and every casualty of a war, whether it be in Iraq or Atlanta or the University of Virginia, is one too many. I hope that my colleagues will read this article and join in the effort to win this war at home.

UVA RAIDS SEND IMPORTANT SIGNAL ON DRUG WAR

(By Carl Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—Just when it appeared that our government had run up the flag of surrender in the war on drugs, law-enforcement authorities dropped a "bombshell" on the University of Virginia (UVA) at Charlottesville, Va.

In raids on three fraternity houses, police seized 12 sandwich bags of marijuana, three bags of hallucinogenic mushrooms, a bag of LSD tablets and scales and pipes used to smoke marijuana and other drugs.

Twelve students have been indicted on charges of selling or distributing illicit drugs.

These raids are extremely important because they tell us a lot about why we have failed so far to wipe out the drug curse.