

As such, I urge you to join with me in supporting the important job-creating Great Lakes cargo equity provision in the maritime security bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT) having assumed the chair, Mr. DICKEY, Chairman pro tempore 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. 1350) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 to revitalize the United States-flag merchant marine, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 287, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was 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, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be granted 5 legislative days to insert their remarks into the RECORD and to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 289 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 289

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the De-

partment of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as ready.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule allows the House to consider and hopefully pass H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, and State Appropriations Conference Report. As most Americans know, we are charged each year with enacting 13 appropriations bills to fund the major functions of Government.

This year we have had a difficult time in meeting that goal, given the extraordinarily complex challenge of reducing the size and scope of Government as we attempt to balance our Federal budget. To date, 7 of the 13 spending bills have become law, and we are working hard to have the others on the President's desk as quickly as possible. We are seeking to work with the White House—but we will not abandon our commitment to balancing the budget in 7 years. This conference report makes a tangible contribution to the deficit reduction effort, providing for a real cut of \$700 million from last year's spending levels. I wish to commend Chairman ROGERS and his entire subcommittee for their excellent work in making the tough choices needed to bring about such substantial savings, and believe me, I know these were tough choices.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a standard one providing for the consideration of appropriations conference reports. There is nothing unusual about the rule. It is the way we do business. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, allowing us to proceed with getting this bill passed and, hopefully, one step closer to being signed into law. Under House rules, this conference report will be debatable for 1 hour and the minority will have its traditional right to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, we had considerable discussion about the merits of this bill during our Rules Committee hearing yesterday as sometimes happens, and I know there is concern among our friends in the minority about the crime provisions of this legislation. I should point out that the Contract With America outlined a series of important tough-on-crime provisions that the congressional majority promised to deliver. Although those provisions—including truth-in-sentencing and prison

litigation reform—passed the House this spring, they have not yet moved through the other body, I am sorry to say. Because we know how important these anticrime measures are to the American people, we are cutting through the legislative logjam that has held them up. I am speaking of provisions to help States keep criminals behind bars and to stop frivolous prison lawsuits. Over and over again, our constituents express frustration that criminals are released early from prison because of overcrowding and lenient State parole policies. Our constituents are concerned about their safety, as they should be, and they want to know that those who commit crimes will do their time. In addition, people are extremely frustrated with reports of endless lawsuits generated by prisoners that clog the system and syphon off precious criminal justice resources. This bill incorporates much of the Judiciary Committee's language to address these two problems in the hopes that we can finally expedite getting these anticrime measures enacted into law before Christmas, I hope.

There is also some disagreement about the way this bill addresses the COPS Program—a pet program of this White House that has placed some 26,000 cops on the beat across the country, but which, in a few short years, will drop the entire burden for funding those policemen on the States and localities. In my view, that's a false promise of a very short-term gain. It is attractive bait, I admit, but it is a short-term gain that in the long run is going to end up costing our communities dearly.

Mr. speaker, I remember the days of the CETA programs. I know what happened because I was in another one of those.

Instead, this bill takes the block-grant approach to allocating those anticrime resources, leaving it up to local officials to determine what the best use will be for those funds. Additional good news in this measure comes in the form of substantial funding for violence against women programs and a significant Federal financial commitment to help States like Florida cope with the tremendous burden of incarcerating criminal aliens. I would point out even though I am from Florida, it is not just Florida that has the problem; it is a national problem. A careful review of the major provisions of this conference report indicates that our House colleagues have done yeoman's work, they have done it well, in their negotiations, bringing the House a fiscally responsible bill that reflects the priorities of our constituents. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the conference report.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, crime is a very serious issue in this country. In fact, today the top three issues for citizens of the Commonwealth Massachusetts are education, crime, and the environment. And I bet it is the same in other States.

Mr. Speaker, life in the United States is not what it used to be. Children worry about whether their classmates are bringing guns to schools, parents worry about what sorts of drugs are being sold in playgrounds, and families worry for their safety even in their own homes and neighborhoods.

It's horrible that many American families feel threatened by violent crime on a daily basis. Congress should be doing every single thing in its power to make sure our children and families are safe. So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder why on Earth my colleagues want to repeal the wildly popular cops-on-the-beat program.

Since 1994, the cops-on-the-beat program has put 26,000 new police officers on the streets of this country. These are police officers who are trained to prevent violent crime, and illegal drug sales, and sent into communities with serious crime problems.

In Massachusetts alone, we have been given the funding to hire over 700 police officers over the next 3 years. These 700 police officers will be walking our streets thanks to the cops-on-the-beat program.

But today my Republican colleagues want to kill this program. The bill we are considering today will turn the hard-hitting, successful cops-on-the-beat program into block grant mush. The funding will be used for a no-strings-attached slush fund to the tune of nearly \$2 billion.

In all likelihood, some of that money, originally meant to stop violent crime on our streets, will be swallowed up into municipal budgets. It's happened before, and it will probably happen again. The newly hired police officers could be let go and our neighborhoods will be the worse for it.

In fact, this money doesn't have to be spent on crime prevention at all. It can be used for yachts or bazookas or armored personnel carriers or a whole lot of other things that will do nothing about the crime on our streets.

Let's leave well enough alone. Let's leave the cops-on-the-beat program as the law of the land. Let's keep those police officers on the street and keep our streets as safe as we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, although I do not oppose this rule, I am very much opposed to this bill. Americans want the police officers walking the streets today, to be walking the streets tomorrow. In fact, they want even more of them, and Congress should not break its promise.

□ 1530

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ken-

tucky [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his generous grant of time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support, obviously, of this rule. This rule is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, because of the unusual approach taken by the Senate in adopting its version of this bill. Instead of amending the House-passed bill, the Senate attached its bill as a single substitute amendment to the House bill, and as a result, the entire bill was in conference. What we bring back to the House is a substitute bill based on the conference agreement. Under that fairly complicated scenario, it makes far more sense to waive all points of order, as this rule does, and I want to thank the Committee on Rules for moving us in this direction.

The conference report, Mr. Speaker, contains some of the most important programs in the Government. Let me highlight one, the Nation's No. 1 domestic priority, the fight against violent crime. The bill provides major new resources to aid the fight against crime, \$14.6 billion in total, an increase of 19 percent over the current year.

Of that total, almost \$4 billion from the violent crime reduction trust fund that was established last year will fund major new initiatives to enable our States and localities to wage that war against violent crime: \$1.9 billion of the money is for the local law enforcement block grant passed by this House in February, to give our cities and towns, in their discretion, the additional resources they desperately need to help make our citizens safe in their own homes; \$617 million for the new State prison grant program to allow resources from the Federal Government to go to the States to provide the facilities to make violent criminals serve most of their time; and \$175 million for Violence Against Women Act grants, \$50 million above the House-passed level, and the full amount that the President requested for these new programs to address child abuse and domestic violence, problems that have been crying for attention and resources.

The bill includes funding for a \$300 million increase over last year for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to regain control over illegal immigration, and an increase of \$571 million over the current year for Federal law enforcement, nearly \$200 million above the House-passed level, for Federal law enforcement: FBI, Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. attorneys and the Federal prisons.

As this debate unfolds, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are going to hear complaints from the other side. They will not like the fact that the conference report includes language, in response to a Senate amendment, to rein in abusive and frivolous lawsuits by prisoners, language that the Administra-

tion generally supports. They will not like the fact that the conference report includes language to target prison grants to States that move forward toward making prisoners serve 85 percent of their sentences. They will not like the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report includes language that moves away from a Washington-based cookie cutter grant program in crime control to a program that allows communities to use funds at their own discretion for their own particular needs.

For every one of these items, the language was worked on by the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and the Senate jointly, and includes the text that was agreed on by those committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is December. We have been debating these issues all year long. This bill passed the House in July. It passed the Senate in September. The Administration has not said one word to me or to this subcommittee or to the full committee or to the House, about what they would like to see done in this bill. We have waited. We have asked for their assistance and their cooperation. They have refused. We have no choice now but to move forward, like it or not.

Unless we pass a bill and find a way to get it signed, none of these resources can become available to our communities. If the programs in this bill are important to the Members, if the fight against violent crime and illegal aliens is important to the Members, if it is important to Members to help stamp out violence against women, then vote for this bill. Step forward. Make your move. Let us send this bill to the White House, get it over with, and get on with the business of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote for this rule and for the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. MCCARTHY].

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and urge members to vote "no" to the rule and to the conference report.

This bill would eliminate the current COPS Program that gives grants to localities to put 100,000 additional community police officers on the streets of our Nation.

The citizens of my district in Missouri have benefited from this program. In 25 cities across the country the violent crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, the crime rate is down.

In my own district the COPS Program in phase 1 has funded 94 total law enforcement officers in towns and communities like independence, Lee's Summit, Raytown and Sugar Creek. In Kansas City alone 26 law enforcement officers have been funded.

If the COPS Program is turned into a block grant fund, there is a real danger

that communities like mine will lose Federal funding and face elimination of a successful program that prevents crime. Mr. Speaker, I have visited with citizens and law enforcement officials and the cops on the beat. I have seen the work that they are doing with community volunteers to prevent crime.

If we allow this valuable program to be made into a block grant these funds may be diverted and may not be spent on preventing crime.

According to the Jackson County prosecutors office, overall crime in Kansas City has decreased 15 percent from 1994. This includes a 25-percent reduction in homicides, 10-percent reduction in violent crimes, and a reduction of 5 percent in part 1 crimes such as auto theft.

The COPS Program has real, tangible, results. The COPS Program is working.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and to oppose passage of this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and of the conference report on H.R. 2076 and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend Chairman ROGERS and the rest of my colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee for their hard work on this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, as Chair of the Small Business Committee I want to specifically address the funding provided for the Small Business Administration [SBA] in this conference report. At the beginning of this year, I established a goal of substantially reducing funding for the SBA, while increasing the agency's ability to assist small business with their capital needs through guaranteed loans. I am pleased to say that legislation authored by the Committee on Small Business, and signed into law in October, substantially reduced the subsidy needed to operate our two largest guaranteed loan programs. By working cooperatively with Chairman ROGERS, we have been able to reduce funding for the SBA by 36 percent—a savings of nearly \$300 million when compared to the fiscal year 1995 appropriations, and yet preserving those programs that are truly important to small business.

Despite these very real reductions, there will be no loss of vital financing assistance for the small business community. In fact, the SBA will be able to provide more guarantees for 7(a) general small business loans in fiscal year 1996 than ever before. The Certified Development Co. program will be able to help small businesses expand, meeting

their needs for larger work space and updated equipment, without any appropriation whatsoever—the program is now completely self-financing.

Mr. Speaker, through dedication to reducing Federal spending and reaching a balanced budget, and unwavering support of small businesses, we have found a way to do more with less. This conference report represents fiscal responsibility and strong advocacy for our Nation's economic backbone—small business. Again, my compliments to Chairman ROGERS, and I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] for a colloquy.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. Speaker, I first congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee in bringing a balanced spending bill back from conference that includes and funds a number of essential governmental functions. Included in this bill is \$12 billion for NOAA's National Undersea Research Program, otherwise known as NURP. To clarify the priority of this funding, I would like to ask if the \$12 million is intended for the existing six NURP research centers.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct, it is.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also further clarify. One of these six centers, the Caribbean Marine Research Center, has long been recognized for the information it provides on a number of environmental concerns. I would ask the chairman of the committee, does the language on this conference report assure \$1.56 billion for the Caribbean Marine Research Center?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, he is correct, it does.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for this clarification.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, although I do not intend to support H.R. 2076. Although there are many sections of this conference report that I find troubling, I will limit my comments to the funding of programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST].

I want to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for providing adequate funding for the NIST laboratories, and particularly for funding the Manufacturing Extension Part-

nership [MEP] at NIST. The MEP was labeled "corporate welfare program" by many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle at the beginning of this Congress. However, due to the educational efforts of the small- and medium-size business community, my Republican colleagues were able to set politics aside and judge the Manufacturing Extension Partnership on its merits. As a result, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership is funded.

I am afraid my Republican colleagues were not so objective in their assessment of the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] at NIST. In hearings before the Committee on Science this year, the only witnesses who spoke against ATP were individuals with no technical or business background. Every other private sector witness has supported the ATP and programs like it—regardless of whether their company received an ATP award.

Over the over we read in the newspapers, magazines, and journals that many U.S. companies are reducing their investment in long-term, high-risk research and development [R&D] to focus on short-term process R&D. As reported by the New York Times—September 26, 1995—the breakup of the AT&T lab was due to diminishing corporate interest on the brilliant breakthrough discoveries that might lead to an entirely new generation of products. It was long-term, high-risk research in the past that resulted in the economic strength of the United States today. If our companies stop doing research to focus on short-term profits, what will be the base of American economic strength in the future? The Advanced Technology Program was designed to work with industry to ensure our future economic strength.

According to the Congressional Budget Office [CBO], the ATP represents less than 3 percent of the \$12 billion the Federal Government will spend on programs that support industrial technology commercialization. Where are my colleagues who decry ATP's alleged corporate welfare when we provide almost \$1 billion to the Small Business Innovation Research Program [SBIR] or \$3.7 billion to the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for applied biomedical research.

If opponents of so-called industrial welfare were serious, we would be debating the widerange of technology commercialization programs which the Government funds. This House has not done this.

Eliminating the ATP is nothing more than a banner for Members who pretend this eliminates government corporate welfare. The CBO numbers show that it is not. Let's be frank. ATP was targeted by the Republican Congress, despite its initiation by a Republican administration, because it was enthusiastically endorsed by Bill Clinton—both as a candidate and as President.

Eliminating ATP funding doesn't say we're willing to make hard choices—it says we're making the simple choices. Eliminating ATP is easy because it is a small program with a small constituency. There has been no

substantives debate in any committee or on the floor of the House regarding the merits of this or related programs. Spouting platitudes, opponents of ATP have killed it for purely political reasons.

□ 1545

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many reasons for opposing this conference report is because of the threat that it poses to America's economic security. We have in recent years in this country recognized that research and development is a key to our economic future, that if we are to have good-paying jobs for young Americans, we have to invest and invest appropriately in research and development.

This bill, as the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] just indicated, is not nearly as bad as the one that went to the conference committee, remains a real setback with reference to applied technology and the investment that is going to be necessary to assure that those good jobs are there in the future.

Over the last 50 years, Mr. Speaker, American know-how and invention have generated up to half of this country's economic growth. Federal support is crucial in assisting this. Millions of jobs have been created in industries because of wise private and public investments, particularly when there has been private and public partnership in areas like semiconductors and biotechnology.

Let us compare what we are doing under this bill with what some of the other countries in the world are doing. In fact, if we are to look specifically at Japan, one of our strongest economic competitors, after this bill is passed, you see that the Japanese are steadily increasing their investment in nondefense research and development, but our investment will go steadily down. It is going in the wrong direction. We do a little investment; they take the ideas and commercialize them, and we end up being the consumers and having a huge trade deficit as a result.

What about other countries throughout Asia that are our economic partners at times, but also our strong economic competitors? If you look at Singapore, if you look at South Korea, if you look at Taiwan, even if you look at India, you see that their commitment to expand their research and development is significantly greater than what our Republican colleagues propose to do under this bill. To suggest that the private sector can pick up all of the slack does not comport with history. Indeed, it is quite the contrary.

Usually when public investment goes up, private investment goes up as well. When you cut key research and development, as this bill does through the irresponsible abolition of the Advanced

Technology Program, you will have less private investment as well as less public investment.

The cuts in ATP, in the Environmental Protection Agency's environmental technologies initiative and the Department of Energy's energy efficiency and renewable energy programs all represent a significant setback.

I think the editorial writers across America have been picking up on the wrong this Congress is doing with reference to our investment for America's future. The Republican Dallas Morning News put it very plainly in an editorial appropriately entitled "Cutting Seed Corn." It said, "These take-no-prisoners cuts are anything but thoughtful. Proposed budget cuts, while having little effect on the deficit," because this is a very small part of our national expenditures, "while having little effect on the deficit, could main this country's network of scientific institutions."

The New York Times referred to "the crippling of American science as an irresponsible gamble and a product of those who have been blinded by ideological fury."

We ought to have bipartisan support for America's economic security, for providing those good jobs, and instead this conference report whittles away at our future and whittles away at the hope that America can provide the top-paying jobs, the quality jobs, and overcome our trade deficit by cutting our research at the same time our trading partners are increasing theirs. It is a mistake, and this conference report ought to be rejected.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will oppose this rule in the Commerce, Justice, and State appropriation bill here today. I am here to talk about the COPS Program.

Being a former police officer myself, I am very concerned about the COPS Program. It is a program that works. It has been a very successful program. To date, we have hired 26,000 police officers. In every jurisdiction in this country 26,000 police officers have been hired, and here are the cities and how much money was received. We have pending another 18,500 police officers; those applications are currently pending with the Department of Justice. We are halfway to our goal of 100,000 police officers on the street. There is no reason to turn back now.

It is an easy one-page application. Police officers around this country like the program. Money is going directly to them. In fact, over half the communities in the United States have applied for the COPS Program. We have more applications than what we can fund.

What happens in this bill? Look at page 21. Page 21 of this conference re-

port says that if you are a small community like many of the communities I represent, and if your Federal match falls below \$10,000, the money is then taken away from the COPS Program and put with the Governors of the State to use in a manner that reduces crime and improves public safety.

When we had this debate on February 14, we asked not to put in an amendment to allow us to build roads, but that was rejected, so you believe, at least the new majority believes, that if you build a new road, you fight crime and you improve public safety. You might have a nice highway, but you certainly do not help any police officers on the street and fight crime in your communities.

So on behalf of the 26,000 police officers throughout this country who have been working at this program, whose jobs now are at risk based upon the proposal put forth by these conferees, we ask that you reject this rule and reject this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this rule and the conference report, and I must respectfully disagree with my colleague, whom I greatly respect, on his comments regarding the COPS Program. No one supports police officers any more than I think anyone in this House, but this COPS Program I do not think has been a success. I think if people look at it closely, they realize that this Federal program does not fully fund these policemen that are going out on the street.

It funds only up to 75 percent and, on average, \$25,000 a year of these packages of salaries and retirement benefits. After 3 years, the Federal funding ceases.

Many localities have therefore, as a result of this mandate of putting this much money into the program, have been unable to afford officers under this program. Over 600 localities have turned down the opportunity to hire up to 1,200 officers when faced with the prospect of contributing this kind of money to their salaries. GAO reports indicate that over 7,000 localities did not even apply for the COPS Program.

Another problem with this program is that the COPS money has not been spent or sent to the areas where the statistics show that there is the most violent crime. I think overall in this country we have to realize that we must begin to prioritize our fight against crime, and at the top of the list, of course, has to go violent crime.

As an example, one of the cities that we have before us is the city of Portland, OR, and in Portland, over 56 percent of the crime that is committed in the entire State of Oregon is committed in the city of Portland. Yet under

the COPS Program, they were furnished less than 1 percent of the COPS money that went to the entire State of Oregon.

Again, GAO found no relationship between crime rates and whether an applicant jurisdiction was awarded a grant. That is very important, because again, we have only so much money to go around and communities know this and Washington must learn this, that we must prioritize violent crime at the top and spend money fighting violent crime.

GAO also found that less than 50 percent of the people who receive COPS money ranked violent crime or drug crimes as one of their top five problems. So over half the cases that were getting this money, over half the money, did not list violent crime or drug crime as one of their major offenses. To me, that is incredible, not a waste of assets, but a misuse, and we can find a much better use of these assets in those localities where violent crime at least ranks in the top five crimes in that community. That is why I strongly favor the concept of block grants that is found in our bill.

Block grants allow money to be spent in communities where there is crime and allows communities to spend money in ways that may be hiring more police officers, more equipment, or whatever, but more effective ways to let the local people use the funds in a way that they think is best to fight the crime. What works best in my little hometown of Henderson, TN does not necessarily work best in New York City or Denver, CO.

Let the localities decide how to spend this money when they get it based on their criminal statistics, their rates of crime, their rates of violent crimes, and let them choose how best to use this money.

Another reason I favor this rule and this bill, Mr. Speaker, it also, as I am talking about violent crime, it favors truth-in-sentencing, and it puts the burden back on the States where it belongs. We in the Federal system have too long had to fill in the gap for State prison systems that have broken down. What we do in this bill is provide money to the States as an incentive, if they will go to truth-in-sentencing where a person, if they are sentenced to 10 years, stands some realistic chance of actually serving 10 years in jail. With that incentive, we will offer them money to help construct and build the prisons necessary to house these people.

Yesterday the Wall Street Journal indicated in its editorial page that overall crime statistics are down. Prison populations are up both in the State and in the Federal system. One reason, one clear reason why crime rates are down on the outside is because of two things. One, people are beginning to learn that if you commit a crime, you will go to jail and you will actually serve that time in jail; it serves as a deterrent. Two, many of the people

who have been committing these violent crimes are finally locked up in jail as a result of a mandated sentence, a required sentence, and they are in jail where they cannot commit crimes against innocent people.

□ 1600

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman was commenting about his district and how crime went down. The Memphis Police Department received 40 police officers underneath this COPS program.

Your district received 82 police officers underneath this COPS program, and you are putting them all at risk if you vote for this bill. You cannot stand here and tell me that crime did not go down in your district with an additional 82 police officers.

Are you saying those 82 police officers did not do anything to help reduce crime in your district? And also Tennessee has pending another 114 police officers at the Justice Department waiting for approval.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Again I would remind my distinguished colleague that the COPS program is only funded for 3 years. And at some point the city of Memphis as well as those others in my district will have to assume full responsibility for that.

Mr. STUPAK. That is correct. Reclaiming my time, you said crime was going down now and it is these 82 additional police officers your district received underneath this program, the COPS program. Not only that, you can go to—Oakland Police Department received one police officer, Galloway City received one police officer. These little communities cannot afford anything without our assistance and you are denying them this assistance.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. LOFGREN].

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about the really astounding and appalling reductions in the Advanced Technology Program. Actually reductions is too sugarcoated: the programs have been wiped out.

This is a program that was initiated in the Bush administration and carried on in the Clinton administration. As we are all aware, we do have a need to get our fiscal house in order. I would suggest that cutting technology investments that have been the basis for job growth and economic growth in this country for the last two decades is going to aggravate severely our economic problems in the future. These cuts are foolhardy indeed.

It is worth noting that our competitors around the world are going in the exact opposite direction. Both Japan and Germany are increasing their ex-

penditures in applied R&D by 30 percent. We are doing an overall cut in science and technology research of 30 percent, creating for us a severe problem.

I am aware that the chairman of the Committee on Science is philosophically opposed to the ATP program. I respect the fact that he is entitled to his faith and his belief, but I also know that every industrialized country in the world is doing the kind of investments that we are cutting in this bill.

We will not pay for the cuts next year. We will not pay for them in 2 years. But 5 years from now, millions of Americans whose employment is tied to prior investments will not be employed, and they will have no one to blame but those who have suggested this foolhardy destruction of our future.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this bill contains the basic authorization that we passed earlier this year in order to have block grants for the communities to let them have the flexibility to decide how to best fight crime in this country. It is the beginning of a 5-year process to produce \$10 billion to the cities and the counties of this Nation, not the States but the cities and counties to let them choose whether they want to have more money for cops or whether they want to have more money for equipment or whether they want to have midnight basketball or whatever program it is that is suitable to them.

It is the basic adage that we have been talking about for some time on our side of the aisle, that what is suitable for Portland, OR, is not suitable for Des Moines, IA, or for Jacksonville, FL.

Let us let the cities, let us let the counties decide where best to fight crime on the local level. It also contains the prison grant reorganization that puts incentives out there in so-called truth-in-sentencing that rewards those States who change their laws to make the violent repeat felons serve at least 85 percent of their sentences. It rewards them by giving them money to build more prison beds. In a separate grant it also rewards those States who simply make progress towards that by allowing them some grant money to be able to do that. Fundamental changes in the law, very critical changes in the law necessary to accomplish the end goal of fighting violent crime in this country and stopping the revolving door.

I think the President is making a big mistake if he thinks that he is going to

veto this bill on the basis that somehow it destroys his cops on the streets program. It does not do that.

Mr. President, if you will look at what is going to come out here today and be passed and be sent down eventually for your signature, you are going to find in this bill not a choice between your COPS program and a block grant program but the choice is between 100,000 cops on the streets or 100,000 cops plus even more cops on the streets and more equipment and more flexibility and a better deal with more localities participating. There is going to be a very easy stride to make to get every single one of the cops that you do not have already onto the streets under the block grant program and it is just a better deal for the cities. Under your program, you cap off this system, saying that the cities and the counties and so forth cannot be reimbursed for cops but up to an amount of \$75,000 total over 3 years for a single new cop. The average new cop according to the Bureau of Justice statistics costs \$50,000 a year to put on the street. That is \$150,000, or twice the amount the Government is going to put up under your proposal, what is in law right now, over a 3-year period.

Under the bill we are putting out here today, there is no cap. The local community can have all the money it takes or needs to put a new cop on the street or as many as they want to put on the street. There is no limit. There is a lot more money involved out there. It takes about \$3 billion more over the next 3 or 4 years to put the rest of the 100,000 out there, 75,000 more. We have put out more than that. Up to \$10 billion will be available for that. In addition to that the communities will only have to match 10 percent of the money instead of 25 percent under yours. So it is a far better program.

I would urge everybody to look at it, especially the President, and decide, we will put 100,000 cops and then some on the street if we adopt the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not in order to address the President in debate. Members must address their remarks to the Chair. Although Members may discuss past and present Presidential actions and suggest possible future Presidential actions, they may not directly address the President as in the second person.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. To the last speaker, he is jeopardizing 80 police officers

in his district, 202 applications pending in Florida, and your bill does not guarantee 1 police officer. All you guarantee is a manner in which reduces crime and improves public safety. Not one police officer is mentioned in your bill.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues in the Congress to vote against this rule and to vote against the bill as well, in that it tears down a legal services system that it took years to build. You know who they are handicapping: The poor, particularly women and children.

So I rise today to appeal to my colleagues to look at the two-pronged attack that this bill makes on legal services. First of all, it cuts the Federal funds for legal services as one attack. Then it restricts the type of legal services that the local legal services organizations can provide with their own funds. So that is a double handicap.

We should not send this message from Congress. We should support the Legal Services Corporation. They help the poor. We will work hard for legal aliens in this country, and we must help to support legal services.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report and to the rule governing its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, last year 1,200 neighborhood law offices provided legal services to 1.7 million clients. The majority of these people were women and children living in poverty.

The conference report before us today contains a two-part attack on the Legal Services Corporation, which last year provided about 60 percent of the funds used by neighborhood legal service organizations. The balance of legal services funds comes from private attorneys, foundations, local charities, and State and local governments.

This conference report continues the majority's assault on the weakest members of our society.

The first part of this attack is to reduce Federal funds for the Legal Services Corporation by \$122 million. This is a cut of 31 percent.

The second part of this attack is to restrict the type of legal services that the local legal services organizations can provide with their own non-Federal funds.

Let me illustrate the unfair consequences of this restriction by sharing with the House a letter I received yesterday from Marcia Cypen, executive director of Legal Services of Greater Miami. She points out that Legal Services of Miami now uses non-Federal funds to represent aliens. Under this conference report, Legal Services of Miami would have to choose between giving up all Federal funds or else stop representing those aliens who are applying for admission as a refugee or for asylum. Many of these aliens have work permits and are working, but they are too poor to get private legal assistance. They must come to Legal Services of Miami if they have been beaten by their husbands, illegally locked out by their landlords, or cheated by a merchant.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the majority to put restrictions on the use of Federal funds. But it is wrong for the majority to impose its ideological views on services provided by donations from private groups and State and local governments that believe it is important that all poor people have access to our legal system.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter referred to in my remarks and its attachment, as follows:

LEGAL SERVICES OF
GREATER MIAMI, INC.,
Miami, FL, December 5, 1995.

Congresswoman CARRIE P. MEEK,
Cannon House Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MEEK: Thank you for requesting our program's input on HR 2076 which includes funding for the Legal Services Corporation in 1996.

A crucial failing of the bill is that it precludes representation of certain classes of aliens with non-LSC funds. The particular classes of aliens affected are listed on the attached page. On a practical level what this means is that we cannot, for example, use non-LSC funds to represent a Haitian woman who is beaten up by her husband, illegally locked out by her landlord, or cheated by a used car dealer if she has applied for political asylum and has a work permit but her political asylum application is still pending. Unfortunately, there are many aliens who remain in this limbo situation for several years.

Approximately five percent of our current non-immigration caseload consists of aliens who will no longer be eligible for legal services with non-LSC funds in 1996. This could be remedied if Section 504(d)(2)(B) were amended to allow non-LSC funds to be used to represent aliens not eligible for representation with LSC funds.

In addition, HR 2076 precludes us from collecting any attorneys fees in 1996. This is inconsistent with the stated goal of reducing LSC's dependency on federal dollars. Our program has relied on income from attorneys fees to bolster our budget, and the lack of this income in 1996 will reduce our services even further.

We appreciate your concern on behalf of the poverty community of Dade County. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

MARCIA K. CYPEN,
Executive Director.

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 5, 1995.

Subject: Ineligible aliens under proposed LSC restrictions.

From: Esther Olavarria Cruz.

To: Marcia Cypen.

I have made two lists, which is necessary to better explain who cannot be represented under the proposed LSC restrictions:

List of aliens who can be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Lawful permanent residents.
2. Aliens who are the spouse, parent, or unmarried child under 21 of a U.S. citizen and have filed applications for permanent residence.
3. Asylees (individuals granted asylum).
4. Refugees.
5. Individuals granted withholding of deportation (higher standard than asylum—very rare).
6. Individuals granted conditional entry before 4/1/80 (old refugee category—almost no aliens now in this category).
7. H-2A agricultural workers (limited to representation in employment contract matters only, such as wages, housing, transportation and other employment rights—very small category).

List of aliens who cannot be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Asylum applicants.
2. Parolees.

3. Special immigrant juveniles (undocumented children adjudicated state dependents because of abandonment, neglect or abuse).

4. Battered spouses of U.S. citizens (unless otherwise eligible under #2 above).

5. Battered spouses of permanent residents.

6. Aliens in exclusion or deportation proceedings.

7. Aliens with immediate U.S. citizen spouses, parents, or unmarried minor children who have not filed for permanent residence.

8. Relatives of permanent residents (unless otherwise eligible above).

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am always told if it is not broke, why fix it. We have a bill before us that is attempting to fix things that are really not broken.

If we read the editorials across this Nation, we will find constantly decreasing crime numbers. When we read between the lines, we will find out that what has happened in those communities, they have joined in community-oriented policing. How did they manage to do that? By joining in with the 100,000 COPS program.

We find that with a one-page application, you can go into the rural hamlets, the urban centers, and all of them can invest in getting more cops on the street, visible cops that interact with the community, thereby bringing down crime. In my district alone, we have been able to access 529 officers in Houston, some \$18 million invested into the local economy, and right now in the State of Texas we have 360 applications pending.

If it is not broke, why fix it? The communities want policing, they want 100,000 cops and they want them to be in their community.

Then we find that this bill wants to cut 31 percent out of the Legal Services Corporation, an institution that we might be able to modify and improve. There is nothing wrong with reducing overhead and making sure that the operational cost is more balanced. But what do we do about family law cases, child custody cases, marital circumstances, senior citizens' cases that the Legal Services Corporation, by and large supported by bar leaders across this Nation, believe that helps people, poor people, access the court system.

Yet this bill makes an unequal America. What it says is that you who can pay can get into the court system but those of you who are the working poor, those of you who have trials and tribulations and deserve a right to access the court system, if you do not have the money, then we are going to knock out the Legal Services Corporation.

It is because someone on the other side of the aisle has a personal agenda and does not want to see poor people address their grievances as a right. I think that goes against the Constitution.

When we begin to talk about the Advanced Technology Program, which I believe is the work of the 21st century, we do not have to look to Japan and Germany. We can look to our own corporations. They are downsizing, they are cutting their research and development departments.

What are your youngsters going to do in the 21st century when they come out with their engineering degrees? The Advanced Technology program interacts and meshes together the private sector with the public sector. It is one of the most viable programs that allows us to advance technology so that our children will have jobs. Why is America putting its head in the sand while its international competitors are investing in technology?

Mr. Speaker, I truly believe this bill is trying to fix what is not broken. We need cops on the beat, we need legal services so that poor people can be equalized with others in this Nation, and I do not know about you, but I want my young people working in the 21st century. I want the Advanced Technology Program to be successfully matching the public and private partnership so that we can be at the cutting edge of technology for the 21st century.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARR. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, crime legislation is not normally very exciting. The process of protecting our citizens and seeing that those that perpetrate crimes on our citizens, that take lives, that take property and we put those people away and take them from society is normally not an exciting process.

But this is exciting legislation because for the very first time we have a piece of legislation here that is supported by the broad range of municipal and county officials from both parties, and independent nonpartisan officials all across this country. The National League of Cities, not a Republican, not a Democrat, not a partisan organization supports this approach because it gives their members, their officials, their mayors, their council men and women, their county officials, the power, the flexibility to put the resources where they need them in their communities and that is an exciting prospect because it works. It works because the decision-making is in the hands of the decision-makers in the communities, not up in Washington.

It will also, Mr. Speaker, result in more police officers on the streets in our communities, and that is exciting news.

□ 1615

We have heard very little from the President recently about the 100,000 cops on the streets. We hear a lot about 20,000 troops in Bosnia. The reason that

we do not hear so much about those police officers on the street is because they are not getting there. This legislation will put them there, and I would hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will see that providing the flexibility and the power over the decisions ought to be and will be under this legislation, which I support and which I urge adoption, that this legislation will result in more police officers on the street, more and better resources being placed in the hands of our local officials from all parties and nonpartisan, across this country.

I strongly urge us to put aside partisanship. It is not so much that the current system is broken and why fix it. Let us make it better. That is what we are trying to do here is pass better legislation and make the system work better to protect our citizens.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule because of the fact that this conference committee report guts the COPS program. In listening to the arguments of the other side of the aisle, I just cannot believe it, as a former prosecutor.

When this bill was passed in the last Congress it had bipartisan support, bipartisan support. But then the new majority came in and had to make some adjustments to it because they wanted to appear to be changing the crime bill. What did they do? They gut the COPS program.

This program is an extremely effective way to fight crime. In fact, it is the cutting edge, cutting edge of how you rebuild neighborhoods and fight crime in neighborhoods.

I hear talk about the county commissioners can decide how to fight crime. County commissioners are not necessarily experts on the latest techniques in fighting crime. The politicians in cities, they will know how to spend the money. This crime bill is the result of an attorney general who had ability in the front lines in the fight against crime, and with police chiefs across America who used statistical data about how you win the war against crime. That is where it came from.

In a short period of time, 25,000 to 26,000 police officers are already on the streets, and now I hear some of my colleagues on the other side say it really will not work, we just instinctively know it.

In Lowell, MA, we have a community policing program going, and I asked the police chief to provide statistics of what happened since this program was started. Burglaries in residential areas, community policing 1 year, down 34 percent; burglaries in business areas down 41 percent; larcenies down 23 percent; car theft down 20 percent. That is what is happening in communities all across America, and they want to tamper with the crime bill that is working, for pure politics.

Law enforcement and fighting crime is not a political issue. We ought to be working together to implement this crime bill. It is the smartest, most effective crime bill that this country has ever passed.

We are playing games at the last minute because it might give the President some credit on fighting crime. Do the right thing. Vote against this bill.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and also of the conference report which underlies it.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for the work that he has done, his staff, and the others that worked on this legislation.

We have been advised by the administration that this is likely a candidate for veto. The reasons given are the Cops on the Beat program, the advanced technology program, and the funding levels for peacekeeping.

Mr. Speaker, I would note that this is a responsible, a fiscally responsible piece of legislation. Let me just highlight some of the things in here that I think make this appropriation bill worthwhile, this conference report.

First is the important funds it does provide for law enforcement, in law enforcement grants, to States, nearly \$2 billion to State and local law enforcement agencies, giving some flexibility. No, it does not force the Cops on the Beat program. It does not put us in the mind set of saying it has to be this kind of program. But if that is the program the States and local government want to continue, they can continue this with the grants program. They have the flexibility to do the kinds of programs that they think are best.

For my State and many others, there is a large amount of funds in here to provide for reimbursing States for incarcerating illegal aliens. That is a responsibility of the Federal Government, a failure of the Federal Government to enforce immigration laws, and States should be reimbursed for incarceration of illegal aliens in their State and local prisons and jails.

There is funding for 1,000 new border agents so we can control our borders. There is 400 new land inspectors for the Immigration and Naturalization Service in here that helps to facilitate the flow of legitimate goods and services and of individuals across the border. There are important restrictions on the Legal Services Corporation. We begin the process of phasing out the Federal funding for that program and returning this responsibility to States and local governments.

There is important funding for the International Trade Commission, and

one that does not get a lot of attention, the State Department, which I think is a vital part of our diplomatic service and our foreign policy. The State Department does not get a lot of attention around this place, but it is vitally important.

I just had the privilege this weekend of taking a trip to Bosnia, to Serbia, to Croatia. I have seen the dedicated service our foreign service people give overseas. They are a vital link in our foreign policy. They also provide vital services for Americans overseas. This bill goes a long way to providing the adequate funding so that they can continue those vital services. No, it is not as much as anybody would like. But I think it is an important step to making sure that our diplomatic functions and our foreign policy is carried out.

This is a responsible bill. It has the right spending priorities. It gives the direction that this Congress should give to States and local governments to provide the flexibility to carry out the law enforcement programs, to provide for the Commerce Department, the vital functions that Commerce now does, and to make sure we have our foreign policy intact through the funding of the State Department.

I urge an "aye" vote on this rule and on the conference report.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, you know, block grant, block grant, block grant, block grant. It almost seems like it is a hari krishna chant coming out of the Republican Party. Sometimes what I think we ought to do is give you your way, block grant the blockheads and send you all back to the States.

I look at what is happening in our country today. I look at the kinds of priorities. This bill demonstrates so clearly the difference between the Democratic priorities and the Republican priorities.

What we are saying in this bill is we want to cut the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency by about 35 percent, we want to gut peacekeeping around the world by 57 percent, we want to do these things, and at the same time we want to increase spending on our prisons. Everybody is for spending on prisons. That is fine. But if we really want to fight crime, then we have got to provide the tools to get crime fought at the local level. It means you have to hire more cops.

If we really want to deal with how we are going to create jobs in this country, then anyone that has followed the advanced technologies that have been developed in the United States, whether it is television sets or VCR's, we spend billions of dollars in this country appropriating money to our labs, appropriating money to our universities, to come up with a vast array of significant scientific breakthroughs.

What happens then is we hand it over to the Germans or Japanese or French

or somebody else who build all the things. The jobs go overseas. We end up with nothing but the bill for the technology we have created.

The advanced technology program provides that technology so that we can actually convert the technology into jobs for the American people.

We have the GPS system, the global positioning system, which has created tens of thousands of jobs all across this country. It is the exact kind of program where scientific breakthroughs take place. We create jobs here in the United States for the people of this country, advancing not only our technologies but advancing the actual salaries of the people that get those jobs. That is the kind of jobs program we need in this country, that is the kind of jobs that the American people are demanding, and that is the kind of jobs that we are not seeing created as a result of the bizarre priorities that are being put forth by the Republican Party.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The last speaker on the Republican side from Arizona, the Fifth District, they are putting 61 police officers at risk, 85 pending cops applications at risk. And they are saying State and local governments do not know what they are talking. But yet they are applying for this program.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let us not just leave the period at the advanced technologies program. Let us recognize that in this bill we are going to eliminate the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. We are going to cut 15 percent from the Economic Development Administration. We are going to cut 36 percent from the Small Business Administration. And we are going to cut 44 percent from the National Telecommunications.

You are clapping, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], because you think those are all wonderful programs to cut. The truth of the matter is if you want good jobs for the people of this country instead of the kind of low-level jobs that the Republicans are so advanced and so great at creating for ordinary working people, they we need to have these kinds of programs to make certain we advance those technologies here in this country.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Yes, we have to clap, because it is so deadly serious that we have to do something about the deficit, and I would just say to you: Where can we slow down spending? We have to do it everywhere we possibly can, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. KENNEDY], for your kids and for your grandkids and great grandkids. Otherwise, this country is going down the drain. Stick to the balanced budget. It is the biggest problem facing this Nation today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

I would just point out, you are providing a \$270 billion tax cut while you are claiming you are for a balanced budget, when you are dumping \$7 billion into our national defense budget.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, \$500 in the pocket of my constituents is better than \$500 in the pocket of this Congress.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Come on, you are saying you are for a balanced budget at the same time you are for a tax cut. Come on, be honest with the American people.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to talk for a minute or two about this block grant approach because my colleagues should know that running between the States of North Carolina and South Carolina is a wonderful lake, and the last time we had a block grant program, the legal block grant program that was implemented under the Nixon administration, one of the law enforcement officials in South Carolina went out and bought a nice yacht and put it on this lake to use for what he said was crime fighting purposes. I think that was the impetus that led to doing away with the last round of block grant programs.

Now, my colleagues are back with these block grant programs, and they say it is the thing of the future and we are going to control them going into the future. But there is nothing in this bill that is going to stop people from buying yachts and tanks and all of these airplanes, like they did under the last block grant program.

The second point I want to make is my colleagues are going to tell us that they are returning all of this discretion back to the local governments so they can buy these yachts, but I will tell my colleagues that this bill does not return discretion to the local government. What it does is reward States that have incarcerated the most people over the last 3 years. There is a provision here that says, and I quote it, *verbatim*,

We are going to give grants to States only that have increased the percentage of persons convicted of violent crimes over the last 3 years; those who have increased the average prison time over the last 3 years.

Well, we are operating, according to a recent newspaper article, the biggest expansion industry in the world is the

United States prison system already, and now we are trying to reward people for putting more people in jail rather than coming into line with other civilized countries in the world.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I cannot sit here and let the gentleman from Michigan get by with saying that the Cops on the Beat grants that have already been made will be jeopardized. They will not be jeopardized. These grants have already been made. They are out there.

What is being jeopardized, the gentleman should know, is, after 3 more years, all of the COPS grants will be gone. Those communities who now have received moneys will have to pay the entire cost of their cops.

Under our program, they will still be going. The communities only have to pay 10 percent from here on. We pay 90 percent from here on out. If you want to have just cops, wonderful. If your police need bullet-proof vests, under our program they can get them. Under yours, they cannot. If cops need bullets or equipment, they will be able to do it under our program.

Let the decision be made not in Washington by a bureaucrat, but by your police chief. If you cannot trust him, that is your problem, not ours.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman from Kentucky, the Fifth District, it was his 25 police agencies that applied for the COPS program and have been awarded that program. It was not Washington telling him to make it. And if he wrote this bill, then he knows nowhere in your bill do you even guarantee one police officer being hired. We have 100,000 guaranteed. Nowhere in your bill does it say your 90/10 provision goes for more than 1 year. We did it for 3 years.

You want technology, bullet-proof vests? COPS more program, equipment technology, civilian employees, all come underneath there. Everything you want is in the COPS program. Just give it some time. Stop playing politics with it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this conference report and to voice my outrage over the mindless assault that is being launched against the Legal Services Corporation.

The Republican proposal guts Legal Services. Funds will be lost by 31 percent and LSC attorneys handcuffed.

This action will deny the poor access to justice, a right guaranteed under our great Constitution.

Many of our colleagues argue we cannot afford programs like the Legal Services Corporation in this time of fiscal constraints. I challenge them, how can we not?

My colleagues, the poor should not be the ones that pay the price for balancing the budget. But that is exactly what will happen if the Legal Services Corporation is so drastically cut.

I urge you to support the efforts of LSC. Our democracy succeeds only when all of our citizens have full access to our legal system.

□ 1630

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, buried on page 127 of this conference report is language designed to reopen the Ocean Dumping Ban Act of 1988. This language was not considered by the House and it was not considered by the Senate, rather it was added by the conferees.

The language on page 127 would have the Federal Government spend taxpayer dollars to develop a demonstration project on the deep ocean isolation of waste, which is a fancy way of saying ocean dumping. This type of study has already been rejected by the Commerce Department, also by the Naval Research Lab. As an environmentalist and as a member of the Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, I am outraged over these efforts to go behind the backs of our subcommittee and the American people to reopen the issue of ocean dumping.

Ocean dumping under current law is illegal. It is irresponsible and wrong to use taxpayer money to fund experiences into ocean dumping of any kind of waste. I would ask my colleagues, let us not threaten the health of our citizens again and the environment just to please some corporate special interests. This is a technology that has been rejected by the government agencies. It is only because some corporate interest decided to spend some money on it that it now appears in this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is totally inappropriate when neither House, neither appropriations committee considered this language, none of the authorizing committees considered this language, even though there is a bill pending before our subcommittee, and yet now we find it in the conference report. We should vote against the rule just for that reason alone.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that it is my understanding that all time has expired on the other side, and we only have one speaker left on this side. As he goes up to the well, I am sure that he will remind us that this is a debate on the rule. I have not heard

any debate on the rule, but we have heard a lot of debate on a lot of other subjects.

I am sure my distinguished colleague from greater San Dimas, CA, the vice chairman of the committee on Rules, Mr. DREIER, the honorable Mr. DREIER, will be able to use the time well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I would like to remind him that this is, in fact, the debate on the rule.

Now, having said that, let me say that I believe this is an extraordinarily good conference report. It goes a long way towards dealing with the goals that the American people set forth in the election of November 1994. We have heard people on the other side of the aisle talking about the opportunity and the future of children in this country. This bill, that has been put into place here by the great chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], has, I believe, made a major step towards reducing our deficit, in that it is \$700 million below the level of last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that as we look at that kind of fiscal responsibility, it is very, very important to face the fact that an appropriations bill is actually reducing the level of spending and, at the same time, meeting very important priorities. One of the most important, from my perspective, is the fact that the Federal Government heretofore has not stood up and acknowledged its responsibility for a very important problem, that being illegal immigration.

This bill alone deals with two of the three very important prongs that we have been using in legislation over the past several months to address the problem of illegal immigration, and by that I am talking about reimbursement to the States for the incarceration of those who have entered this country illegally. And, also, it is very important for us to realize that toughening up our border patrol is key. There is \$300 million in this bill that will go directly, directly towards hiring an additional 1,000 border patrol officers so that we will be able to again have the Federal Government acknowledging its responsibility.

The other very important part of that issue is not in this bill, but it is part of our Republican agenda here, and we are, frankly, doing it in a bipartisan way, and that is eliminating the mandates that have been imposed on the States to deal with issues like that.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for the superb job that he has done on this very difficult bill, for meeting those priorities, and, at the same time, reducing the level of expenditures. I also want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS] for reminding me this is, in fact, the debate on the rule. It is a good bill,

and I hope we can vote for it and then move on to the conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 289, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2076), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXVIII and House Resolution 289, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Monday, December 4, 1995, at page H13874.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2076 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to bring to the floor this conference report. When this bill passed the House on July 26, I described it as being tough on crime and even tougher on spending. The conference report we bring to the House today is, if anything, even tougher on crime and even tougher on spending.

Overall, the conference report provides \$27.3 billion, \$315 million below the House-passed level. There is \$315 million less in spending than when this bill left the House. The bill includes \$22.8 billion in discretionary spending, \$300 million below the House-passed level; it is \$700 million below last year, even after rescissions; and \$3.7 million below what the White House requested.

The bill also includes \$3.95 billion in the violent crime reduction trust fund. That is \$1.6 billion above last year.

In general, the conference report is similar to the bill that passed the House on July 26. The major changes from the House-passed bill are: First, funding for law enforcement is \$200 million above the House level; second, it is offset by rescissions of prior year

funding totaling minus \$200 million; and third, there is a decrease in State/USIA funding, \$370 million below the House level due to a lower 602(b) allocation.

Overall, for law enforcement programs, the conference report includes \$14.6 billion, which is a 19-percent increase over 1995. More than half of the funding in this bill is for our No. 1 domestic priority, to fight crime and drugs and control illegal immigration. More than half.

The \$3.95 billion in crime trust funds provides major new initiatives to help States and local authorities fight crime. This includes \$1.9 billion for the local law enforcement block grants, much discussed here in this body, passed by the House in February as a part of the Contract With America, to give cities and towns the resources they need to fight crime as they see fit to do it—to do what they deem wise, not what we in Washington deem wise for them.

The major difference between this block grant and the COPS Program is not whether there will be more police on the Streets. Both programs put more cops on the streets. The difference is about control, whether we want a Washington-knows-best cookie cutter program or a local empowerment program. This conference report chooses local control.

There is \$671 million for the new State prison grant program, based on truth-in-sentencing, which rewards those States that keep prisoners locked up for 85 percent of their sentences. We will give them the money to build the prisons to put those violent criminals behind bars for most of the time a jury sentences them to.

We put \$535 million for Byrne grants for locals to use to fight against crime.

For the first time, Mr. Speaker, we are funding \$175 million to help with the fight against violence against women; \$50 million above the House level and the full amount of the President's request.

I cannot believe the President says he wants to veto a bill that funds violence against women grants to the exact penny he requested of us. More than 100 Members of Congress have written in favor of that program on both sides of the aisle. If Members vote against this conference report or if the President vetoes this bill, they will be voting and fighting against funding for these programs.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report carries two legislative provisions added by the Senate. The authorization for that truth-in-sentencing prison grant program and a provision to stop abusive, frivolous and expensive lawsuits by prisoners in jail.

The conference report continues the House bill's emphasis on enforcing our immigration laws. It includes a \$300

million increase over 1995 for the immigration service to hire 3,000 new personnel, including 1,000 new and redeployed border patrol agents on the border to stem the tide of illegal immigration.

□ 1645

And, we are reimbursing States for the costs of jailing criminal aliens who commit crimes in their States. This is of major importance to the States of California, Texas, New York, and Florida especially. And if the President should veto this bill, he is saying to the people of California and to the people of Texas and to the people of Florida and New York, "We don't care about your expenses. You go ahead and pay the bills for these people who are breaking our boundaries and committing crimes in your States. We are not going to pay you." That is what he is saying when he vetoes this bill.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, this report provides increases of \$571 million over 1995 for Federal law enforcement, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. attorneys, and Federal prisons, to sustain the current personnel and to provide enhancements to help them do their job.

Overall, this is the toughest anticrime, antidrug legislation this Congress has ever produced. But as tough as the bill is on crime, it is even tougher on spending reductions in lower priority areas.

The Department of Commerce is funded at \$3.4 billion, a reduction of 15 percent and below the House-passed level.

The conference report funds manufacturing extension centers at \$80 mil-

lion, but doesn't fund Advanced Technology Program.

There are significant reductions throughout Commerce, including: EDA, down 21 percent to \$348 million; MBDA, down 27 percent to \$32 million; and Department Administration, down 20 percent to \$29 million.

NOAA is funded at \$1.8 billion, \$58 million below 1995.

The conference report includes a provision requiring funding to reflect Commerce Department reorganization, upon enactment of that legislation.

We conform in this report international spending to budget realities, reducing the State, USIA, and Arms Control accounts from \$5.7 to \$4.8 billion, a 15-percent decrease below last year, while preserving their core functions. And we zero out the agency of the United Nations called UNIDO, an agency that the administration the other day said the United States would withdraw from; a good thing because we are not going to give them any money for it. It is zero in this bill.

We keep the House funding level for Legal Services at \$278 million compared to the Senate's \$340 million, but we restrict those funds so they are not abused by that agency. We reduce funding for the SBA by 35 percent.

We prohibit expansion of the Vietnam Embassy construction unless the President certifies that Vietnam is fully cooperating on MIA-POW issues.

Those are some of the highlights of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

We have no choice but to move forward. The administration has refused to confer with us for these months and all of this year on what they want in

the bill. They simply sit back and say we are going to veto it unless we get our way on COPS. They are sort of in a pique about that one. It is a political thing. It is sort of, I guess, his version of getting off Air Force One last. I wish he would get over this pique and get on with the business of legislating and protecting our country against crime and drugs. That is what this bill is all about.

So I urge all Members who care about issues in this bill, from violence against women programs to small business assistance, to help move this process forward and pass this conference report.

I want to thank the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. REGULA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and especially the ranking minority member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], a friend and colleague, a tremendous advocate, and a great assist to me on this bill.

I want to thank staff, Jim Kulikowski, our chief of staff, Sally Chadbourne, Theresa McAuliffe, Kim Wolterstorff, Mac Coffield, Jennifer Miller, and on the minority side, Mark Murray, Liz Whyte, and Sally Gaines, for long, long and hard dedicated work.

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expense: 1/						
Direct appropriation.....	119,843,000	73,229,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	-45,361,000
(By transfer).....				(11,000,000)		
Crime trust fund.....	17,400,000	15,500,000				-17,400,000
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	137,043,000	88,729,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	-62,761,000
Working capital fund (recession).....	-5,500,000					+5,500,000
Police Corps (Crime trust fund).....				10,000,000		
Counterterrorism fund.....	34,220,000	26,366,000	26,866,000	26,866,000	18,866,000	-17,322,000
Administrative review and appeals: 1/						
Direct appropriation.....		54,336,000	39,736,000	72,319,000	38,866,000	+36,866,000
Crime trust fund.....		33,180,000	47,780,000	14,347,000	47,780,000	+47,780,000
Total, Administrative review and appeals.....		87,516,000	87,516,000	86,666,000	86,666,000	+86,666,000
Office of Inspector General.....	30,464,000	36,744,000	30,464,000	27,436,000	26,960,000	-1,524,000
Total, General administration.....	196,247,000	239,387,000	219,180,000	225,282,000	208,608,000	+10,559,000
Appropriations.....	(184,347,000)	(190,707,000)	(171,400,000)	(200,935,000)	(159,026,000)	(-25,321,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(17,400,000)	(48,680,000)	(47,780,000)	(24,347,000)	(47,780,000)	(+30,360,000)
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	7,450,000	8,781,000	5,448,000	5,448,000	5,448,000	-2,004,000
Legal Activities						
General legal activities:						
Direct appropriation.....	416,634,000	437,060,000	401,829,000	406,529,000	401,829,000	-14,905,000
(By transfer).....					(12,000,000)	(+12,000,000)
Crime trust fund.....	4,800,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	2,991,000	7,591,000	+2,991,000
Total, General legal activities.....	(421,434,000)	(444,861,000)	(409,520,000)	(409,520,000)	(421,520,000)	(+86,000)
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund.....	2,500,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	+1,528,000
Independent counsel (permanent, indefinite).....	4,000,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	-1,116,000
Civil liberties public education fund.....	5,000,000	5,000,000				-5,000,000
Antitrust Division.....	85,143,000	91,762,000	85,143,000	85,143,000	85,143,000	
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	-4,500,000		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-19,380,000	-14,860,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-39,840,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,922,000
Direct appropriation.....	41,003,000	43,490,000	20,881,000	20,881,000	17,521,000	-23,482,000
United States Attorneys:						
Direct appropriation.....	829,024,000	906,463,000	896,825,000	906,463,000	895,509,000	+86,465,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19).....	2,000,000					-2,000,000
Violent crime task force.....	15,000,000	15,000,000				-15,000,000
Crime trust fund.....	8,800,000	14,731,000	14,731,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+23,200,000
Total, United States Attorneys.....	862,824,000	936,194,000	911,556,000	936,463,000	925,509,000	+72,885,000
United States Trustee System Fund.....	103,183,000	109,245,000	101,598,000	103,183,000	102,360,000	-783,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-40,597,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-3,594,000
Direct appropriation.....	62,586,000	65,054,000	57,405,000	58,992,000	58,169,000	-4,387,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	630,000	905,000	830,000	905,000	830,000	
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation.....	396,782,000	446,867,000	418,973,000	439,839,000	423,248,000	+26,466,000
Crime trust fund.....		16,300,000	25,000,000	15,000,000	25,000,000	+25,000,000
Total, United States Marshals Service.....	396,782,000	463,167,000	443,973,000	454,839,000	448,248,000	+51,466,000
Federal Prisoner Detention.....	296,753,000	295,331,000	250,331,000	295,331,000	262,820,000	-43,833,000
(Prior year carryover).....					(33,511,000)	(+33,511,000)
(By transfer).....					(9,000,000)	(+9,000,000)
Total, Federal prisoner detention.....	(296,753,000)	(295,331,000)	(250,331,000)	(295,331,000)	(295,331,000)	(-1,422,000)
Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	77,862,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+7,018,000
Community Relations Service 2/.....	20,379,000	20,895,000		10,838,000	5,319,000	-15,080,000
Assets forfeiture fund.....	50,000,000	55,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	30,000,000	-20,000,000
Total, Legal activities.....	2,232,073,000	2,424,619,000	2,221,408,000	2,317,261,000	2,239,678,000	+7,905,000
Appropriations.....	(2,220,673,000)	(2,385,767,000)	(2,174,066,000)	(2,269,290,000)	(2,177,287,000)	(-43,386,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(11,400,000)	(38,822,000)	(47,322,000)	(47,991,000)	(62,591,000)	(+51,191,000)

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses.....	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	
Advance appropriation.....		2,655,000				
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund.....		16,264,000				
Advance appropriation.....		30,000,000	18,264,000	16,264,000	18,264,000	+ 18,264,000
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation.....	2,655,000	51,574,000	18,919,000	18,919,000	18,919,000	+ 16,264,000
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement.....	374,943,000	378,473,000	374,943,000	358,843,000	358,843,000	-15,100,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,038,774,000	2,305,387,000	2,084,857,000	2,088,426,000	2,002,438,000	-36,336,000
(By transfer).....					(22,000,000)	(+ 22,000,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19).....	77,140,000					-77,140,000
Counterintelligence and national security.....	80,421,000	82,224,000	82,224,000	121,345,000	102,348,000	+ 21,824,000
FBI Fingerprint Identification.....	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	
Digital telephony (crime trust fund).....		33,400,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	33,400,000	+ 33,400,000
Other initiatives (crime trust fund).....		13,100,000	30,800,000	152,500,000	184,900,000	+ 184,900,000
Construction.....		98,289,000	98,400,000	98,800,000	97,589,000	+ 87,589,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	2,280,774,000	2,617,770,000	2,430,481,000	2,806,471,000	2,505,072,000	+ 224,337,000
Appropriations.....	(2,280,774,000)	(2,571,270,000)	(2,348,881,000)	(2,402,971,000)	(2,286,772,000)	(+ 6,037,000)
Crime trust fund.....		(46,500,000)	(80,800,000)	(202,500,000)	(218,300,000)	(+ 218,300,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	798,944,000	845,408,000	828,728,000	837,241,000	792,908,000	-7,036,000
Diversion control fund.....	-43,431,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-3,810,000
Direct appropriation.....	756,513,000	798,168,000	781,488,000	790,000,000	746,868,000	-10,845,000
Crime trust fund.....		12,000,000	12,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+ 60,000,000
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	756,513,000	810,168,000	783,488,000	850,000,000	805,888,000	+ 49,155,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses:						
Direct appropriation.....	1,101,475,000	1,453,471,000	1,421,481,000	953,934,000	1,384,825,000	+ 293,360,000
Border Patrol:						
Direct appropriation.....			(484,700,000)	488,200,000	(508,800,000)	(+ 508,800,000)
Crime trust fund.....			(78,000,000)	10,300,000	(78,000,000)	(+ 78,000,000)
New offsetting fees.....				(117,000,000)		
Subtotal, Border patrol.....			(572,700,000)	(816,500,000)	(584,800,000)	(+ 584,800,000)
Immigration initiative (crime trust fund).....	100,800,000	336,488,000	182,842,000	54,279,000	182,628,000	+ 62,028,000
Border control system modernization (crime trust fund).....	154,800,000		150,900,000	111,083,000	153,570,000	-1,030,000
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund.....	(1,356,875,000)	(1,788,989,000)	(1,725,023,000)	(1,735,796,000)	(1,711,023,000)	(+ 364,348,000)
Fee accounts:						
Immigration legalization fund.....	(3,482,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(-1,859,000)
Immigration user fee.....	(330,952,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(+ 26,132,000)
Land border inspection fund.....	(1,584,000)	(5,985,000)	(5,985,000)	(5,985,000)	(5,985,000)	(+ 4,381,000)
Immigration examinations fund.....	(291,097,000)	(304,572,000)	(440,180,000)	(440,180,000)	(440,180,000)	(+ 149,083,000)
Cuban/Haitian resettlement (examinations fund).....			(10,057,000)	(10,057,000)	(10,057,000)	(+ 10,057,000)
Breached bond fund.....	(6,200,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(+ 158,000)
Subtotal, Fee accounts.....	(833,315,000)	(875,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(+ 188,132,000)
Construction.....	50,000,000		11,000,000	35,000,000	25,000,000	-25,000,000
Immigration Emergency Fund.....	30,000,000					-30,000,000
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service.....	(2,089,980,000)	(2,484,771,000)	(2,567,470,000)	(2,582,243,000)	(2,567,470,000)	(+ 487,480,000)
Appropriations.....	(1,181,475,000)	(1,453,471,000)	(1,432,481,000)	(1,478,134,000)	(1,419,825,000)	(+ 238,350,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(255,200,000)	(336,488,000)	(303,542,000)	(175,882,000)	(316,188,000)	(+ 60,986,000)
(Fee accounts).....	(833,315,000)	(875,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(838,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(+ 188,132,000)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,353,597,000	2,630,259,000	2,614,578,000	2,614,578,000	2,614,578,000	+ 260,981,000
Prior year carryover.....	-30,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-47,000,000	-17,000,000
Direct appropriation.....	2,323,597,000	2,630,259,000	2,574,578,000	2,574,578,000	2,567,578,000	+ 243,981,000
Crime trust fund.....		13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	+ 13,500,000
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	2,323,597,000	2,643,759,000	2,588,078,000	2,588,078,000	2,581,078,000	+ 257,481,000
National Institute of Corrections.....	10,302,000	10,158,000		8,000,000		-10,302,000
Buildings and facilities.....	276,301,000	323,728,000	323,728,000	348,410,000	334,728,000	+ 58,427,000

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
Total, Federal Prison System.....	2,610,200,000	2,977,846,000	2,911,806,000	2,945,466,000	2,915,806,000	+305,806,000
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice Assistance:						
Direct appropriation.....	97,977,000	102,345,000	97,977,000	102,345,000	99,977,000	+2,000,000
Crime trust fund:						
Violence Against Women Grants.....	26,000,000	174,900,000	124,500,000	175,000,000	174,500,000	+148,500,000
Rural law enforcement.....		10,252,000		10,000,000		
Crime prevention.....		30,000,000		30,000,000		
Model intensive prevention.....		48,216,000				
State prison drug treatment.....		27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	+27,000,000
Other crime control programs.....		4,428,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	+900,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	26,000,000	294,794,000	152,400,000	242,900,000	202,400,000	+178,400,000
Total, Justice Assistance.....	123,977,000	397,139,000	250,377,000	345,245,000	302,377,000	+178,400,000
State and local law enforcement assistance:						
Direct appropriations:						
Byrne grants (discretionary).....	62,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	30,000,000	60,000,000	-2,000,000
Byrne grants (formula).....		190,000,000		250,000,000	326,000,000	+326,000,000
State identification grants.....				60,000,000		
Weed and seed fund.....	13,456,000	5,000,000	(23,500,000)	(43,500,000)	(26,500,000)	-13,456,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations.....	75,456,000	245,000,000	50,000,000	340,000,000	366,000,000	+312,544,000
Crime trust fund:						
State and local block grants:						
Byrne grants (discretionary).....				50,000,000		
Byrne grants (formula).....	450,000,000	280,000,000	475,000,000	225,000,000	147,000,000	-303,000,000
Community policing.....	1,300,000,000	1,902,984,000		1,680,000,000		-1,300,000,000
Local law enforcement block grant.....			1,950,000,000		1,903,000,000	+1,803,000,000
Subtotal, State and local block grants.....	1,750,000,000	2,182,984,000	2,425,000,000	1,965,000,000	2,060,000,000	+306,000,000
Upgrade criminal history records.....	100,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	-75,000,000
State prison grants.....	24,500,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	726,800,000	617,500,000	+593,000,000
State criminal alien incarceration program.....	130,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+170,000,000
Youthful offender incarceration.....		9,643,000	19,643,000	15,000,000		
Drug courts.....	11,900,000	150,000,000		100,000,000		-11,900,000
Council of Prevention Council.....	1,500,000			2,000,000		-1,500,000
Other crime control programs.....		26,799,000	13,700,000	13,300,000	12,700,000	+12,700,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	2,017,900,000	3,174,406,000	3,283,343,000	3,147,100,000	3,005,200,000	+987,300,000
Total, State and local law enforcement.....	2,093,356,000	3,419,406,000	3,333,343,000	3,487,100,000	3,363,200,000	+1,299,844,000
Juvenile Justice programs.....	155,250,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	-6,750,000
Crime trust fund.....				(20,000,000)		
Total, Juvenile Justice programs.....	(155,250,000)	(148,500,000)	(148,500,000)	(168,500,000)	(148,500,000)	(-6,750,000)
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits.....	27,845,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	+829,000
Disability benefits.....	2,072,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	+62,000
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	2,402,300,000	3,965,653,000	3,762,826,000	4,011,453,000	3,674,895,000	+1,472,385,000
Appropriations.....	(368,400,000)	(526,463,000)	(327,085,000)	(621,453,000)	(667,085,000)	(+308,665,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(2,043,900,000)	(3,466,200,000)	(3,436,743,000)	(3,360,000,000)	(3,207,800,000)	(+1,163,700,000)
Total, title I, Department of Justice.....	12,299,791,000	15,291,039,000	14,474,522,000	14,962,979,000	14,668,146,000	+2,368,365,000
Appropriations.....	(9,977,391,000)	(11,326,839,000)	(10,534,036,000)	(11,078,979,000)	(10,742,177,000)	(+784,788,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(2,327,900,000)	(3,964,200,000)	(3,940,487,000)	(3,914,000,000)	(3,925,989,000)	(+1,568,089,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT						
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses.....	20,949,000	20,949,000	20,949,000	20,889,000	20,889,000	-60,000
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	42,500,000	47,177,000	42,500,000	34,000,000	40,000,000	-2,500,000
Total, Related agencies.....	63,449,000	68,126,000	63,449,000	54,889,000	60,889,000	-2,580,000

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration.....	296,093,000	279,558,000	284,886,000	286,079,000	284,886,000	-1,208,000
Export Administration						
Operations and administration.....	38,844,000	48,441,000	38,844,000	38,804,000	38,804,000	-40,000
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs.....	382,783,000	407,783,000	328,500,000	86,000,000	328,500,000	-54,283,000
Emergency recession (P.L. 104-18).....	-3,250,000					+5,280,000
Salaries and expenses.....	32,144,000	31,183,000	20,000,000	11,000,000	20,000,000	-12,144,000
Total, Economic Development Administration	406,677,000	438,966,000	348,500,000	100,000,000	348,500,000	-61,177,000
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development.....	43,789,000	47,921,000	32,000,000	32,789,000	32,000,000	-11,789,000
United States Travel and Tourism Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	16,326,000	16,303,000	2,000,000	12,000,000	2,000,000	-14,326,000
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	837,980,000	896,315,000	749,478,000	504,381,000	746,878,000	-91,102,000
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE						
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses.....	46,896,000	57,220,000	40,000,000	46,896,000	45,900,000	-996,000
Economics and statistics administration revolving fund.....	1,877,000					-1,877,000
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses.....	136,000,000	144,812,000	136,000,000	133,812,000	133,812,000	-2,188,000
Periodic censuses and programs.....	142,063,000	193,450,000	136,000,000	193,450,000	150,300,000	+8,217,000
Total, Bureau of the Census	278,063,000	338,262,000	271,000,000	327,262,000	284,112,000	+6,029,000
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	20,981,000	22,932,000	19,709,000	8,000,000	17,000,000	-3,981,000
(By transfer).....				(9,000,000)		
Public broadcasting facilities, planning and construction.....	28,983,000	7,959,000	19,000,000	10,000,000	15,500,000	-13,483,000
Endowment for Children's Educational Television.....	2,499,000	2,502,000				-2,499,000
Information infrastructure grants.....	44,982,000	69,912,000	40,000,000	18,900,000	21,500,000	-23,482,000
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	97,405,000	133,306,000	78,709,000	36,900,000	54,000,000	-43,405,000
Patent and Trademark Office						
Salaries and expenses.....	82,324,000	110,868,000	90,000,000	82,324,000	82,324,000	
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	506,385,000	639,655,000	479,708,000	493,382,000	466,336,000	-40,049,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services.....	247,486,000	310,679,000	263,000,000	222,737,000	259,000,000	+11,514,000
Industrial technology services.....	418,373,000	642,458,000	81,100,000	101,900,000	80,000,000	-336,373,000
Construction of research facilities.....	34,839,000	69,913,000	60,000,000	27,000,000	60,000,000	+25,381,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	700,498,000	1,023,050,000	404,100,000	351,337,000	399,000,000	-301,498,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities 3/.....	1,806,082,000	2,021,135,000	1,724,452,000	1,806,082,000	1,792,677,000	-9,415,000
Offsetting collections - fees.....	-6,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+3,000,000
Direct appropriation.....	1,799,082,000	2,018,135,000	1,721,452,000	1,806,082,000	1,792,677,000	-8,415,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund).....	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(57,500,000)	(62,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(+7,500,000)
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent).....	8,500,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	-4,600,000
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund).....	-1,500,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-2,400,000
Total, Operations, research and facilities.....	1,806,082,000	2,018,135,000	1,721,452,000	1,806,082,000	1,792,677,000	-13,415,000
Coastal zone management fund.....	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	
Mandatory offset.....	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	
Construction.....	82,254,000	82,299,000	42,731,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-32,254,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion.....	22,936,000	23,347,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	-14,936,000
GOES satellite contingency fund (recession).....	-2,500,000					+2,500,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund.....	1,273,000	1,282,000	1,032,000	1,032,000	1,032,000	-241,000
Fishermen's contingency fund.....	999,000	1,000,000	999,000	999,000	999,000	

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Foreign fishing observer fund	400,000	398,000	198,000	198,000	198,000	-204,000
Fishing vessel obligations guarantees.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	1,911,704,000	2,098,709,000	1,774,410,000	1,898,598,000	1,883,184,000	-58,550,000
Technology Administration						
Salaries and expenses	8,242,000	13,908,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-3,242,000
National Technical Information Service						
NTIS revolving fund	7,000,000	-7,000,000
Total, Science and Technology	2,827,444,000	3,133,895,000	2,183,510,000	2,222,908,000	2,257,184,000	-370,290,000
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	36,471,000	35,826,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	-7,371,000
Office of Inspector General	18,887,000	22,249,000	21,849,000	19,849,000	19,849,000	+2,982,000
Total, General administration.....	53,358,000	58,075,000	50,949,000	48,949,000	48,949,000	-4,409,000
Transition fund	20,000,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Construction of research facilities (recession)	-152,993,000	-75,000,000	-75,000,000
Total, Department of Commerce.....	3,981,718,000	4,882,584,000	3,400,197,000	3,081,718,000	3,383,428,000	-578,290,000
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	4,025,197,000	4,730,710,000	3,463,648,000	3,136,605,000	3,444,317,000	-580,850,000
(By transfer)	(58,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(57,500,000)	(71,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(+7,500,000)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,957,000	1,892,000	1,992,000	1,992,000	1,992,000	+5,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	22,583,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	+1,589,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	24,240,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	+1,594,000
Care of the building and grounds.....	3,000,000	4,003,000	3,313,000	3,313,000	3,313,000	+313,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	27,240,000	29,837,000	29,147,000	29,147,000	29,147,000	+1,907,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges.....	1,756,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	+134,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	11,860,000	13,603,000	12,178,000	12,366,000	12,366,000	+716,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	13,436,000	15,495,000	14,070,000	14,258,000	14,258,000	+850,000
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges.....	1,385,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	+28,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	9,300,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	+146,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	10,885,000	10,859,000	10,858,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	+174,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	220,428,000	228,024,000	228,024,000	228,024,000	228,024,000	+5,596,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	2,119,899,000	2,419,941,000	2,183,000,000	2,220,170,865	2,207,117,000	+87,418,000
Direct appropriation.....	2,340,127,000	2,645,985,000	2,408,024,000	2,446,194,865	2,433,141,000	+93,014,000
Crime trust fund.....	30,700,000	41,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,340,127,000	2,876,695,000	2,480,524,000	2,476,194,865	2,463,141,000	+123,014,000
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,250,000	2,320,000	2,318,000	2,318,000	2,318,000	+68,000
Defender services.....	240,500,000	295,781,000	280,000,000	274,433,000	287,217,000	+28,717,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	54,346,000	72,008,000	59,028,000	59,028,000	59,028,000	+4,882,000
Court security	97,000,000	116,433,000	109,724,000	102,000,000	102,000,000	+5,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19)	16,640,000	-16,640,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services.....	2,750,883,000	3,183,187,000	2,881,594,000	2,913,973,865	2,893,704,000	+142,841,000

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salary and expenses.....	47,500,000	53,445,000	47,500,000	47,500,000	47,500,000
Federal Judicial Center						
Salary and expenses.....	18,828,000	20,771,000	18,828,000	17,000,000	17,914,000	-914,000
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds.....	28,475,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	+4,425,000
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salary and expenses.....	8,800,000	9,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	-300,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary.....	2,905,829,000	3,335,994,000	3,043,398,000	3,074,167,995	3,054,812,000	+148,983,000
Appropriations.....	(2,905,829,000)	(3,305,284,000)	(3,001,898,000)	(3,044,167,995)	(3,024,812,000)	(+118,983,000)
Crime trust fund.....		(30,700,000)	(41,500,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	1,724,828,000	1,748,438,000	1,718,878,000	1,687,800,000	1,708,800,000	-15,828,000
Security enhancements.....		9,720,000	9,720,000	9,720,000	9,720,000	+9,720,000
Registration fees.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs.....	1,725,528,000	1,758,858,000	1,727,298,000	1,698,220,000	1,719,220,000	-8,108,000
Salary and expenses.....	363,972,000	372,480,000	363,278,000	368,000,000	363,278,000	-20,888,000
Security enhancements.....		1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	+1,870,000
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	363,972,000	374,350,000	365,148,000	369,870,000	365,148,000	-18,828,000
Transition fund.....				5,000,000		
Capital investment fund.....		32,800,000	18,400,000	18,400,000	18,400,000	+18,400,000
Office of Inspector General.....	23,850,000	24,250,000	27,898,000	24,350,000	27,398,000	+3,518,000
Representation allowances.....	4,780,000	4,800,000	4,780,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	-280,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials.....	9,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	-1,000,000
Security and maintenance of United States missions.....	391,780,000	421,780,000	391,780,000	369,890,000	365,780,000	-6,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.....	8,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-500,000
Repatriation Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy.....	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)
Administrative expenses.....	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000
Total, Repatriation loans program account.....	775,000	775,000	775,000	776,000	776,000
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	15,485,000	15,485,000	15,185,000	15,185,000	15,185,000	-300,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	129,321,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	-3,919,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	2,691,331,000	2,773,040,000	2,688,975,000	2,844,122,000	2,874,317,000	-17,014,000
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment.....	872,661,000	923,057,000	858,000,000	550,000,000	700,000,000	-172,661,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year assessment.....	518,687,000	445,000,000	425,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	-293,687,000
International conferences and contingencies.....	6,000,000	8,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	1,397,348,000	1,376,057,000	1,286,000,000	778,000,000	928,000,000	-469,348,000
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salary and expenses.....	12,858,000	13,858,000	12,358,000	11,900,000	12,058,000	-900,000
Construction.....	6,844,000	10,398,000	6,844,000	8,000,000	6,844,000
American sections, international commissions.....	5,800,000	6,290,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
International fisheries commissions.....	14,899,000	14,899,000	14,899,000	15,119,000	14,899,000
Total, international commissions.....	39,371,000	45,215,000	39,471,000	40,419,000	39,171,000	-900,000
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	-5,000,000
Appropriation (FY 1995 Defense Bill, P.L. 103-335).....	5,000,000	-5,000,000
Total, Department of State.....	4,143,650,000	4,202,312,000	4,024,448,000	3,482,541,000	3,846,488,000	-487,182,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities.....	50,378,000	76,300,000	40,000,000	22,700,000	35,700,000	-14,878,000

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Board for International Broadcasting						
Israel Relay Station (recession)	-2,000,000					+2,000,000
United States Information Agency						
Salary and expenses	475,645,000	498,002,000	448,645,000	429,000,000	448,645,000	-30,000,000
Technology fund		10,100,000	5,080,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	+5,050,000
Office of Inspector General	4,300,000	4,563,000				-4,300,000
Educational and cultural exchange programs	233,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	210,000,000	200,000,000	-33,279,000
Transfer (FY 1995 Foreign Ops Bill, P.L. 103-336)	42,000,000					-42,000,000
Subtotal	275,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	210,000,000	200,000,000	-75,279,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	2,800,000	300,000	300,000	1,137,000	300,000	-2,800,000
Israel Arab scholarship program	397,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	
International Broadcasting Operations	475,363,000	395,340,000	341,000,000	294,191,000	325,191,000	-150,172,000
Radio Free Asia: Operations	5,000,000	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	-5,000,000
Broadcasting to Cuba	24,809,000	(26,083,000)	(24,809,000)	24,809,000	24,809,000	
Radio construction	69,314,000	85,919,000	70,164,000	22,000,000	40,000,000	-29,314,000
East-West Center	24,500,000	20,000,000		18,000,000	11,750,000	-12,750,000
North/South Center	4,000,000	1,000,000		4,000,000	2,000,000	-2,000,000
Tenth Paralympiad				(5,000,000)		
National Endowment for Democracy	34,000,000	34,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-4,000,000
Total, United States Information Agency	1,395,407,000	1,300,327,000	1,064,646,000	1,038,584,000	1,065,142,000	-310,265,000
Total, related agencies	1,443,785,000	1,378,627,000	1,124,846,000	1,061,284,000	1,120,842,000	-322,943,000
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,567,436,000	5,578,939,000	5,149,092,000	4,523,825,000	4,767,330,000	-820,106,000
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(182,610,000)	(182,610,000)	(182,610,000)	(182,610,000)	(-51,746,000)
Maritime National Security Program		175,000,000		48,000,000	48,000,000	+48,000,000
Operations and training	78,067,000	81,850,000	64,600,000	66,800,000	66,800,000	-6,467,000
Ready reserve force:						
Maintenance, operations and facilities	149,853,000					-149,853,000
Recession	-156,000,000					+156,000,000
Total, Ready reserve force	-8,347,000					+8,347,000
Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	25,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	25,000,000	40,000,000	+15,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(250,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(500,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(+750,000,000)
Administrative expenses	2,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		3,500,000	+1,500,000
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	27,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	25,000,000	43,500,000	+16,500,000
Total, Maritime Administration	94,740,000	308,650,000	116,600,000	136,600,000	156,100,000	+61,360,000
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salary and expenses	208,000	212,000	208,000	208,000	208,000	
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salary and expenses	9,000,000	11,400,000	8,500,000	9,000,000	8,750,000	-250,000
Commission on Immigration Reform						
Salary and expenses	1,894,000	2,877,000	2,377,000	1,894,000	1,894,000	
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salary and expenses	1,080,000	1,122,000	1,080,000	1,080,000	1,080,000	
Competitiveness Policy Council						
Salary and expenses	1,000,000	503,000				-1,000,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salary and expenses	233,000,000	298,000,000	233,000,000	233,000,000	233,000,000	
Federal Communications Commission						
Salary and expenses	185,232,000	223,800,000	185,232,000	166,185,000	175,709,000	-9,523,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	
Direct appropriation	68,632,000	107,200,000	68,632,000	49,785,000	59,309,000	-9,523,000

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	18,589,000	18,947,000	15,000,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	-3,714,000
Offsetting fee collections.....		-2,226,000				
Direct appropriation.....	18,589,000	16,719,000	15,000,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	-3,714,000
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	96,926,000	107,873,000	96,926,000	89,035,000	96,926,000	
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	-4,500,000		-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-19,380,000	-14,880,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-39,940,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,822,000
Direct appropriation.....	54,786,000	59,611,000	34,666,000	24,773,000	31,308,000	-23,462,000
Japan - United States Friendship Commission						
Japan - United States Friendship Trust Fund.....	1,247,000	1,250,000	1,247,000	1,247,000	1,247,000	
(Foreign currency appropriation).....	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation.....	400,000,000	440,000,000	278,000,000	340,000,000	278,000,000	-122,000,000
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	1,384,000	1,425,000	1,000,000	1,384,000	1,190,000	-194,000
Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	300,000	350,000	250,000	350,000	350,000	+ 50,000
National Bankruptcy Review Commission						
Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(1,000,000)					(-1,000,000)
Ounce of Prevention Council						
Crime trust fund 4/.....		14,700,000				
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	297,405,000	342,922,000	297,405,000	267,864,000	297,405,000	
Offsetting fee collections.....	-192,000,000		-184,293,000	-123,000,000	-184,293,000	+ 7,707,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	-30,548,000		-9,667,000	-9,667,000	-9,667,000	+ 20,882,000
Investment adviser fee - offsetting collection.....	(-8,595,000)					(+ 8,595,000)
Direct appropriation.....	74,856,000	342,922,000	103,445,000	134,967,000	103,445,000	+ 28,589,000
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses.....	251,504,000	242,831,000	225,625,000	215,181,000	222,480,000	-29,014,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-9,350,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	+ 8,050,000
Direct appropriation.....	242,154,000	239,531,000	222,325,000	211,881,000	219,180,000	-22,964,000
Office of Inspector General.....	8,500,000	9,200,000	8,750,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy.....	3,598,000	12,426,000	5,000,000	1,000,000	4,500,000	+ 904,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy 5/.....	274,438,000	50,835,000	146,010,000	173,510,000	155,010,000	-119,429,000
Micro loan guarantees.....	1,216,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,216,000	1,216,000	
Section 503. prepayment.....	30,000,000					-30,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	97,000,000	99,910,000	92,622,000	92,822,000	92,622,000	-4,378,000
Total, Business loans program account.....	406,251,000	164,971,000	244,332,000	268,346,000	253,348,000	-152,903,000
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy 5/.....	52,153,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	-17,721,000
Administrative expenses.....	78,000,000	80,340,000	78,000,000	62,400,000	71,578,000	-8,422,000
Contingency fund (emergency).....	125,000,000	100,000,000				-125,000,000
Total, Disaster loans program account.....	255,153,000	214,772,000	112,432,000	96,832,000	106,010,000	-149,143,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund.....	5,389,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	-2,859,000
Total, Small Business Administration.....	917,427,000	630,908,000	590,389,000	588,091,000	589,578,000	-327,849,000
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 6/.....	13,550,000	13,550,000		5,000,000	5,000,000	-8,550,000
Crime trust fund.....		800,000				
Total, State Justice Institute.....	13,550,000	14,150,000		5,000,000	5,000,000	-8,550,000
Total, title V, Related agencies.....						
Appropriations.....	1,891,883,000	2,221,997,000	1,454,582,000	1,545,272,000	1,485,320,000	-406,563,000
Recession.....	(2,049,863,000)	(2,206,967,000)	(1,454,582,000)	(1,545,272,000)	(1,485,320,000)	(-564,563,000)
Crime trust fund.....		(15,300,000)				(+ 158,000,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority).....	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)

**FY 1996 COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076) — continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Procurement: General provisions 7/.....	-11,789,000					+11,789,000
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Working capital fund (rescission).....				-55,000,000	-65,000,000	-65,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
National Telecommunications and information Administration						
Information infrastructure grants (rescission).....				-36,769,000		
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad (rescission).....				-140,000,000	-60,000,000	-60,000,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
United States Information Agency						
Radio construction (rescission).....				-7,400,000	-7,400,000	-7,400,000
Total, title VII, Rescissions.....				-239,169,000	-132,400,000	-132,400,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-367,694,000	-132,655,000	689,000	-16,284,000	-16,284,000	+371,430,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority.....	26,310,642,000	31,026,024,000	27,566,129,000	27,017,415,885	27,271,261,000	+960,819,000
Appropriations.....	(24,153,992,000)	(27,015,824,000)	(23,604,142,000)	(23,465,577,895)	(23,822,892,000)	(-631,300,000)
Rescissions.....	(-171,250,000)			(-392,162,000)	(-207,400,000)	(-36,150,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(2,327,800,000)	(4,010,200,000)	(3,981,987,000)	(3,944,000,000)	(3,955,999,000)	(+1,526,069,000)
(By transfer).....	(56,800,000)	(55,800,000)	(57,800,000)	(62,000,000)	(108,000,000)	(+49,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,463,000)	(3,558,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	
(Liquidation of contract authority).....	(214,358,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,748,000)
(Foreign currency appropriation).....	(1,420,900)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(26,420,000)	(1,420,000)	

1/ 1995 "Salaries and expenses" funds were used for "Administrative review and appeals".

2/ Does not reflect transfers to INS and GLA.

3/ Includes budget amendment of -\$3,265,000 related to privatization of portions of the National Weather Service. Legislation will be proposed to offset this account from the Marine Navigation Trust Fund.

4/ Funding of \$1,500,000 was provided under Office of Justice Programs in FY 1995.

5/ Assumes legislation to lower the subsidy for these accounts through new fees and increases in interest rates.

6/ The State Justice Institute is authorized to submit its budget directly to Congress. The President's request includes \$7,000,000 for the institute.

7/ The FY 1995 budget authority amount reflects the unspread balance.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today with the chairman of our subcommittee to present the conference report on H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies appropriation bill. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for the open and interactive way in which he has allowed us to deal with this legislation in this bipartisan way. I want to congratulate him on his first conference report, and his efforts in bringing it to the floor. I would like to think that I could congratulate him in the sense that we are going to be all done, but I do not think that is the case. I think we will be seeing this bill again after a Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, in many respects this is a good bill, and I support the lion's share of it. It is below the total level of discretionary spending provided last year. That was a goal that I think everybody embraced. Law enforcement funding, Mr. Speaker, is a very important part of this bill, as the chairman said. Funding for Federal law enforcement activities and for Federal support of State and local law enforcement has been significantly increased.

The Department of Justice, Mr. Speaker, receives \$2.4 billion in excess of last year's funding, with the Violent Crime Trust Fund being increased by over \$1.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, this robust funding for law enforcement includes money for 200 new FBI positions, plus significant amounts of money for new equipment and facilities and for support of these new positions. It includes funding for 30 new Drug Enforcement Administration agents, with new equipment and mobile enforcement teams to support those important new hires.

Mr. Speaker, amazingly, this legislation provides for a total of 3,000, let me repeat that for my colleagues and anyone who is listening, for 3,000 new positions at the Immigration and Naturalization Service, including 800 new border patrol agents and 400 new inspectors, and corresponding support personnel.

Mr. Speaker, in the law enforcement area this bill provides \$175 million, full funding, as the chairman indicated, for the Violence Against Women Act programs, and it includes \$535 million for the Byrne Grant Program, a very popular, very effective, local law enforcement grant program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is adequate in my view in other areas. The Economic Development Administration is funded at the House level, and I think it is appropriate at this time to give special recognition to our chairman. In representing his district from Kentucky, and I my district from West Virginia, we appreciate how important the Economic Development Administration is

to areas that are experiencing economic hardship. That agency has reached out and is broadening its portfolio and addressing the concerns of economically distressed areas as a result of military spending displacements.

NOAA is funded, Mr. Speaker, at \$80 million above the House level. I consider that to be a good thing. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, several departments and agencies are severely underfunded in this bill. The committee's allocation in my view is as much as \$500 million short. In fact, virtually every other part of this bill has been reduced from last year.

The Department of Commerce's funding level of \$3.4 billion is \$600 million less than last year. Tragically, Mr. Speaker, in my view, this conference agreement zeros out the highly effective Advanced Technology Program. It is tragic from the standpoint that I think substantively the ATP program is extremely important to our strategic activities to be competitive economically into the future as we compete with the world's economy. But also, Mr. Speaker, I think we should point out in this bill that zero funding the ATP program makes us renege on grants that we have already granted to some 400 companies. I do not think that action speaks very well.

The State Department and its related agencies are reduced by \$800 million below last year. That is too low. We are advised they are going to limp along with that. That cannot continue—that kind of treatment of the State Department. And many other related agencies, such as the Legal Services Corporation, are reduced dramatically. Peacekeeping functions, Mr. Speaker, are so underfunded, almost ignored, that we expect to be dealing with a \$1 billion plus deficit next year to meet our international peacekeeping obligations.

Mr. Speaker, many of these underfunded or zeroed out programs are extremely important parts of President Clinton's economic revitalization initiatives or his foreign policy initiatives, or simply our commitments to ensure that the disadvantaged receive legal services. It is clear from the President's statements that any or all of them may cause him to veto this bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President is committed to veto this bill because funding of the COPS program as a block grant program jeopardizes the 26,000 cops already on the beat. But, more importantly, and probably because we will get beyond that jeopardy, it makes impossible his commitment, a very fundamental part of his campaign and a very fundamental part of his law enforcement crime fighting initiative, to achieve the goal of putting 100,000 new police officers on the beat by the end of fiscal year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program that is working, and it need not be fixed simply because it was not invented by

the majority. It was President Clinton's program. The first year, from last year's 1995 fiscal year funding, we have put almost 26,000 new policemen on the beat. The first year met 25 percent of the goal. In the second year, the lowest estimates and projections are that we will put another 24,000 or 25,000 policemen on the beat if we get funding for the COPS program. That is 50,000 new policemen on the beat in the first 2 years of a 6-year program where the President promised to have 100,000 by the end of the century. We are far ahead of schedule on this program. There is no legitimate criticism of the so-called COPS program. In my mind the block granting of this program is an effort to undermine a program that is already working.

The President has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that this item is nonnegotiable, and I expect it to be the subject of the motion of recommit on this conference report.

In addition, because the bill enacts by reference certain provisions of H.R. 728, the formula for States to receive the block grant funds provided in this bill is heavily skewed toward those States with high populations and high crime rates. Smaller States, rural areas that are getting the job done, are disadvantaged in this bill.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains 31 pages of legislation in a bill that only has 78 pages in total. The issues addressed by these three legislative proposals are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. These items include a major legislative rewrite of the Truth in Sentencing initiative grants, prison litigation reform and Legal Services Corporation. All these provisions amend current law and have impacts that are not clearly defined, despite the claims of the Committee on the Judiciary. The reasons they have ended up in this appropriations bill are unclear to me, because as far as I know, we still have a Committee on the Judiciary with an especially competent chairman and ranking member, and I see no reason why an appropriations bill should contain such extensive authorizing language.

Members may in fact be surprised by the impacts some of this language will have on the distribution of prison grant funds for their States. Preliminary information, for instance, from the Justice Department, indicates that some States that are currently eligible for prison grants will not be eligible for Truth In Sentencing incentive grants. While some of these States may become eligible for general prison grant funds, the amount of the funds available for this purpose has been reduced substantially from what it could have been under current law.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that in a bill as large and diverse as this one, there will always be things that we agree with and things that we do not. We all know it will be vetoed. I intend to work closely with the gentleman

from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman, when that time comes, to adjust the things that need to be adjusted to get a signable bill. I believe that is his desire. It is certainly mine. We must advance the process here today and get closer to that goal.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full committee.

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

□ 1700

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for yielding and I congratulate him and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MULLOCHAN], the ranking member, for doing an outstanding job on a difficult bill with limited resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tough bill, but it is a good bill. It is one that I feel very comfortable in voting for and urging my colleagues to support, and I hope that all of us certainly on this side can support the bill, so we can send it to the President.

If he wants to veto it, that is his judgment and he will exercise it and we will go from there. But the fact is, with the resources available, this is a good bill. We should take comfort in sending it to him.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say briefly on the COPS issue, that is a limited, centralized, big government, big bureaucracy program that does not have the flexibility to the policeman on the beat. That does not get to the inner cities that really need flexibility and funds to fight the very heavy law enforcement problems that they have.

So, I would urge approval of this bill, which includes a significant block grant for law enforcement and gives those communities flexibility. That is not just me speaking; that is the Washington Post of Thursday, September 21, 1995, that I will include for the RECORD which, indeed, says that local authorities should have more choice and that the plan included in this bill is the preferable one.

That being said, there are some Members who have raised objections earlier under discussion of the rule about a provision in the statement of managers that was alleged to allow ocean dumping. There was a "Dear Colleague" submitted by a gentleman from New Jersey that alleges that, and I just want to say that that "Dear Colleague" is wrong. This conference report does not allow ocean dumping; the conference report does not fund any ocean dumping; and it does not change any ocean dumping laws.

The conference report does ask NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to report to Congress on its analysis of possible technology and feasibility of deep

ocean relocation of dredge soil that already exists in our Nation's harbors, and it would ask NOAA to report to Congress as to what the legal consequences are, and what are the options, if any, that Congress can explore for the future.

Mr. Speaker, that being said, that is what the language says. But there are Members from New Jersey and Massachusetts and elsewhere who have legitimate concerns about just this language.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] to express his concerns and have an opportunity to reply to him.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, under the section entitled National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, on page 127, there appears a paragraph entitled, "Deep Ocean Isolation Study," and it says, in part,

The conferees have been made aware that an innovative deep ocean waste handling and disposal system exists.

Later on it says that:

The conferees expect NOAA to evaluate this proposal and develop a funding program for engineering analysis and preliminary design work on systems to transport dredge spoils to a deposit site, transfer the material to a receiving platform, and deploy a tethered delivery system for safe conduct of deep ocean isolation.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman is prepared to speak on this issue to clarify this situation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I am prepared to speak, but before I do that, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TORKILDSEN].

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I share the concerns of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], specifically because our oceans are very complex ecosystems. Also, this tethered delivery system that is referenced has already been studied by the Navy, and the Navy has determined that it is likely to fail.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Louisiana that there will be no ocean dumping at all, nothing authorized under this language.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say to both gentlemen, I believe that this language clearly requires that NOAA only evaluate and develop a cost estimate for testing of this new technology, not to carry out a demonstration at this time. I am prepared to direct NOAA not to proceed with this evaluation until the concerns of the gentlemen, as well as any other Members who have similar concerns, have been satisfied as expressed in authorization language by the Fisheries, Wildlife and Ocean Subcommittee of the Committee on Resources. The subcommittee is chaired by the gentleman from New Jersey. And if that language is acceptable, if that colloquy is acceptable to both gentlemen, I would hope that they would support the bill

and I would urge all of our colleagues to support the bill accordingly. Is that acceptable?

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, that having been said, as far as this gentleman is concerned, that language is acceptable and I am prepared to support the bill with that assurance.

Mr. TORKILDSEN. If the gentleman would yield, the language is acceptable as well, and I will support the bill on that basis.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlemen and urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1995]

MORE POLICE OR MORE CHOICES

The Republicans are out to undo portions of the crime bill passed last year, particularly that part of the law that provides money to put 100,000 new community police on the streets. They would convert that program into law enforcement block grants without the mandate that the money be used to hire new officers. The current vehicle for this effort is the State, Justice and Commerce appropriations bill, which the Senate is expected to consider this week. President Clinton is determined to defend the police program because he views it as a major achievement of his administration. Setting aside this political consideration, though, preserving the form in which this assistance is given may not be worth a fight.

Protecting the public from violent crime has traditionally been a local responsibility, although, of course, federal funds have always been welcome. In the prosperous and innovative years of the Great Society, grants were made to state and local governments for law enforcement assistance, and broad discretion was given to the recipients in deciding how to use them. There were some abuses—scholarships for family members, purchases of high-tech equipment of dubious value—but much was achieved before the grant program was discontinued in the early '80s. Now the Democrats are reluctant to trust local authorities with real responsibility, so they set aside billions in the crime bill but mandated that the money be used only to hire officers for community policing.

There's nothing wrong with community policing, and many cities would be glad to spend federal dollars to implement it. But others, including some large cities, already have instituted community policing and need computers instead. Some communities, such as Washington, don't need additional police manpower at all but are short on funds to pay and provide benefits to people already on the payroll. Finally, as many cities have realized after a careful reading of the law, the feds will pay only start-up costs of new hires. Matching funds are provided at a diminishing rate for five years, after which localities must pick up the full cost of the new employees. Many communities simply can't afford to do that.

In light of the federal government's budget situation, this may not be the time for Washington to be financing local programs of this kind. But if funds are to be given, it makes sense to provide communities more flexibility in planning and spending. Because community policing has proved to be so effective and so popular with the public, many areas will spend the money as Washington intends. But if new technologies, more cars or a social service unit trained to deal with juveniles are needed more, why shouldn't

local authorities have more choice? Word processors, a modernized telephone system or better lab equipment may not have the political appeal of 100,000 new cops. But for some cities, they may be a much better deal.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate colloquy, and particularly what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] said. But I must warn that I am concerned that this very research program, which is in the report language, is the very thing that we are opposed to. In fact, if the research program goes ahead, which hopefully it will not based on what the gentleman from New Jersey just said, but if this research program were to go ahead, it is essentially opened. That would allow a significant amount of ocean dumping to take place of various contaminated materials.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the Department of Commerce, in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Resources on July 28 of this year, specifically said that they were opposed to this research project because it is opened; there is no guidance, and ultimately there would be ocean dumping taking place of various contaminated materials.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out that the Naval Research Laboratory in a report issued this year in the early part of 1995, specifically said that this tethered container concept was analyzed and determined to be unacceptable from both the production rate capability and because of handling system problems.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to do this research. It has already been done and it has been found to be unacceptable.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], who is a very hard-working member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say this is a good bill. I think it recognizes, of course, the fiscal restraints that we are under. It is \$700 million under 1995 in terms of discretionary spending.

But as chairman of the Steel Caucus, I want to also point out that we have kept the funding up for the International Trade Administration. We are in a competitive environment worldwide with our products, including steel, and it is therefore very important that the ITA have full funding.

We have been able to do that. It is almost at 1995 levels, and what this means is that the International Trade Administration will be able to very vigorously support our trade laws and make sure that none of our industries are subjected to unfair trading practices.

With the GATT treaty in place the challenges to maintain a fair trade en-

vironment has become extremely important. The Commerce Department funding is down about \$578 million, and many people say this Department perhaps is not necessary. However, the ITA has a very essential function, and I am pleased that we have been able to keep the funding level at 1995.

The second important thing I would bring to the attention of my colleagues is the manufacturing extension program. Again, we have kept the funding level up. This is an agency that provides help to many small businesses. Some 14,000 of them in northern Ohio potentially benefit from this program, because this agency provides help to many small businesses and give them advice as to how to manage their accounting, how to manage in some cases the sales programs. They provide the kind of professional consulting that many times the small business does not have.

So, these two features are important to the economy and jobs, and I am pleased that we could fund them at almost a 100 percent level.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2076. I do so reluctantly because of my strong feeling that Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman ROGERS has sought to be fair and reasonable in the midst of a very difficult process. The fact is that the conference committee was unable to report a balanced bill—the allocation for Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary was just not sufficient to make that possible.

There are provisions of this conference report that I strongly support. Five hundred million dollars is allocated to reimburse States and localities for the cost of incarcerating aliens convicted of a criminal offense. Obviously, these funds are vital to my State of California, as well as Los Angeles County, which bear an enormous burden of the costs of the Federal Government's inability to control illegal immigration. Increases in funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service included in the legislation are essential to the Government's ability to control this problem.

However, while the INS and law enforcement are well funded, there are serious problems with the allocation of funds for other components of the bill. Funding for programs within the Department of Commerce are dramatically reduced from fiscal year 1995. State Department activities are seriously underfunded, particularly as it relates to the United States commitment to international organizations and United Nation's peacekeeping activities.

In addition to the underfunding of many valuable accounts, I have fun-

damental differences with the conference report over policy initiatives included in the legislation. The crime bill enacted by the 103d Congress and signed by President Clinton balanced the needs of law enforcement with the needs of prevention. The Community Oriented Policing Services program [COPS] addressed the real fear of millions of Americans that there were insufficient numbers of law enforcement personnel on our streets. At the same time, the law authorized prevention activities aimed at reducing the prevalence of criminal activity among the Nation's youth.

H.R. 2076 undermines this approach by ignoring enacted authorizations and creating a new law enforcement block grant. The COPS program has already been successful in providing 25,000 additional cops on the street. This block grant eliminates a program that is working; allows funds to be used for a variety of purposes—including equipment and infrastructure; and places prevention programs in the unenviable position of competing for the same funding as personnel and equipment.

There are also small programs within the Justice Department which provide far greater benefits than their cost to the Federal Government. The Community Relations Service [CRS] is such a program. CRS provides valuable mediation, conflict resolution, and technical assistance services in the resolution of volatile racial disputes. Unfortunately, such dispute resolution activities remain essential in communities across the Nation and the small Federal investment in CRS' activities is well spent in prevention of more serious problems.

The dispute resolution activities of CRS were funded at \$10 million in fiscal year 1995. This year Americans have become acutely aware of the racial tensions which exist in this country. Yet this small investment—supported by law enforcement and the civil rights community alike—has been cut by almost 50 percent. As for conference report language supporting additional funding for CRS through transfer in the case of emergent circumstances, I can report that those emergent circumstances already exist in many parts of this country.

The technology programs of the Department of Commerce are particularly hard hit by this bill. The Advanced Technology Program [ATP] has been eliminated. When all the smoke about industrial policy and picking winners and losers clears, what is it we have done in this bill? We have struck funding for a public-private partnership for the development of high-risk technologies with the potential for long-term economic benefits.

Sharing the costs of high-risk research with the private sector, and allowing research and development that might not otherwise proceed, seems to me a wise investment in our economic future. At a time when job creation is increasingly dependent on small businesses, it is important to note that half

of ATP awards in the first 4 years of the program have been made to small businesses.

The Commerce Department's information infrastructure grant program is cut by over 50 percent from last year's funding level of \$45 million. These grants foster an essential public-private partnership to support the expansion of the information superhighway.

As a result of where they live, income level, or educational attainment, millions of Americans now find the information age inaccessible. Perhaps nowhere is this problem as critical and the repercussions for the future as serious as in our educational system. Millions of children are being left behind as their higher-income counterparts avail themselves of the computer age, both at home and in schools where funding is available for information technology.

USA Today recently reported that high school drop-out rates fell dramatically and absentee rates dropped in half when kids were given access to computers, CD-ROMS and other technology. While many decry the failure of our public school systems to teach our children, we have an opportunity with technology grants to do something significant in our schools and provide essential opportunities to poor and at-risk youth.

Through matching grants to schools, libraries, State and local governments and non-profit organizations, information infrastructure grants can provide an invaluable catalyst to assure that we do not become a nation divided into information technology haves and have nots.

Last Monday, the Washington Post featured an article highlighting the Minority Business Development Agency [MBDA] as an agency that is virtually privatized, was established under a Republican administration and has been credited with stimulating business growth around the country. Today we will pass a bill that reduces funding for the MBDA by 27 percent—from \$44 million to \$32 million.

Minorities continue to be significantly underrepresented in the business community. MBDA enhances business opportunities and expansion of existing minority enterprises by providing management and technical assistance and enhancing access to capital for minority entrepreneurs. It seems inconsistent—to say the least—that the majority would target a program such as MBDA, while seeking to replace the access to the economic marketplace afforded minority businesses through affirmative action with some yet to be defined “empowerment agenda.”

Finally, the conference report responds to the opponents of the Legal Services Corporation [LSC] by severely reducing funding for the LSC and placing tight restrictions on LSC grantee activities. LSC has done an exemplary job for over 30 years of providing access to the legal system for lower-income Americans.

Unfortunately, the conference chose to acquiesce to opponents of LSC who use isolated and anecdotal claims to insist that the Corporation's main activity has been to pursue a political and social agenda. As a result, the ability of poor Americans to enjoy their rights to adequate legal representation will be eroded. It was not enough to address opponents concerns about LSC through implementation of restrictions on grantee activities; the conference report goes far beyond these concerns by reducing funding for the LSC by over 30 percent.

As we continue to resolve appropriations matters, it is my hope we are able to deliberate on an alternative to this conference report that I can support. That will require that a more reasonable and adequate amount of funding be provided for the many essential functions of the federal government included in this measure.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. Specifically, I strongly oppose dismantling the community policing initiative. This is one crime fighting program that works, as the ranking member said earlier.

This bill will not guarantee that even one new police officer would be put on the beat. The streets of my district are safer today because of community policing. Neighborhoods are safer because we put more police officers on the beat.

The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations made a comment before that said that this program does not work in inner-cities. That is wrong. It does work in inner-cities. In 1990, my hometown of New Haven, CT, an inner-city, had the unfortunate distinction of having the highest crime rate of any city in the State of Connecticut. Then police and community leaders came together and implemented a community policing program. Three years later, New Haven has a much prouder distinction, and that is of a crime-fighting innovator. Crime has been reduced by 7 percent in the first year of the program and by 10 percent in the second year. In fact, New Haven's community policing program has become a model for the Nation.

In my district, 41 new police officers are already on the job in 10 municipalities as a result of the COPS initiative to put 100,000 new police officers on our Nation's streets.

Mr. Speaker, the results are in. According to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports for the first 3 months of 1995, aggravated assault is down by 40 percent, robbery is down by 21 percent, and murder is down by 5 percent. In February of 1996, because of COPS grants, my district is expected to put an additional 20 police officers on the beat in New Haven.

Make no mistake about it. A “yes” vote on this conference report today is a vote to take cops off of the streets.

Vote “no” on this conference report. It is, in fact, wrong to end this program that has worked in our Nation's cities, inner-cities and rural communities.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker I rise in strong support of this bill. I rise in very strong support of the conference report. It cuts corporate welfare coming from the Commerce Department; it prevents U.S. soldiers from being ordered to serve under foreign operational command; it makes much needed cuts in foreign aid; it begins to crack down on illegal immigration; it prohibits Federal funding to provide Federal convicts with weight-lifting equipment and other counter-productive pursuits; it helps limit frivolous prison litigation; it sends a clear message to the courts that they had better stop wasting money on overly-lavish courtroom facilities; and it significantly improves upon last year's very flawed crime bill.

The anti-crime block grants that will go to communities under this legislation are not bound up with the dictates, mandates, and restrictions that characterized last year's bill. I will tell you that the local officials in Cincinnati and Hamilton County are in a better position to judge how they can best spend anti-crime money than can Federal officials here in Washington. In fact, when Cincinnati was awarded a multi-million dollar grant last year under the old crime bill, my city found that it simply could not afford to accept the money—the Federal requirements were just too much. This bill provides local officials far more flexibility to spend the funds to meet the particular needs of the particular situations that they confront.

Now, I've got to say, again, that I would have preferred to enhance the tax base of local communities by reducing the tax bite that Washington takes and simply not have any Federal crime grants at all. It's better to leave the money in the communities rather than running it through DC and then sending it back. But the approach that this bill takes represents a great improvement over the existing top-down system in which the feds micro-manage everything.

I commend the committee and the conferees for their excellent work on these improvements, and I would like also to congratulate once again the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], and his absolutely tremendous staff, on the fine work that they have done to prove the way for the anti-crime provisions in this bill. I urge support for the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

□ 1715

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us to appropriate funds for the Commerce, Justice,

State Department, and related agencies. I commend my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, Chairman ROGERS, for working through a very difficult conference to bring a reasonable conference agreement to the House floor.

I also thank the chairman and the staff of the subcommittee and full committee for their cooperation in working with our Committee on International Relations.

A key provision in the House passed bill has been retained in this conference report. The provision ties expansion of the United States mission in Vietnam to cooperation by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on resolving the remaining POW/MIA cases. This addresses concerns that the President lifted the trade embargo on Vietnam in February 1994 and established full diplomatic relations in July 1995 in the absence of any concrete results on cases that Vietnam should be able to provide.

The conference report requires that before expanding the size of the United States mission in Hanoi, the President must certify that the Government of Vietnam is "fully cooperating" with the United States to account for our POW/MIA's. This includes turning over American remains and information on those still missing that we have every reason to believe is being held by the Vietnamese Government. I want to point out that this provision does not interfere with our diplomatic relations, but it does link expansion of the United States presence to specific cooperation by the Vietnamese. This provision reinforces the President's stated commitment to accounting for the 2,167 Americans still missing in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

This provision seeks to achieve real progress by the Government of Vietnam in accounting for our missing Americans. My colleagues, this issue is not solely about remains, though an honorable burial is certainly deserved by those who gave their lives in service to our country. It is about the POW/MIA families' and our veterans' trust in their Government to seek and discover the truth.

As we deploy 20,000 Americans to Bosnia, we must make every effort to assure them that if they are captured or become missing, the United States will make every effort to return them to their families and their Nation. It is crucial to our national honor that we, both in Congress and the executive branch, continue to press Vietnam to fully cooperate on our POW/MIA's.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have grave concerns that the Vietnamese have been less than forthcoming on cases brought to their attention. The data shows that since the President lifted the trade embargo against Vietnam, only 10 cases have been accounted for.

There is strong reason to believe, based on a November 1995 Department

of Defense analytical assessment of each POW/MIA case, that the Vietnamese still have remains and records on individuals which they have so far not turned over to the United States Government.

This provision calls upon our Government to use all information available to account for our POW/MIA's. The intention is that "all information" include intelligence assessments, material evidence, incident information, and subsequent reporting, as well as the case-by-case assessments in DOD's "Zero-based Comprehensive Review of Cases Involving Unaccounted for Americans in Southeast Asia" produced in November 1995. This document provides valuable information on individual cases, to include where and what kind of information DOD analysts believe the Government of Vietnam has in its possession. It should be used to prompt the Vietnamese to respond to those cases. This would include the special remains cases, photo cases, priority discrepancy cases—fate not determined; priority discrepancy cases—death confirmed—Vietnam-Lao border cases, and priority discrepancy cases in areas of Laos and Cambodia where Vietnamese forces operated during the war.

Several United States Defense Intelligence Agency assessments through 1992 indicated that the Government of Vietnam likely holds hundreds of American remains that have not been repatriated to United States authorities. These analyses reinforce the recently released DOD case-by-case assessments.

Notably, the administration's fiscal year 1996 budget request for the State Department did not assume any expansion in Vietnam. Consequently it is my understanding that any expansion that might take place, if the President issues a certification, will require approval by Congress through the regular reprogramming process. As part of the review of any reprogramming request, the President's certification will be evaluated to determine whether the Government of Vietnam has exhausted all its unilateral efforts to cooperate fully with the United States in accounting for all discrepancy cases. We will assess Vietnam's cooperation to resolve the last known alive and remains discrepancy cases by the degree to which they meet the United States Government definition of accounting for our missing personnel which means locating and repatriating living Americans or their identifiable remains or providing convincing evidence as to why neither is possible.

In addition, Congress will be looking for the Vietnamese Government to increase its cooperation on the remaining original status POW-MIA cases in terms of results achieved in meeting the above definition, including on incidents of loss in areas of Laos and Cambodia where Vietnamese forces operated at the time of the incident.

We would expect if remains are not provided, then convincing evidence of

why this is not possible should be provided by the Government of Vietnam from archival information, such as documents from the Central Committee of the Vietnamese Communist Party and reports of the Military Law Division of the Ministry of National Defense, including burial and photographic records of American casualties in Vietnam and in areas of Laos and Cambodia that were under Vietnamese control during the war.

Full Vietnamese cooperation on POW-MIA related archival records and documents also includes provision of the source documents used by a single Vietnamese official to compile the handwritten Group 559 summary document provided to the United States in 1993.

Many of my colleagues in the House and the Senate have worked for years on this issue yet we continue to hope that all the remaining cases will soon be resolved so that those most affected by the Vietnam war can end the uncertainty and frustration they have endured for so many years.

Speaking on behalf of the families and our Nation's veterans, I thank Chairman ROGERS for his outstanding efforts in finding a workable compromise on this provision. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report.

I think it is a bad bill for a number of reasons, but I would like to highlight just two aspects of the bill:

I would like to go back to an earlier statement made on the floor by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BRYANT], which may have left the impression that money for the COPS Program was not being directed to the right places. In talking about the COPS Program, he stated that the city of Portland, OR, only was to receive one new police officer. Let me remind my colleagues that the whole purpose of the COPS Program was to target smaller communities, and those communities where the rate of crime is growing. The city of Portland, thankfully, is not experiencing such growth. But the surrounding suburban and rural areas are. In my district alone, the following communities received one new police officer: Astoria, Carlton, Clatskanie, Clatsop County Sheriff's Office, Cornelius, Dundee, Gearhart, Hillsboro, Newberg, North Plains, Rainier, Scappoose, Seaside, Sherwood, St. Helens, Tigard, Vernonia, Warrenton, and five in Yamhill County. Many of these communities are in Washington County, which is the heart of my district, and the fastest growing part of the State—19 new police in this county alone. These are the types of communities in Oregon which need the money the most and can afford it the least. So I would remind my colleagues that the success of the COPS Program is that it

puts the money where the money is most needed.

This bill eliminates funding for the Advanced Technology Program in the Commerce Department. This program provides loans to businesses to develop commercial applications for new technologies. Let me tell you why elimination of this is pound wise and penny foolish.

Over the past 50 years, innovation has been responsible for as much as half of the Nation's economic growth. Economic growth, of course, means more jobs and improved living standards. Combined public/private investment in research and development have resulted in millions of new jobs in biotechnology, communications, software, aerospace, and semiconductors.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science estimates that under the Republican budget resolution, there will be a 30-percent cut in the Federal investment in nondefense R&D.

Along with zeroing out funding for the Advanced Technology Program, funding in other bills will be drastically reduced for DOE's renewable energy R&D programs, and EPA's Environmental Technologies Initiative.

These cuts are coming at a time when Japan plans to double its R&D Government dollars by the year 2000. They are doubling their commitment and we are cutting ours. What is wrong with this picture?

I have repeatedly stated that while I am in favor of a balanced budget, but that it must be done with the right priorities in mind. Our balance the budget strategy should be based on an investment strategy—where can we put limited Federal dollars where they will do the most good—where they will invest in our Nation's well being—create new, high paying jobs—which in turn creates a better future for our children.

This appropriations bill does not get the priorities right, and I urge the defeat of this conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], who really has become quite an expert on these issues while bringing his law enforcement background to the debate.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me on this issue.

As my colleagues know, back in the 103d Congress we put forth the COPS Program, and now we are here in the 104th Congress, and suddenly we want to block-grant this program. We have heard all the horrors of the block grants that have occurred in the past, the airplanes, the tanks, the yachts that have been purchased, and under our colleagues' block grant proposal not one police officer is guaranteed. There is a possibility, but there are no guarantees. No communities can look with confidence that they will receive a police officer.

Mr. Speaker, they tell us they are going to do this because they want to

leave it to the local units of government. Well, let me, if I may, look at Kentucky District No. 5 where the distinguished chairman is from. Every one of those communities that applied applied because they wanted a police officer, not because Washington made them. It was the local county commissioners of Perry County, or Pike County, or Clay County, or Wolf County, or Jenkins City Police Department, or how about West Liberty City Police Department. They applied. Washington did not force them. They know how to fight crime at the local level, and they received under the COPS Program 25 police officers.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman realize that the State of Kentucky under the COPS Program gets \$10 million, but under the block grant program would get \$18 million. Does the gentleman realize that?

Mr. STUPAK. I realize that, but tell me. Nowhere in that \$18 million is one police officer guaranteed for Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. They can use it all.

Mr. STUPAK. Prisons and everything else.

Mr. ROGERS. They can use it all.

Mr. STUPAK. Reclaiming my time—

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield—

Mr. STUPAK. No, I would like to finish my—and if I have time left—

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUNDERSON). The gentleman from Michigan reclaims the time.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, if I have time remaining, I will yield, but I am going to finish my argument.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman should not ask me questions if he does not want—

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman tells us that these Washington force—it was the gentleman's local communities that wanted these police officers, and now what is going to happen? Now, according to page 21, if the gentleman's agencies fall below \$10,000, they lose their block grant, they lose. They lose their COPS Program, and I know my friends on that side of the aisle say that is not true, but the Department of Justice says under page 21 when they fall below the \$10,000 rule, they will lose their officers.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STUPAK. No, I will not. I want to continue my argument.

Department of Justice, who administers the program, said—

Mr. ROGERS. The truth?

Mr. STUPAK. I am interested in putting forth my argument. I have not interrupted the gentleman, and the gentleman has never yielded to me yet

today, so I am not going to yield to him now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman says that this is not going to happen, but the Department of Justice who must administer this program tells us that is what is going to happen, I believe the Department of Justice, that the program will be terminated because of their \$10,000 rule.

In Kentucky there are 132 applications pending, 132 more municipalities and country sheriffs who did not know what they were doing underneath their logic are applying for the COPS Program. My colleague will say that we need flexibility, as the gentleman said and as the Washington Post pointed out. I do not want the Washington Post to fight crime for us. I want local agencies, and that is why we have the COPS More Program, more program which provides us equipment, which provides us technology, that provides us with the technology we need.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is interested in hearing the truth, here is what the State of Michigan will sustain under these comparative programs.

Under the COPS Program Michigan gets \$33,700,000. Under our block grant program Michigan gets about \$74,500,000, and they can use it all on cops if they want to, or they do not have to if they do not want to.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Not for the moment. We give the choice to local communities. We are going to give more than twice the amount of money to Michigan that they get under the old—

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Will the distinguished—

Mr. ROGERS. I will not.

If the gentleman from Michigan is interested in hearing it from the horse's mouth, or whatever he wants to call it, I am giving him the truth.

Michigan fares more than twice better under our program than the old COPS Program, and the old COPS Program grants will stay in effect. They are not going to lose any of the cops already on the beat under the program as it is now. But their communities will have in the future a chance for a lot more.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to ask the distinguished chairman if he would engage me, please?

I am curious. If we have two States here who, under the block grant program the gentleman is asserting, can get a considerable amount, a higher amount, of money, what is the base amount for COPS and for the block grant program that the gentleman is comparing? Is that the same amount of money?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. It is the same amount of money this year, however let me also say this to the gentleman:

Under our proposal each community only has to put up 10 percent to get their 90 percent from us. Under the COPS Program, as the gentleman knows, in the first year the local community has to put up 25 percent; the second year, up to 50 percent, and so forth. That is—

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time so I can just get to the point, if we are dealing with the same absolute dollar amount, COPS compared to block grant, the gentleman has sighted a pattern in two States where the State he is asserting is almost getting twice as much money under a block grant program; is that true—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute, and I ask the gentleman from Kentucky, if this continues, would he mind yielding 1 minute so we can straighten this out? I think it is an important point.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. To answer the gentleman's question, the COPS Program, as it is now, is based on \$1.3 billion in the first year. Our program is based on \$1.9 billion.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, please; \$1.9 billion for what year?

Mr. ROGERS. For 1996, the year we are talking about.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. For 1996, so the gentleman is comparing last year's dollar volume with this year's dollar volume.

Mr. ROGERS. The awards are not made yet for COPS.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I understand, Mr. Speaker. See, I am trying to understand if we are dealing from the same base number; then the gentleman has either picked two States who, under the formula, miraculously get twice as much money in a block grant program out of the same pot of money, or else there are a lot of States out there that are going to get a lot less money under the block grant program. One or the other?

See what I mean?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman would yield, we know under the block grant program the dollar figure each State will get, and that is the figure I gave for the gentleman for the State of Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I will have to conclude by making my point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to finish this statement.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is, if we are dealing with the same base number, if

the block grant program is yielding up considerably more amounts of money, then we have to be dealing with a larger base, and the chairman has indicated here, if I am understanding him, that he is comparing the 1995 funding level, which I understand is \$1.3 billion with the 1996 funding level, which is something like \$1.9 billion. That would explain the discrepancy.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and I think that explains the discrepancy with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], and I am sure under his program Michigan is going to get the same amount as Kentucky.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from West Virginia that he has utilized an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we have only one difference about this matter. We just happen to think that cops on the streets of America speak a heck of a lot louder than all these political promises in Washington, and here are some of those police officers. This is their graduation picture in Austin, TX, and they are out patrolling the streets and the neighborhoods of America making Austin and central Texas safer because they are on the street instead of in some political promise. Last year they said it could not be done, but this Congress, the last Congress, the Democratic Congress, had the courage to pass a smart, comprehensive anticrime bill, and it pledged to put 100,000 police officers on the streets and neighborhoods across the country. They said it could not be done. Well, there are already 26,000 new officers on the street.

□ 1730

What do they propose as an alternative? They are going to have a comment period for the State bureaucracy, for the Governors of the States of the country to comment on whether or not these local requests for new cops are appropriate. That comment period is longer than it took the city of Austin to get approval to put these new law enforcement officers in cadet academies. That is a substitution of bureaucracy to go along with all the political rhetoric instead of backing up our law enforcement officers.

The idea that we will have some block grant program that requires the approval of a State bureaucracy that will not guarantee one single new law enforcement officer to back up these young men and woman who have dedicated their lives to protecting the security and the safety of their neighbors is flat wrong. These young people, according to our police chief, Elizabeth Watson, are out there working to build neighborhood enforcement teams. Instead of roving gangs, we have roving bands of law enforcement officers protecting our neighbors. The idea of a block grant program with no definition, no guarantees, no direction, does

not provide the assurance we need for personal security in America today.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2076, the conference report to the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary appropriations bills.

Immigration, both legal and illegal, is an issue that affects every American. The Federal Government must take seriously its responsibility to establish and maintain a credible immigration policy that benefits American families, taxpayers, and workers, and serves America's national interests.

I introduced H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995, to address many of the problems in current immigration law. H.R. 2202 recently passed the Judiciary Committee on a bipartisan vote of 23 to 10, and has 114 cosponsors. This legislation is designed to reduce illegal immigration, and to reform our immigration system.

Funding is crucial to the effective implementation of these immigration policies. Chairman Hal Rogers and I have worked together to ensure that the immigration programs and objectives contained in H.R. 2202, especially those that provide for stronger enforcement of our borders, are funded in H.R. 2076. I would like to thank Chairman ROGERS for his tireless efforts to secure our borders.

Both bills contain enforcement initiatives to secure America's borders. These include an increase of 1,000 border patrol agents on the front lines, additional support staff and improved equipment for the Border Patrol, and 400 additional land border inspectors.

Both bills also contain initiatives to remove criminal and illegal aliens from the United States. H.R. 2076 funds the removal of illegal aliens and criminal aliens after they have served their sentences and provides \$500 million to reimburse States for the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens.

Mr. Chairman, America's immigration policies have failed in the past largely because the Immigration and Naturalization Service has often been ignored and underfunded. Both H.R. 2202 and H.R. 2076 will change that.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], a leader in this body in the fight against violence against women.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this conference report because of my strong support for the Violence Against Women Act. I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr.

LIVINGSTON], and in fact the entire Committee on Appropriations for their cooperation and full support in securing \$175 billion to protect women from abuse.

As we have seen recently, domestic abuse and other assaults on women do not discriminate based on social status. We already know the numbers. Each year over 4 million women are abused by their partners. During their lifetime three out of four women will be a victim of violent crime. The number of domestic crimes in our Nation today is twice that of robberies. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the reality in America is that in the next 5 minutes, 1 woman will be raped and 14 more will be severely beaten by their husbands or boyfriends.

Yes, while we have heard these statistics over and over again, we have marveled at how little has been done in the past, because what we have failed to concentrate on up until today are the names and the faces and the bodies and souls that are destroyed every 15 seconds in America.

Last year Congress enacted the Violence Against Women Act to reduce these numbers and increase protection for women. Republicans and Democrats stood up and enacted a crime bill that protected them. It has been a long fight, first to authorize the Violence Against Women Act, and today now finally funding it. Today we show the rest of the country that this Congress is committed to stopping crime and helping the victims of crime. I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from New York, Ms. NITA LOWEY, for her cooperation.

Let me just conclude. At a time when the Nation's awareness of domestic violence has never been greater, it is essential that we in Congress stop talking about doing something about this crime and start putting our money behind it by fully funding the Violence Against Women Act in this conference report. In this section of the bill we are once again standing up for women and against criminals.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his cooperation, and urge on behalf of all those women who will be victims of domestic abuse or who may not be because of our efforts today to please support this conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the hard-working and distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me start by congratulating and paying my respects to the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, and our terrific staff. Given the incredible parameters within which they had to work, they have done a decent job, and if there is any indecency here, it is not HAL's doing. But there are some serious failings.

Let me just start off by returning to the question of the block grants versus

the COPS program. I will be offering the motion to recommit when we finish debate on this to transfer or to specify that that portion of the funding in this bill that was going to go to block grants will be restored to funding the COPS program.

Mr. Speaker, this is, as many of my colleagues have already pointed out, a success already. It is focused, it is effective, it is putting money on task on the streets of America to improve safety and law enforcement. We are all, I think, appropriately forewarned, given the bad experience back in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration days of what can happen in a slush-funded, no-accountable block grant environment. I hope my colleagues will support the motion to recommit.

Beyond that problem, Mr. Speaker, there are other problems with this bill: the underfunding of our technology investments in the NIST accounts, the incredible intrusion into the operations of the Legal Services Corporation, the huge shortfall in funding for peace-keeping operations at the United Nations that is going to put us in a fiscal corner for years; the incredible, idiotic waste of money on the TV Marti program; and several extraneous legislative provisions that have no business within this bill. This leaves me, with reluctance, to urge my colleagues, if the motion to recommit fails, to vote "no" on final passage.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the prison litigation reform provisions included in the conference report on H.R. 2076, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Earlier this year the House passed H.R. 667, the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act. This bill contained many provisions designed to address the problems associated with inmate lawsuits. One area that was not included in that legislation was the many so-called Bivens actions that are filed by Federal prisoners in Federal court every year. These suits are not based on any statutory authority from Congress. In *Bivens v. Six Unknown Federal Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), the Supreme Court created a so-called "constitutional tort" that allows inmates to circumvent the congressionally created Federal Tort Claims Act and sue the Federal Government for alleged violations of their constitutional rights due to prison conditions and/or treatment.

The real problem with these cases came with the Court's decision in 1992 that an inmate need not exhaust the administrative remedies available prior to proceeding with a Bivens action for money damages only. *McCarthy v. Madigan*, 112 S.Ct. 1081 (1992). This decision was made without the benefit of any legislative guidance and the Court made that point very clearly in its opinion, almost to the point of asking that Congress do some-

thing. Since 1993 there has been a total of 1,365 new Bivens cases filed in Federal court tying up the time of Federal judges and lawyers for the Bureau of Prisons at a time when we already have overcrowded dockets.

In order to address the problem of Bivens actions, I introduced H.R. 2468, the Prisoner Lawsuit Efficiency Act ("P.L.E.A."). This bill makes it clear that administrative exhaustion be imposed in all actions arising under the Bivens case. In H.R. 667, the House adopted a similar provision to that of the P.L.E.A. by requiring the exhaustion of administrative remedies for those prisoners bringing suit under 42 U.S.C. §1979 (the Civil Rights for Institutionalized Persons Act ("CRIPA")).

I am very pleased to say that I have worked with the conferees of H.R. 2076 to ensure that the prison litigation reform measures address the Bivens issue. The new administrative exhaustion language in H.R. 2076 will require that all cases brought by Federal inmates contesting any aspect of their incarceration be submitted to administrative remedy process before proceeding to court. By returning these cases to the Federal Bureau of Prisons, we will provide the opportunity for early resolution of the problem, we will reduce the intrusion of the courts into the administration of the prisons, and we will provide some degree of fact-finding so that when or if the matter reaches Federal court there will be a record upon which to proceed in a more efficient manner.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the 56 Members who joined me as a co-sponsor of H.R. 2468. Their commitment to a fair and efficient judicial system is to be commended. In addition to the strong support this proposal has had here in the House, H.R. 2468 has been endorsed by Mr. Norman Carlson, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons from 1970 until 1987, and Mr. Michael Quinlan, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons from 1987 until 1992. Former U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh has written to me stating that:

An exhaustion requirement [as imposed by H.R. 2468 and now H.R. 2076] would aid in deterring frivolous claims: by raising the cost, in time/money terms, of pursuing a Bivens action, only those claims with a greater probability/magnitude of success would, presumably, proceed.

Mr. Thornburgh also points out that an administrative review process would also aid the Federal courts by allowing for preliminary fact-finding and the creation of a record at the Bureau level, so as to clarify the issues to be presented to the court.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2076 and I commend Mr. ROGERS for bringing this conference report to the floor.

I want to speak particularly about title VIII of the conference agreement, which contains important provisions concerning prison litigation reform. These provisions were proposed by the Senate conferees and are substantially similar to the prison litigation reform legislation which passed the House—earlier this year.

Title VIII will provide much needed relief to States dealing with the problems of unreasonable Federal court

intervention in the operation of prisons and frivolous litigation by prisoners.

For too long, Federal judges have been attempting to micromanage correctional facilities throughout the country. Judicial intervention in local prison management has often resulted in the release of dangerous criminals.

This legislation will ensure that relief granted to prisoners who claim their rights are being violated by prison officials will go no further than necessary to remedy the alleged violation, and that imposing a prison population cap should absolutely be a last resort. It will also prevent the permanent court supervision of correctional facilities by allowing a party to move for the termination of court-ordered prospective relief within set time periods.

Title VIII will also significantly curtail the ability of prisoners to bring frivolous and malicious lawsuits by forcing prisoners to exhaust all administrative remedies before bringing suit in Federal court.

In addition, Title VIII will require a Federal court to dismiss, on its own motion, lawsuits which do not state a claim upon which relief may be granted or are frivolous or malicious. Furthermore, a prisoner who filed a lawsuit in Federal court will have to pay at least a nominal filing fee if he has sufficient assets.

For too long the Federal courts have entertained meritless claims by inmates, and have imposed unreasonable and unnecessary burdens on State and local correctional authorities. As a consequence, taxpayers' resources have been wasted, and efforts to protect the public safety have been compromised. It's time we restored some balance and common sense to the judiciary's handling of prison litigation.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions in this conference report which reform prison litigation are desperately needed. I urge my colleagues to pass the report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, who is the nicest guy that has ever run through a rotten bill. It is a wonderful feat. Everybody brags about him, but the bill stinks, thank you very much.

The President is going to veto the measure. He has told us that over and over and over again. Even a Republican Attorney General came before the Senate and told them that the provisions dealing with terminating all consent decrees is unconstitutional, we do not need an ex-Republican Attorney General to find that out, and that it would not stand constitutional muster. It never got changed.

What about the most authorizing on an appropriation that has happened this year? It happened in this nice chairman's bill here that is loaded with judicial matters.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations conference report. This conference report improperly includes substantive legislative provisions regarding prison litigation reform and truth in sentencing. In addition, the bill severely cuts funding for both drug courts and the President's Cops on the Beat Program. We cannot incarcerate ourselves out of crime.

None of these provisions belong in an appropriations bill. These are matters clearly within the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee and I am distressed that the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction has been subverted in this way.

The prison litigation reform provisions are problematic for several reasons. First, these provisions would have an enormous, negative fiscal impact on the Federal judiciary. According to the Administrative Office of Courts, requiring the Federal judiciary to hold a trial in every future prison conditions case and in every case that is currently operating under a consent decree, and requiring that such a hearing be held every 2 years thereafter could cost \$239 million annually and require the hiring of 2,096 new personnel. Notwithstanding this price tag, the bill does not appropriate any funds for the Federal judiciary to offset these costs.

Second, the provisions would render emergency relief ineffective. Preliminary injunctions would mandatorily terminate 90 days after entry unless the court made the injunction final within the 90-day period. It is virtually impossible for the parties to complete discovery and for the court to complete a trial and issue a decision within 90 days. Preliminary injunctions are designed to address emergencies, often involving life and death situations that warrant attention in advance of the time that is required to conduct a full-blown trial.

Termination of a preliminary injunction, without attention to whether there is good cause for the injunction to remain in effect, and without allowing adequate time for the parties to conduct discovery and the court to hold a trial would deprive a court of the power to prevent a defendant from returning to life threatening practices. Federal courts would be prevented from issuing any relief in prison or jail conditions cases without a finding of a violation of law, effectively prohibiting court-enforceable settlement agreements.

Third, the provisions would require a court to terminate relief, upon motion of either party, 2 years after issuance or 2 year's after the Act's enactment unless the court holds a trial and finds an ongoing violation of law. In effect, this would legislatively authorize defendants to revert to practices that run afoul of the Constitution or Federal statutes without consequence until the court could conduct a trial and reissue relief. This provision also fails to take into account the fact that changing systemic problems often takes years.

Fourth, the bill would prevent the Federal courts from remedying egregious abuses suffered by prisoners. The provisions in the bill would apply to all prisoner initiated lawsuits, not merely frivolous lawsuits. Thus lawsuits seeking to enjoin the rape of juvenile and female prisoners by prison guards, suits to en-

join sadistic beating of prisoners, and the failure to provide prisoners with minimally adequate medical care would all be prevented by this legislation.

Finally, the prison litigation reform provisions are unconstitutional as written. Witnesses called by both sides at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing this past July agreed that changes were necessary before the bill could pass constitutional muster.

For example, former Attorney General William Barr, who testified in support of the general principles behind the bill, testified that the termination of all existing consent decrees is unconstitutional. The changes suggested by the witnesses to make the bill constitutional are not reflected in the current language.

The truth in sentencing provisions in the conference report are also troubling. Current law evenly distributes funding for prisons. But under the new provisions in this bill, some states will totally be denied funding and states that make only modest improvements in relatively weak sentencing schemes will be highly favored over states with long-standing, tougher policies. Moreover, funds will be unfairly and irrationally allocated among the states so that low population states with relatively little violent crime will often get the same funding as high population states with serious violent crime problems.

Finally, the conference report contains block grants for both the Cops on the Beat Program and the Drug Court Program. If states are given block grants for general law enforcement purposes rather than given money to be spent on hiring more police officers, the President will not be able to fulfill his pledge to put 100,000 more cops on the beat. Putting police officers on the streets, walking the beat, has proven effective. There is no reason to halt the funding for a program that has been shown to reduce crime and increase public confidence in police. Similar logic applies to the drug courts program. We should not stop funding programs that have been shown to reduce crime.

Because I object to this use of an appropriations bill as a way to subvert the Judiciary Committee's jurisdiction and because the bill contains provisions which are substantively harmful, I urge a no vote on the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK].

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

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of engaging the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who I think wrote an extraordinarily good bill, in a colloquy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that this bill is the first step toward eliminating the Department of Commerce. As Senator majority Leader DOLE said yesterday in a Wall Street Journal opinion page piece, and I quote: "We are firmly committed to eliminating the Commerce Department this year so that we may establish, in practice, the principle that wasteful programs and agencies no longer have permanent tenure in the Federal Government." I will be entering this article into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], am I correct in assuming the Commerce dismantling language must take place in the authorization process.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. Any legislation dealing with the reorganization of the Commerce Department must be addressed in the authorization process. We have certainly taken a first step in this bill by terminating the Advanced Technology Program and taking significant reductions in many Commerce agencies and individual programs.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

[From The Wall Street Journal, Dec. 5, 1995]

'REINVENT' COMMERCE DEPARTMENT OUT OF EXISTENCE

(By Bob Dole and Spencer Abraham)

The 1994 Republican landslide came about because we had a clear message that resonated with the American people: Government should be smaller, more local, less intrusive, and less costly. Our welfare and budget measures constitute large steps in the right direction. But to fulfill our mission we also must reduce the size of the federal government by eliminating programs that are unnecessary, duplicative and wasteful.

No agency fits this description better than the Commerce Department. The department's own inspector general calls it "a loose collection in more than 100 programs." The nonpartisan General Accounting Office notes that it shares its "missions with at least 71 federal departments, agencies, and offices." And this loose collection of ill-defined programs has no unifying purpose or goal. Former Commerce Secretary Robert Mosbacher notes that the department's is "nothing more than a hall closet where you throw in everything that you don't know what to do with." Even the president's own Office of Management and Budget acknowledged the department's lack of purpose by sending home 67% of Commerce's bureaucrats as "nonessential" during the recent government shutdown.

We are firmly committed to eliminating the Commerce Department this year so that we may establish, in practice, the principle that wasteful programs and agencies no longer have permanent tenure in the federal government. This is not to say that we can or should begin a wholesale dismantling of the federal government. But as a federal bureaucracy, the Commerce Department simply has no reason to exist.

Defenders of the Commerce Department contend that it has a clear purpose: to promote U.S. international trade. They claim that the department's trade advocacy and counseling efforts "returned * * * to the federal Treasury for every * * * in export promotion." According to this view, it is federal bureaucrats who secure foreign contacts for American businesses, thus holding the American economy together.

This is obviously not true. As former Clinton economic adviser Robert Shapiro of the Progressive Policy Institute says: "All you can do with [export promotion] is increase jobs for companies with the clout to get the subsidy. But that's at the expense of industries that don't have the clout. You're just shifting things around."

Many of the department's other programs are simply taxpayer subsidies for some of

America's biggest corporations. The U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration subsidizes tourism, while the Technology Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology subsidize corporate research. These programs take money from taxpayers and successful companies to fund bureaucrats' favorite companies and projects. And this comes at a heavy cost—the cost of employing 37,500 bureaucrats at an average salary of \$42,000. That's about \$10,000 more per year than the average Kansas or Michigan family earns.

In reality, most of the tens of thousands of bureaucrats in the vast Commerce Department building on Pennsylvania Avenue do nothing to promote U.S. trade. Some claim that the Commerce Department is required by our Constitution, because that document makes regulating commerce a federal function. But, in fact, about half of the department's \$3.6 billion budget is consumed by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the nation's weather and ocean mapping service. And while 19 federal agencies are charged with promoting U.S. exports, Commerce directs only 8% of federal spending toward trade promotion.

The Commerce Department's functions can be done without, or done more efficiently by other agencies, or the states, or the private sector. This does not mean, however, that we would or should terminate all the department's functions. Instead, after eliminating the umbrella organization and its bureaucracy, we would eliminate unneeded programs, transferring or privatizing programs that are necessary.

An example of a Commerce program that needs to be eliminated outright is the Economic Development Administration. At one point, 40% of the EDA's loans were in default, while economic assistance grants were being distributed to such affluent areas as Key Biscayne, Fla. Even when it is effective, the EDA duplicates the efforts of numerous other programs in other departments. Other programs that should be eliminated include the Technology Administration and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration. The latter outfit issues telecom grants; for example, it recently gave \$200,000 to HandsNet Inc., a California-based Internet service used by liberal lobbyists. The last thing our government should be paying for is lobbying aimed at making it spend more taxpayer dollars.

While those programs should be eliminated, others, like the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, should be moved to more appropriate agencies or to private institutions. For example, seafood inspection should be transferred to the Agriculture Department, which already carries out most food inspection programs. As for international trade programs, the bulk of these should be sent to a single, unified trade agency incorporating the existing U.S. Trade Representative's office.

This is the way to effectively "reinvent" government. Our Commerce Department elimination plan would save \$6 billion over seven years. By eliminating unnecessary programs and bureaucracies, like those now churning away within the Commerce Department, we can bring federal spending under control. And guess what? The really essential functions of government will be done more efficiently than ever before once the federal bureaucracy isn't wasting its time on so many unnecessary efforts.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee for helping us advance the cause to eliminate this unnecessary bureaucracy this year. May we assume that the chairman remains committed to dismantling the Department of Commerce, and that he will continue to work with us to do so in the authorization process this year?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, we have worked closely on these efforts this year, and I will continue to support the process that has been established.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] for her work on eliminating woman abuse. I wholeheartedly support her efforts.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill. I think it ought to be beaten. I am in favor of the motion to recommit that will be offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] to require the retention of the Cops on the Beat Program. The President has clearly indicated he will veto this bill if the Cops on the Beat Program is not restored.

This program is putting 26,000 cops in 175 communities all around the country, including 32 in my district. Forty-nine percent of the police agencies in communities under 50,000 people have applied for funding under the COPS Program. I think this indicates this is not just a program which is popular in urban areas. The Justice Department has requests for over 9,000 more to be funded right now. That, to me, indicates that communities are highly desirous of obtaining help under this bill.

I think the block grant program is a mistake. We have seen in the past outrageous examples of waste in that program. We do not want to repeat it. I urge Members to support the Skaggs motion to recommit.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] who has been very active on the block grant program.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate here about the COPS Program. I find it fascinating to hear it, and the block grant program and so on.

I think we are dealing here with a fundamental difference between Republicans and Democrats. We have been a long time in making this block grant program and in making our point about it. What we are doing with the COPS Program and with the prevention programs that were passed in the last Congress is we are consolidating

them into a \$10 billion block grant program, \$2 billion of which is in this bill for the first year over 5 years today before us as well as the authorization. What we are in the process of doing is saying to the cities and the counties, "You know best how to spend that money to fight crime." It makes a whole lot more sense to us.

□ 1745

Democrats on that side of the aisle want the same old business as usual up here that Washington knows best, and I do not think that is true. I think Spokane, WA knows better how to spend its money to fight crime and Charleston, SC knows better how to spend its money, and what is good for Spokane may not be good for Charleston.

The same thing is true for the COPS of the Street Program, which is what we are talking about. We are hearing about this bill being vetoed over that issue. I want to make the point that the choice is not between more police and block grants. The choice is between more police under the COPS Program versus more police at less cost to localities with greater flexibility under the block grant proposal.

Not one single cop that has been funded so far of the 26,000 would be lost or 1 year of funding under what we wrote that is in this bill. I do not care what the Justice Department says, I helped write the language, and I am very confident of that.

In addition to that, under your proposal, as you can see from this chart, the 74,000 more cops that the President is going to get under his plan over here under the 100,000 are easily going to be funded by the cities in making their choice over here, with only about a third of the block grant money. I am confident that is going to take place. I am confident because in one measure the President of the League of Cities wrote a letter to me yesterday that I want to introduce into the RECORD right here.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
Washington, DC, December 5, 1995.

Hon. BILL MCCOLLUM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal
Justice, Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing on behalf of the nation's 135,000 municipal elected leaders from cities and towns across the country to reaffirm our continued support for your leadership efforts to make the federal anti-crime partnership more efficient and effective in addressing local crime and violence. Rather than supplanting police officers, we believe your public safety block grant legislation would have the effect of enabling us at the local level to take initiatives to put more police officers on the street to enhance neighborhood safety.

Just this last week, more than 4,100 of our members met at our Congress of Cities in Phoenix and voted unanimously to adopt national municipal policy urging greater flexibility for municipal officials to take steps to address public safety in our communities. No level of government has a greater stake in federal anti-crime and safety efforts, so the response from our members—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—from cities

and towns of all sizes, reemphasizes our support for the positive steps you are taking to address the public safety needs of cities.

Our experience is that the kinds of approaches to and needs for public safety vary enormously from city to city, as do local resources. Consequently, we are apprehensive that any one-size-fits-all approach or one that requires a match irrespective of demands and local resources limits our ability and flexibility to meet local issues as effectively as possible. We are concerned that the debate between the existing cops program and your legislation is elevating form over substance.

We believe your legislation could lead to initiatives and programs that would put more, not less officers on the street than current law. It would permit cities to purchase equipment, to move trained personnel onto the streets, and to take other actions to insure more effective and efficient responses. Equally importantly, it is more balanced in meeting the needs of cities with disproportionately limited resources and higher crime and violence rates. These are critical issues to us.

Our members strongly believe that your proposal would make for a more effective and flexible partnership on one of the highest priorities of every municipal leader in America. We appreciate your efforts and look forward to positive action by the Congress.

Sincerely,

GREGORY S. LASHUTKA,
President, Mayor of Columbus.

It says, "We believe that your legislation could lead to initiatives and programs," talking about the block grants, "that would put more, not less, officers on the streets than current law. It would permit cities to purchase equipment, to move trained personnel onto the streets, and to take other actions to ensure more effective and efficient responses. Equally important, it is more balanced in meeting the needs of cities with disproportionately limited resources and higher crime and violence rates. These are critical to us."

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, cities and communities around this country with block grants are going to put more cops, more than 100,000, on the streets with this flexibility that they want. The police chief in Washington, DC, Chief Thomas, testifying before my subcommittee this summer, said in response to a question that Mr. Davis asked, "Would you prefer to put that money into technology as opposed to new officers at this point?" Chief Thomas responded, "Yes, I would. I think that is a better use of our dollars to improve the infrastructure in the department." The Washington Post said the block grant program is a better program.

My point is that we are dealing here now with an opportunity for us to get this clarification we need on the record. This is a form-over-substance thing for those who are opposing it.

The COPS Program is a good program. It is what the cities and communities want under the block grant system, not the President's proposal, but the block grant proposal that is in this bill that allows them maximum flexibility and gets more police officers, and the other is nonsense.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

[Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.]

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a Christmas gift to America's violent felons. Every gun-toting gang-banger, every ruthless drug lord, every violent carjacker on America's streets should celebrate tonight if this bill passes, because it will mean fewer cops on the street and fewer prison cells to put them away once the cops apprehend them. The report is so filled with bad ideas it ought to be called the "Soft-On-Violent-Criminals Act."

Here are just three of the worst ideas: First, it kills the COPS Program, as has been mentioned. Every major police organization in America opposes this bill because they know it will mean fewer cops. They know it will give money to mayors and governors and all sorts of politicians to do what they want with it, not to put cops on the street.

Now the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] defends the block grant program, and he is my friend and I respect him. Let us hear what NEWT GINGRICH said about the block grant program. He said, this is Speaker GINGRICH, the exalted leader, the man who brought you to the Promised Land. He said

If they say to me, in the name of fighting crime, will I send a \$2 billion check to the cities, many of which have destructive bureaucracies, to let the local politicians build a bigger machine with more patronage, my answer is no. What I cannot defend is sending a blank check to local politicians across the country for them to decide how to spend it.

The last time we did a block grant, a small town in Louisiana bought a tank. The Governor of Indiana bought a jet plane. A study was even financed to figure out why inmates want to escape from prison.

And to boot, 23 States will get less money to build prisons under the Republican proposal. Your State is probably on the list. Take a look when we come to the door.

Less money for cops, less money for prisons. It just does not make any sense. And instead, a giant pork barrel that says to governors and mayors: put your brother-in-law on the payroll, buy useless equipment, do not put cops on the street.

This bill, simply because COPS was originally an idea of Democrats, simply because Democrats wanted to get tough on crime, came about as an alternative. It is a weak alternative. The President should veto it, and then we should support law enforcement, support prisons, support cops, and put a better bill together. I strongly urge a vote against this wasteful, soft-on-crime proposal.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman portrays the idea that the COPS Program put more policemen on the beat than the local block grant will. Nothing could be further from the truth. If you want to know the answer to the question of which is best for our communities, let me refer you, gentleman, to the mayor of Columbus, OH, who happens to be the president of the National League of Cities who wrote a letter just yesterday to us, and I will submit it for the RECORD.

He says, and we have lifted this portion from the letter: "We believe your legislation," the block grant program, "could lead to initiatives and programs that would put more, not less, officers on the street than current law. It would permit cities to purchase equipment, to move trained personnel onto the streets, and to take other actions to ensure more effective and efficient responses. Equally important, it is more balanced in meeting the needs of cities with disproportionately limited resources and higher crime and violence rates. These are critical issues to us." So says the mayor of Columbus, OH, and so says the League of Cities of the United States of America.

The National Association of Chiefs of Police, the people who have to enforce our laws, says, please give us the block grant program. We need cops, yes. We also need bulletproof vests for those cops. We need police cars. We need radios, we need equipment. Let us decide where to put the money. Do not tell us from Washington with your cookie-cutter approach, one-size-fits-all, do not tell us what we need. Give us the money to fight crime in our cities, do not tell us how to use it.

So we say to you, support this bill, reject the motion to recommit, and let us put those cops on the beat as the cities and communities want them. Vote against the motion to recommit and support the conference report.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES,
Washington, DC,

Hon. BILL MCCOLLUM,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing on behalf of the nation's 135,000 municipal elected leaders from cities and towns across the country to reaffirm our continued support for your leadership efforts to make the federal anti-crime partnership more efficient and effective in addressing local crime and violence. Rather than supplanting police officers, we believe your public safety block grant legislation would have the effect of enabling us at the local level to take initiatives to put more police officers on the street to enhance neighborhood safety.

Just this last week, more than 4,100 of our members met at our Congress of Cities in Phoenix and voted unanimously to adopt national municipal policy urging greater flexibility for municipal officials to take steps to address public safety in our communities. No level of government has a greater stake in federal anti-crime and safety efforts, so the response from our members—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents—from cities and towns of all sizes, reemphasizes our support for the positive steps you are taking to address the public safety needs of cities.

Our experience is that the kinds of approaches to and needs for public safety vary enormously from city to city, as do local resources. Consequently, we are apprehensive that any one-size-fits-all approach or one that requires a match irrespective of demands and local resources limits our ability and flexibility to meet local issues as effectively as possible. We are concerned that the debate between the existing cops program and your legislation is elevating form over substance.

We believe your legislation could lead to initiatives and programs that would put more, not less officers on the street than current law. It would permit cities to purchase equipment, to move trained personnel onto the streets, and to take other actions to insure more effective and efficient responses. Equally importantly, it is more balanced in meeting the needs of cities with disproportionately limited resources and higher crime and violence rates. These are critical issues to us.

Our members strongly believe that your proposal would make for a more effective and flexible partnership on one of the highest priorities of every municipal leader in America. We appreciate your efforts and look forward to positive action by the Congress.

Sincerely,

GREGORY S. LASHUTKA,
President, Mayor of Columbus.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, now is not the time to terminate this successful COPS Program.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the COPS Program, and in opposition to H.R. 2076.

The American people are demanding tough and effective solutions to our Nation's crime problem. That's why Congress passed the most sweeping crime bill in U.S. history last year. That important legislation created the COPS Program, which is already making our streets safer by putting more than 25,000 new police officers on American streets in its first year.

In my district alone, the COPS Program has provided funding for almost two dozen new officers to patrol the streets of Marin and Sonoma Counties. These officers are helping to protect my constituents from violent criminals, and officers like them are sharply reducing crime rates throughout the country.

Now, just as we are beginning to see a significant reduction in crime, the other side wants to take thousands of officers off our streets and leave local communities without adequate police protection. This legislation will put the American people at risk by eliminating the COPS Program and slashing funding for crucial crime prevention efforts.

Now is not the time to be terminating successful anticrime initiatives like the COPS Program. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit, and to vote against this misguided bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I also place in the RECORD a letter from the United States Conference of Mayors opposing this.

The Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report cuts 12 percent from the administration's request. This report eliminates the successful Cops-on-the-Beat Program and replaces it with a block grant to States. We do not know that this block grant will provide more police on our streets, it could be used for many other purposes.

In my district in Houston, our Mayor Lanier and Police Chief Nuchia have used the Cops-on-the-Beat to add 376 more police officers on the streets of Houston. It is a success and yet the Congress wants to kill it—I hope President Clinton vetoes this bill because we need to keep these 376 police officers on our Houston streets—not have them lost in the bureaucracy.

THE UNITED STATES
CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,

Washington, DC, December 6, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,

Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Crime, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SCHUMER: As the Subcommittee on Crime begins an oversight hearing on the COPS program, I am writing to apprise you of the strong support of The U.S. Conference of Mayors for the program. We worked very hard with Congress and the Administration last year to see the program enacted into law. The U.S. Department of Justice, and the COPS Office in particular, have worked very hard since then to implement it in a quick and effective fashion, and it has already begun to make a difference on the streets of our cities. They have been extremely responsive to the needs and requests of our cities.

We are aware that there are proposals in Congress to change the COPS program into a block grant and that, in fact, the conference agreement on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill would substitute the block grant for FY96. We believe that changing the program at this time would be a mistake. Cities have allocated money and personnel to the program and have budgeted for the future with the COPS program in mind. While a block grant is quite tempting, we have a program on hand which is working. We are concerned that changing the program at this time would represent bad public policy and could jeopardize some of the progress we have made in our cities to prevent and control crime.

Change now also seems premature since the Subcommittee is just now holding an oversight hearing. We recommend that Congress examine the program's effectiveness through the oversight process before considering changes in it.

At the annual meeting of The U.S. Conference of Mayors last June we adopted a policy resolution which reiterated our continuing support for the COPS program and called on Congress to provide full funding for it in the future. We urge you to help us see this happen.

Sincerely,

WELLINGTON WEBB,
Mayor of Denver,

Chair, Criminal and Social Justice Committee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], chairman of the Treasury, Postal Service Appropriations Subcommittee has expressed his concerns to me regarding the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Forces. As the gentleman from Iowa and I both know, there has been a

long history of cooperation between the Treasury and Justice Departments on the Organized Crime and Drug Enforcement Task Forces [OCDEF], with nearly a third of the assigned agents coming from Treasury agencies. These task forces have been successful in part because of Treasury's specialized expertise in money laundering, financial crime, tax law and other matters. Treasury's expertise is particularly critical in drug racketeering cases, and can often clinch a case for a jury and make the difference between a conviction and an acquittal. The appropriation for these task forces has been reduced \$15 million below the House level. As indicated in the Statement of Managers, the conferees intend that reductions be made proportionately among all law enforcement agencies, not just from Treasury and the Coast Guard, based on each agency's task force requirements and participation. The conferees will work to ensure funds are distributed fairly, and have required Justice to report back to the committee on the allocation of these funds.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Programs for fiscal year 1996. This bill will cripple many of our Nation's most important governmental functions so that the interests of the American people will not be well served.

Excluding the money from the violent crime control trust fund, established in the 1994 Crime Control Act (Public Law 103-322), this bill appropriates 13 percent less than requested by the Clinton administration. This legislation cuts the State Department by 9 percent and the Commerce Department by 15 percent.

In addition to these overall reductions, the conference report also eliminates funding for many governmental programs that have proven to be excellent investments of Federal dollars. The conference report on H.R. 2076 eliminates the advanced technology program that has created thousands of jobs across this Nation. The bill also eliminates the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, which provides assistance to one of America's fastest growing industries, an industry that provides jobs to millions of Americans.

In the Justice portion of the bill, the committee has failed to follow through with the President's unprecedented efforts to fight crime. The bill provides for \$281 million less than requested by the Clinton administration for the Department of Justice. This substantial cut in crime fighting dollars for many programs that would have played an essential role in our efforts to make our citizens safer is short sighted and dangerous.

Crime control measures supported by the administration to prevent crime, hire more police officers and fight the scourge of drugs will be substantially cut or eliminated in this conference report. The report would slash funding for the highly successful and popular cops program that responds to the public's desire for an increased police presence in our communities. As a result of the cuts in this legislation, the hiring of new police officers under the cops grant program would be ended, and instead, a Republican local law enforcement block grant program would replace mechanisms set up in the 1994 crime bill to fund local crime fighting.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for the Department of Commerce is a devastating \$1.3 billion—27 percent—below the total requested by the administration. The conference report hampers our Government's efforts to promote economic development and technology advancement. As a result of the draconian cuts to the Department of Commerce, the Economic Development Administration originally targeted for elimination would survive, but would be cut by over 21 percent. In addition, the National Institute of Standards and Technology would be drastically cut by over 60 percent. This program includes the successful manufacturing extension partnership program that has helped our Nation's industries create jobs for thousands of Americans.

Economic opportunities for women and minorities will also be substantially curtailed by the legislation we are considering today. The minority business development agency will be cut by over 33 percent. This irresponsible and unjust slashing of the budget for this important agency will lead to the foreclosing of economic opportunities for thousands of Americans who must also endure the ravages of systematic discrimination.

Next, the Legal Services Corporation, that provides vital legal assistance to poor Americans who cannot afford an attorney, has also been targeted for substantial cuts. In addition to cutting the budget for the Legal Services Corporation by a staggering 37 percent, this appropriations bill prohibits attorneys from receiving Federal assistance when representing illegal aliens, initiating class action suits or participating in litigation involving prisoners or abortions. There are few more sacred rights possessed by Americans than their right to seek redress in the courts. This attack on the Legal Services Corporation is yet another attempt by the new Republican majority to weaken programs which are politically unpopular with conservatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to add that the attempt by the majority to curtail essential governmental services to the American public is clearly inappropriate. This action circumvents the appropriate authorizing committees that should consider the proposed elimination or weakening of so many important laws. With limited opportunity for debate and hearings, this "legislation" in an appropriations bill is clearly an unjustifiable circumvention of the procedures of the U.S. House of Representatives. This attempt to short circuit the process can only have one result: The compromise of vital services affecting the poor, minorities, women, and Americans overall.

It is my belief that the conference report for H.R. 2076 and the circumstances under which it is presented in this House is an attempt to mislead the American people to believe that simplistic solutions will cure what ails this Nation. Nothing could be further from the truth. As our Nation faces an epidemic of crime, discrimination and poverty, the solution to these problems will not be found in quick fixes by slashing programs unpopular with the Republican majority. The American people elected us to act in their best interest, not compromise their welfare because Government refuses to have the courage to meet its obligations to all of its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would again like to express my opposition to the misguided priorities this bill represents. I strongly encourage all of my colleagues to vote against the conference report on H.R. 2076.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, let me first applaud Chairman ROGERS, the Committee, and the Committee staff for their extraordinary efforts in producing this fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary appropriations bill. Furthermore, I would like to acknowledge the Committee's support for initiatives under the National Institute on Justice [NIJ] account, and in particular the language that encourages the NIJ to undertake a national study on correctional health care.

This language carries a considerable amount of importance to our Nation's criminal justice system and not-for-profit organizations devoted to assisting states with correctional health care programs. For example, in North Carolina, the National Commission on Correctional Health Care has been working with health and correctional officials in an effort to stem escalating costs and other problems associated with correctional health care. Understanding the potential health risk associated with the more than 11 million persons that are released from jails, prisons, and juvenile correctional facilities annually, the National Commission assists correctional and public health officials throughout the country with correctional health care concerns. As we look to advance the efforts that provide data relevant to crime and the criminal justice system at NIJ, efforts like that of the National Commission should be encouraged.

I thank Chairman ROGERS for his support on this matter, and I urge the committee's continued support for activities related to the National Commission and correctional health care.

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a former Federal prosecutor to discuss a topic that unfortunately, directly impact so many of our constituents.

Crime in this country has reached epidemic proportions, and it is time this body got serious about restoring the rule of law to our society.

Today 8 out of every 10 Americans can expect to be the victim of a violent crime at least once in their lives.

Indeed, the fight against crime engages us in a struggle that affects the very core and future of American society.

As the 104th Congress joins in this fight, I urge all of my colleagues to support the conference report before us today.

It allocates to this battle a very significant amount of money in a very sensible way.

It takes us away from the Washington-knows-best of the 103rd Congress, and sends decision making back to the local law enforcement agencies.

I congratulate my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for following through on the Judiciary Committee's fine work, and look forward to supporting this conference report.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations conference report includes \$11.75 million for the East-West Center in Honolulu, HI.

The brain child of President Lyndon B. Johnson, the East-West Center has been dedicated to improving the mutual understanding and cooperation among the governments and peoples of the Asia-Pacific region for 35 years. The Center, established in 1960, helps prepare the United States for constructive involvement in Asia and the Pacific through education, dialog, research and outreach.

Over 35,000 Americans, Asians and Pacific Islanders from over 60 nations and territories have participated in the East-West Center's educational, research and conference programs. Presidents, prime ministers, ambassadors and distinguished scholars and statesmen from all parts of the region have used the Center as a forum to advance international cooperation.

Among, its most important functions is its graduate program which brings together students from all over the United States and the Asia-Pacific region to study specific issues related to the Asian Pacific region and develop through personal contact mutual understanding and cooperation among the Asia-Pacific nations, including the United States. Most of these students go on to assume positions in government, business, the media and academia in their respective countries and utilize their experience at the East-West center to shape policy and foster understanding among Asia-Pacific nations.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when we face unparalleled challenges in Asia and the Pacific continuing the work of the center is more important now than ever. I am pleased that the conference committee affirmed the important role of the East-West center by continuing Federal support.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations bill which provides needed funds to the states, especially my state of California, to pay for the costs of illegal immigrants. The decision by Judge Mariana Pfaelzer to strike many important portions of the vote-passed Proposition 187, which had eliminated state support for illegal aliens, stresses the need for this Congress to respond to the growing problem of illegal immigration. Judge Pfaelzer ruled that illegal immigration was a federal problem requiring a federal solution. While this is not the ultimate or best solution, it certainly is an acceptable interim step.

H.R. 2076 would provide \$500 million to lift from the backs of state taxpayers the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrant felons. In addition, this important appropriations measure would provide for an additional \$300 million to fight the problem of illegal immigration at the border.

While not in this specific Conference Report, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that the Balanced Budget Act passed by Congress also provides \$3.5 billion for assisting the states with the cost of emergency health care for illegal immigrants. This is an important initiative about which Speaker GINGRICH and I first announced a month ago in Yorba Linda in my district. The people of California are strongly in favor of this needed reimbursement and rightly deserve it.

I ask my colleagues, especially those who represent districts equally affected by the problem of illegal immigration, to support the passage of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. EMERSON]. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. SKAGGS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SKAGGS moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2076 (H. Rept. 104-378) to the committee of the conference report with the instruction that within the scope of the differences committed to them, that the managers on the part of the House insist that the funds intended for community policing from within the \$1,903,000,000 provided under the heading "Violent Crime Reduction Programs, State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance" for Local Law Enforcement Black Grants, pursuant to H.R. 728 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995, in the conference substitute be provided instead pursuant to the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing provisions of title I of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 for which the Senate amendment provided funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, 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 SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 190, nays 231, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 840]

YEAS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch

Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee

Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Klecicka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge

Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn

Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabó
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak

NAYS—231

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehler
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combust
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Creameans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan

Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery

Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torrice
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Vislosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schafer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton

Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp

NOT VOTING—11

Chapman
DeFazio
Fowler
Jefferson

Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White

Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1816

Messrs. DELAY, POMBO, and NEUMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. NADLER, CRAMER, and BEVILL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7, rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 166, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 841]

YEAS—256

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bevill
Bilbray
Billrakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Christensen
Chryslers
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal

DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke

Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCreary
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt

Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gepjardson
Gephardt
Gibbons

Chapman
Clayton
DeFazio
Fowler

Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)

NAYS—166

Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinckey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Loggren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens

NOT VOTING—10

Jefferson
Ros-Lehtinen
Tucker
Volkmer

Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Visclosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099,
DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS
AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPRO-
PRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LEWIS of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2099) 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, 1996, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-384)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2099) "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, 1996, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 14, 20, 24, 43, 62, 67, 75, 82, 86, 87, 89, 90, 91, 92, 98, 111, 112, and 116.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered, 6, 7, 10, 11, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 64, 69, 73, 78, 79, 84, 85, 88, 93, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 103, 106, 107, 108, 113, and 115, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *\$16,564,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *\$848,143,000*: *Provided, That of the amount appropriated and any other funds made available from any other source for activities funded under this heading, except reimbursements, not to exceed \$214,109,000 shall be available for General Administration; including not to exceed (1) \$2,450,000 for personnel compensation and benefits and \$50,000 for travel in the Office of the Secretary, (2) \$4,392,000 for personnel compensation and benefits and \$75,000 for travel in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning, (3) \$1,980,000 for personnel compensation and benefits and \$33,000 for travel in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Affairs, and (4) \$3,500,000 for personnel compensation and benefits and \$100,000 for travel in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs: Provided further, That during fiscal year 1996, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the number*

□ 1832

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.