

Bentsen	Hamilton	Owens
Berman	Harman	Pallone
Bevill	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bishop	Hayes	Payne (NJ)
Bonior	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Borski	Hilliard	Pelosi
Boucher	Hinchey	Peterson (FL)
Brewster	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Browder	Hoyer	Pickett
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Poshard
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Rahall
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
Chapman	Johnston	Rivers
Clay	Kanjorski	Roemer
Clayton	Kaptur	Rose
Clement	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Coleman	Kennelly	Sabo
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Sanders
Condit	Kleczka	Sawyer
Conyers	Klink	Schroeder
Costello	LaFalce	Schumer
Coyne	Lantos	Scott
Cramer	Levin	Serrano
Danner	Lewis (GA)	Sisisky
de la Garza	Lincoln	Skaggs
DeFazio	Lipinski	Skelton
DeLauro	Lofgren	Slaughter
Dellums	Lowe	Spratt
Deutsch	Luther	Stark
Dicks	Maloney	Stenholm
Dingell	Manton	Stokes
Dixon	Markey	Studds
Doggett	Martinez	Stupak
Dooley	Mascara	Tanner
Doyle	Matsui	Tauzin
Durbin	McCarthy	Taylor (MS)
Edwards	McDermott	Tejeda
Engel	McHale	Thompson
Eshoo	McKinney	Thornton
Evans	McNulty	Thurman
Farr	Meehan	Torres
Fattah	Meek	Torricelli
Fazio	Menendez	Towns
Fields (LA)	Mfume	Tucker
Filner	Miller (CA)	Velázquez
Flake	Mineta	Vento
Foglietta	Minge	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Mink	Volkmer
Frost	Mollohan	Ward
Furse	Montgomery	Waters
Gejdenson	Moran	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Murtha	Waxman
Geren	Nadler	Williams
Gibbons	Neal	Wilson
Gonzalez	Oberstar	Wise
Gordon	Obey	Woolsey
Gutierrez	Olver	Wyden
Hall (OH)	Ortiz	Wynn
Hall (TX)	Orton	Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Brown (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Collins (MI)	Moakley	Waldholtz
Ford	Rangel	
Green	Reynolds	

□ 1139

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. REED, Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NEY, and Mr. PORTMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Member may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 190 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2020.

□ 1140

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

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

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present H.R. 2020, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Treasury, the Executive Office of the President, General Services Administration, and various independent agencies for fiscal year 1996. The bill being considered today was given a very appropriate number, H.R. 2020.

□ 1145

We call it a bill with vision, starting with a strong vision for a future free of debt and deficits. This bill cuts \$403 million in real spending from 1995 enacted levels, and that is 3 percent less than last year.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of points I would like to make about the spending portion of the bill that I think may be of interest to some Members.

There are claims that this bill is over 1995 by \$401 million in budget author-

ity. That number has been shown in various charts and reflects a comparison of H.R. 2020 to 1995 assuming enactment of the rescission supplemental. The reason this number looks so high is quite simple. H.R. 1944 includes a rescission of \$580 million from GSA's Federal Building Fund. As the number for 1995 comes down, the number for 1996 simply looks bigger.

The fact is, the bill is actually a cut in outlays, and that is a real cut in spending by about \$403 million. There seems to be a lack of understanding or misunderstanding about the difference between budget authority and outlays among some of our colleagues, particularly some of our newer Members. The fact is, outlays are the money that is spent. It is quite simple. If you can cut outlays, you cut actual spending. We are cutting \$403 million in actual spending; these are dollars that will not be spent. That is the number that counts in deficit reduction, not budget authority, because budget authority is simply authority to spend the money. Until you spend it, it does not really count for anything.

As a result, I would like to remind my colleagues the bill is within its section 602(b) allocation in both budget authority and outlays and there are no Budget Act points of order against consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I will insert a table in the RECORD that compares the bill by account to the amounts appropriated in 1995 and the amounts requested by the President. I would urge my colleagues to look at this chart because, if they review it, I think they will see that each proposed spending level by program is below the 1995 level in every single instance, except for crimes, parts of IRS, and law enforcement activities.

I also would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and members of our subcommittee, for their work in helping us put this package together. I think it is important to note that about 90 percent of our budget was off limits. We could not touch it because it supports salaries and fixed expenses. We had to make our contributions to deficit reduction using only 10 percent of our allocation. The 602(b) number that we received was a tough one, and we had to make some tough decisions in the process. I think that will be reflected in the bill if people will take time to study and go through it.

Again I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] as well as the other subcommittee Members for their cooperation, and also the great work our staff has done in working through this very difficult bill.

As reported, H.R. 2020 also has a vision of change for programs that are under our jurisdiction. One that requires agencies and activities to tighten their belts, to think better and smarter, and to use their resources more wisely. That vision includes the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan measure, despite some attempts being made to label it so. We have had a lot of years of runaway spending in this body, and, as a result, everyone has shared in the wealth over the years. Unfortunately, that has brought us to the point we are at today, where everyone is going to have to share in the pain of cutting back. That includes the Executive Office of the President as well.

The facts speak for themselves. We held 42 hearings over a three month period, including a week's interruption. We heard from 174 witnesses, including members of the administration, the private sector, and Members of Congress. Everyone was given an opportunity to justify their requests for resources in the upcoming fiscal year.

I would also say that, today, Members have had more than adequate time to take a look at what is in our package. After subcommittee markup, it laid out there for almost a week. I shared it with Mr. HOYER and our colleagues on the minority side several days before we went to subcommittee markup. The full committee markup has been available now for over a week. And if people are running in here at the last minute, I would say maybe we should take a look at some of the staff work that is not being done by Members on both sides who are calling at the last minute saying "We didn't know this." There is no excuse. It has been out there a long time and there has been enough time for people to take a look at it.

In preparing this package, we scrubbed the numbers, we looked at what was being requested, we looked at agency accomplishments, their goals, and their plans for the future because that is an important part of the process. We separated out programs that were merely those that were wanted from programs that were truly needed. After doing that, we sat down and wrote the bill.

First and foremost, H.R. 2020 outright terminates agencies and programs that have outlived their useful-

ness, that produce work that can be accomplished by others parts of the government or private sector, or simply have a place in a leaner and stronger government.

In many cases we found duplication. Where we found duplication, one of those duplicates departed. We successfully terminated four agencies as a result of that process, for first year savings of \$7.7 million and 5-year savings of \$40.8 million. Those four agencies are gone, nada, zero. They are zeroed out. They don't exist anymore. There is nothing partisan about it. Not even the termination of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Chairman, to my critics who claim that we are being partisan, I would simply say, think again. As we prepared the bill, I did not sit down and ponder what would be a strong partisan statement. I do not view myself as a partisan individual. I spent my time a bit more constructively, and simply produced and pondered on what could be and should be good Government. Then we sat down and made the mark.

I will challenge my critics who say this bill goes too far as we debate H.R. 2020 here today on the floor. Ironically, H.R. 2020 is also being criticized by those who believe it does not go far enough.

That is right. On the first hand we are being criticized for going too far, and on the second hand, the measure is being criticized for not going far enough. We have a lot of people angry, so that probably tells us we probably have a pretty good bill. If we have everyone upset on all sides, it may be because we are in the mode of making cuts.

But to our critics who say we have not gone far enough, I would simply say to them, stop and think. We need to be smart about the process.

This is a first step in a multiyear process, the bill we will consider today. We have taken programs, we have merged their activities, and started a serious downsizing. Rome was not built in a day, nor did it burn down in a day. I think it took 3 or 4, if I recall history

correctly, and the Federal Government cannot stop in its tracks overnight.

It is a big train, and it has been moving for a lot of years, and it cannot be stopped simply by throwing a brick wall up in front of it. If we are going to avoid a crash, what we have to do is apply the brakes in a very slow, a very deliberate, and a very positive manner, to bring this runaway freight train under control.

I remind my colleagues that the programs and accounts funded in this bill serve specific constituencies and meet specific statutory requirements. Public law requires us to do and fund certain activities, the very activities that are funded in this bill.

I would caution my colleagues who think this bill does not go far enough. Not all of our vision for change can be achieved in a year or a single appropriations bill. It takes longer than that. We have, I think, some well thought out plans to achieve a balanced budget over a period of 7 years, and you have to go about that in a very deliberate fashion. This is step one out of six more steps to go in order to get there.

So I urge my colleagues to support the measure. This measure, with 20/20 vision, a healthy vision for agencies under our jurisdiction, and a bill with a vision for a future free of deficits for our children and our grandchildren.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the primary rule that we applied in looking at everything that was in this particular package was the notion that there is a great difference between wanting something and actually needing it. In a case where it was determined that an item was merely wanted, it has been downsized or terminated. In a case where it is a need item, we looked very carefully at the needs. In some cases there are slight increases, particularly in the area of the Secret Service, which is faced with an election cycle with security at the Olympics that are coming up at Atlanta. We tried to use some common sense in putting this thing together, and I very strongly urge my colleagues to support the package.

**FY 1996 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government
Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2020)**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY					
Departmental Offices.....	104,379,000	120,408,000	104,000,500	-378,500	-16,407,500
Office of Inspector General.....	39,700,000	31,884,000	29,319,000	-381,000	-2,545,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	18,823,000	22,198,000	20,273,000	+450,000	-1,925,000
Treasury Forfeiture Fund (limitation on availability of deposits).....	15,000,000	15,000,000		-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	58,813,000	35,828,000	38,070,000	-22,743,000	+242,000
Transfers of unobligated balances.....		(11,600,000)			(-11,600,000)
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses.....	5,515,000	8,183,000	8,183,000	+2,348,000	
Transfer to Salaries and Expenses.....		(-11,600,000)			(+11,600,000)
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....	64,828,000	43,991,000	44,233,000	-20,395,000	+242,000
Foreign Law Enforcement.....		14,480,000			-14,480,000
Financial Management Service.....	183,729,000	189,259,000	181,837,000	-1,892,000	-7,422,000
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	420,136,000	400,885,000	381,035,000	-39,103,000	-8,850,000
United States Customs Service:					
Salaries and Expenses.....	1,395,793,000	1,381,550,000	1,388,829,000	-6,984,000	+8,279,000
(By transfer).....	(13,200,000)			(-13,200,000)	
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection.....		3,000,000	3,000,000	+3,000,000	
Operation and Maintenance, Air & Marine Interdiction Programs.....	89,041,000	80,993,000	80,993,000	-28,048,000	
Unobligated balances carried forward (non-add).....		(18,733,000)	(18,733,000)	(+18,733,000)	
Customs Facilities, Construction, Improvements and Related Expenses.....	1,000,000			-1,000,000	
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected).....	1,408,000	1,408,000	1,408,000		
Total, United States Customs Service.....	1,487,240,000	1,448,948,000	1,465,228,000	-32,012,000	+8,279,000
United States Mint.....	55,740,000	58,261,000		-55,740,000	-58,261,000
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	183,458,000	178,885,000	170,000,000	-13,458,000	-8,885,000
Payment of Government Losses in Shipment.....	800,000	800,000	800,000		
Internal Revenue Service:					
Administration and Management.....	225,832,000			-225,832,000	
Processing, Assistance, and Management.....	1,511,288,000	1,805,042,000	1,882,742,000	+171,478,000	-122,300,000
Tax Law Enforcement.....	4,385,458,000	4,524,361,000	4,254,478,000	-130,883,000	-269,875,000
Information Systems.....	1,386,510,000	1,878,882,000	1,575,218,000	+188,708,000	-304,368,000
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	7,508,887,000	8,208,875,000	7,512,434,000	+3,567,000	-696,541,000
United States Secret Service.....	483,808,000	541,258,000	542,481,000	+58,655,000	+1,203,000
Violent Crime Reduction Programs:					
Departmental Offices.....	2,400,000	4,850,000		-2,400,000	-4,850,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	2,700,000	2,221,000	2,221,000	-479,000	
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms.....	7,000,000	25,305,000	3,100,000	-3,800,000	-22,205,000
Gang Resistance Education and Training: Grants.....	8,000,000	7,200,000	12,200,000	+3,200,000	+5,000,000
United States Customs Service.....	4,000,000	4,885,000	33,885,000	+29,885,000	+29,180,000
Internal Revenue Service: Tax Law Enforcement.....	7,000,000	19,048,000		-7,000,000	-19,048,000
United States Secret Service.....	6,800,000	9,800,000	10,000,000	+3,400,000	+200,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.....		5,080,000	2,500,000	+2,500,000	-2,580,000
Total, Violent Crime Reduction Programs.....	38,700,000	78,200,000	63,888,000	+25,188,000	-14,314,000
Procurement reform.....	-33,437,000			+33,437,000	
Total, Title I, Department of the Treasury.....	10,582,071,000	11,349,203,000	10,515,208,500	-46,864,500	-833,868,500
TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	82,317,000	109,094,000	85,080,000	-7,237,000	-24,014,000
Payment to the Postal Service Fund for Nonfunded Liabilities.....	37,778,000	36,828,000	36,828,000	-948,000	
Total, Title II, Postal Service.....	130,093,000	145,922,000	121,908,000	-8,185,000	-24,014,000
TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Compensation of the President.....	250,000	250,000	250,000		
The White House Office.....	40,022,000	40,183,000	39,458,000	-563,000	-734,000
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating Expenses.....	7,827,000	7,827,000	7,822,000	-305,000	-305,000
White House Repair and Restoration.....		2,200,000			-2,200,000
Official Residence of the Vice President.....	324,000	324,000	324,000		
Special Assistance to the President.....	3,280,000	3,280,000	3,175,000	-105,000	-105,000
Council of Economic Advisors.....	3,439,000	3,439,000		-3,439,000	-3,439,000
Office of Policy Development.....	5,058,000	3,867,000	3,867,000	-1,191,000	
National Security Council.....	6,848,000	6,848,000	6,499,000	-189,000	-189,000
Office of Administration.....	26,217,000	26,100,000	25,736,000	-481,000	-384,000
Procurement reform.....	-117,000			+117,000	
Office of Management and Budget.....	57,754,000	56,272,000	55,438,000	-2,326,000	-846,000
Office of National Drug Control Policy.....	9,942,000	9,942,000	20,082,000	+10,120,000	+10,120,000
Unanticipated Needs.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000		

**FY 1996 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government
Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2020)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Federal Drug Control Programs:					
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program	107,000,000	110,000,000	104,000,000	-3,000,000	-6,000,000
Special Forfeiture Fund	41,800,000	37,000,000		-41,800,000	-37,000,000
Transfer to other agencies:					
El Paso Intelligence Center	(1,800,000)			(-1,800,000)	
SAMSHA	(14,000,000)			(-14,000,000)	
CTAC (Rand)	(8,000,000)			(-8,000,000)	
ONDCP Director Discretion	(18,100,000)			(-18,100,000)	
United States Customs Service	(13,200,000)			(-13,200,000)	
Total, Federal Drug Control Programs	148,900,000	147,000,000	104,000,000	-44,900,000	-43,000,000
(Transfer to other agencies)	(85,100,000)			(-85,100,000)	
Total, Title III, Executive Office of the President	310,544,000	308,342,000	287,280,000	-43,264,000	-41,082,000
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Administrative Conference of the United States	1,800,000	2,288,000		-1,800,000	-2,288,000
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	1,000,000	1,400,000		-1,000,000	-1,400,000
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled	1,882,000	1,800,000	1,882,000		-116,000
Federal Election Commission	25,710,000	28,021,000	28,521,000	+811,000	-2,500,000
Federal Labor Relations Authority	21,341,000	22,230,000	18,742,000	-1,889,000	-2,488,000
General Services Administration:					
Federal Buildings Fund:					
Appropriation	310,187,000	-289,112,000		-310,187,000	+289,112,000
Recessions	(-715,532,000)			(+715,532,000)	
Limitations on availability of revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities	(804,002,000)		(387,777,000)	(-336,225,000)	(+387,777,000)
Alfred P. Murrah Federal Office Building	(40,400,000)			(-40,400,000)	
Repairs and alterations	(723,884,000)	(811,000,000)	(713,086,000)	(-10,778,000)	(-197,914,000)
Installment acquisition payments	(127,531,000)	(181,883,000)	(181,883,000)	(+54,432,000)	
Rental of space	(2,181,300,000)	(2,338,000,000)	(2,341,100,000)	(+158,800,000)	(+2,100,000)
Building operations	(1,322,025,000)	(1,382,551,000)	(1,388,463,000)	(+67,438,000)	(+36,912,000)
Transfer to Construction and Acquisition		(554,813,000)			(-554,813,000)
Repayment of Debt		(73,433,000)	(73,433,000)	(+73,433,000)	
Emergency funding	(-68,800,000)			(+68,800,000)	
Total, Federal Buildings Fund	310,187,000	-289,112,000	-310,187,000	+289,112,000	
(Limitations)	(4,932,322,000)	(5,412,780,000)	(5,088,822,000)	(+134,500,000)	(-346,938,000)
Real Property Activities:					
Appropriation		1,022,213,000			-1,022,213,000
Transfer from FBF		(554,813,000)			(-554,813,000)
Construction and Acquisition - Limitation:					
(Construction - Limitation)		(1,017,213,000)			(-1,017,213,000)
(Acquisition - Limitation)		(8,000,000)			(-8,000,000)
Subtotal		(1,022,213,000)			(-1,022,213,000)
Policy and Oversight		111,827,000	62,488,000	+82,488,000	-49,328,000
Operating Expenses	130,036,000	83,878,000	48,130,000	-80,908,000	-4,748,000
Office of Inspector General	33,080,000	34,407,000	32,546,000	-541,000	-1,858,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	2,215,000	2,181,000	2,181,000	-34,000	
Procurement reform	-8,958,000			+8,958,000	
Total, General Services Administration	486,578,000	885,384,000	148,358,000	-339,220,000	-818,035,000
John F. Kennedy Assassination Record Review Board	2,180,000	2,418,000	2,180,000		-288,000
Merit Systems Protection Board:					
Salaries and Expenses	24,546,000	24,546,000	21,128,000	-3,420,000	-3,420,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,250,000)	(2,430,000)	(2,430,000)	(+180,000)	
Morris K. Udell Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmen- tal Policy Foundation	10,000,000			-10,000,000	
National Archives and Records Administration	185,238,000	185,281,000	185,281,000	-1,947,000	-2,000,000
Reduction of debt	-3,682,000	-4,012,000	-4,012,000	-330,000	
Procurement reform	-325,000			+325,000	
National Historical Publications and Records Commission:					
Grants program	9,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-5,000,000	
Information Security Oversight Office		1,482,000			-1,482,000
Office of Government Ethics	8,104,000	8,328,000	7,778,000	-328,000	-882,000
Office of Personnel Management:					
Salaries and Expenses	111,988,000	108,572,000	85,524,000	-26,475,000	-23,048,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(83,834,000)	(102,538,000)	(102,538,000)	(+18,704,000)	
Office of Inspector General	4,008,000	4,037,000	4,008,000		-28,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,158,000)	(8,181,000)	(8,181,000)	(+23,000)	
Government Payment for Annuity, Employees Health Benefits	4,210,580,000	3,748,337,000	3,748,337,000	-462,223,000	
Government Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance	25,159,000	32,847,000	32,847,000	+4,488,000	
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	7,339,638,000	7,945,988,000	7,945,988,000	+606,350,000	
Employees Life Insurance Fund (limitation on administrative expenses)	(783,000)	(883,000)	(883,000)	(+240,000)	
Retired Employees Health Benefits Fund (limitation on adminis- trative expenses)	(81,000)			(-81,000)	
Procurement reform	-1,258,000			+1,258,000	
Total, Office of Personnel Management	11,893,108,000	11,837,591,000	11,814,515,000	+121,408,000	-23,078,000

**FY 1996 Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government
Appropriations Bill (H.R. 2020)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1995 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Office of Special Counsel	7,865,000	8,888,000	7,840,000	-115,000	-728,000
United States Tax Court	34,039,000	34,039,000	32,899,000	-1,140,000	-1,140,000
Total, Title IV, Independent Agencies	12,488,239,000	13,134,388,000	12,273,882,000	-224,347,000	-860,494,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(4,319,984,000)	(8,547,113,000)	(5,178,982,000)	(+ 866,868,000)	(-1,368,151,000)
Total appropriations	23,500,947,000	24,837,823,000	23,178,996,500	-322,880,500	-1,739,538,500
(Limitations)	(4,319,984,000)	(8,547,113,000)	(5,178,982,000)	(+ 866,868,000)	(-1,368,151,000)
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent)	118,488,000	128,840,000	128,840,000	+ 7,344,000	
Funding for IRS compliance	-188,000,000			+ 188,000,000	
Mint revolving fund	-3,100,000		60,230,000	+ 63,330,000	+ 60,230,000
Black Lung savings	-4,800,000			+ 4,800,000	
Compensation of Members and Judges	-5,950,000			+ 5,950,000	
Emergency funding	-43,588,000			+ 43,588,000	
GSA: Federal building fund	-580,412,000			+ 580,412,000	
Bureau of the Public Debt	-1,500,000			+ 1,500,000	
Rent reductions	-4,041,000			+ 4,041,000	
Excess IRS receipts	-27,800,000			+ 27,800,000	
GSA Federal building fund obligational authority			-80,237,000	-80,237,000	-80,237,000
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	-739,305,000	128,840,000	138,633,000	+ 878,338,000	+ 8,883,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	22,761,442,000	25,064,883,000	23,315,119,500	+ 553,677,500	-1,748,543,500
Mandatory	11,736,378,000	11,888,400,000	11,888,400,000	+ 153,021,000	
Discretionary:					
Crime trust fund	36,700,000	78,200,000	83,886,000	+ 25,186,000	-14,314,000
General purposes	10,866,363,000	13,097,083,000	11,261,533,500	+ 378,470,500	-1,735,228,500
Total, Discretionary	11,025,063,000	13,175,283,000	11,425,719,500	+ 400,856,500	-1,748,543,500

Note: Amounts shown in FY 1995 Enacted include effect of pending rescission bill.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, before I speak about the specifics of the bill, I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT]. This is his first year as chairman of the committee. As I said on a number of occasions, I would not have planned that he be chairman of the committee, because it means, of course, that I am not chairman of the committee. But if we had to have a new chairman and I was going to be replaced, I am very thankful that it was the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

The gentleman is one of our finest Members, he is a conscientious, effective leader on his side of the aisle, and he is first an American who cares about the efficiency and effectiveness of the application of the tax dollars of our citizens. He is a pleasure to work with, and I congratulate him for the work he has done to date. He has cooperated with the minority side and with me individually each step of the way, and I would like to thank him for that.

I particularly want to thank the staff, some of whom have been with the committee, and I want to say that they have also cooperated very closely with me individually and other members of the minority side of the committee, and with our staffs. That cooperation, I think, has helped the confidence that each of us have in dealing with one another. We have not agreed on every issue, but we are working cooperatively together.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, let me make an observation that I make almost every time I start to talk on an appropriations bill. The American public and our colleagues need to understand that we have a financial problem at the Federal level. We have a deficit that must be dealt with. We have a deficit that has been growing. We have a deficit that is crowding out capital funds for economic expansion. I am a supporter of the balance budget amendment, because I believe we need an extrinsic constraint which will force us and, yes, force the American public to make tough choices.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, it is important for us to realize that the expansion of Federal expenditures has not, and I underline has not, occurred in the discretionary spending items over which the Committee on Appropriations has jurisdiction. In point of fact, as we have pointed out on a number of occasions, the Committee on Appropriations has appropriated less money than the Presidents have asked for since 1981, and, indeed, even before that. But particularly in the administrations of Mr. Reagan and Mr. Bush, Presidents Reagan and Bush, we appropriated about \$100 million less than they asked for.

It was not that the appropriation process got out of hand that led to the substantial operating deficits during the last decade. The fact of the matter is entitlements have grown exponentially. The fact of the matter is that we have not come to grips with that, and if we do not come to grips with it, very frankly, we are going to crowd out all discretionary spending, all investment spending, all of the decisionmaking process in which we involve ourselves annually as to where to apply the resources of our Nation.

In point of fact, Mr. Speaker, since 1953 until today, we have gone from spending approximately 18 percent of our Gross Domestic Product in discretionary spending, making decisions where to invest on defense and on the domestic side, to where now less than 8 percent of our GDP at the Federal level is spent on discretionary spending between defense and nondefense discretionary spending.

□ 1200

Why do I make that preface? Because we are going to have on the floor perhaps an amendment to cut this million dollars or \$10 million or \$20 million. That is significant money, of course. But the fact of the matter is, it will not solve the deficit. And it is not the reason the deficit grew, notwithstanding what the National Taxpayers Union says on the voting on these individual, sometimes small and sometimes significant, dollar amendments.

The Treasury, Postal bill, Mr. Chairman, has been a hard bill to put together for fiscal year 1996. Based on the deck we have been dealt, however, with our 602(b) allocation, it is an inadequate allocation to fund the priorities and responsibilities in this bill for law enforcement, for tax collection and for other matters.

In addition to law enforcement and revenue collection, the Customs is also in this bill, and every American is worried about the integrity of our borders. Every American is worried about the commerce and the stealing of jobs from the U.S. workers. Customs plays a critical role in that, and they are being sorely tested in terms of the resources that have been made available to them in this bill.

Within the limited resources of which I have just spoken, however, I think the chairman and the committee have tried to do the best job possible in funding the allocations of the agencies under this bill. The \$23.2 billion provided in the bill is about \$322 million below the amount we appropriated last year and \$1.8 billion below the amount requested by the administration; in other words, almost 10 percent below what the administration requested. And I might say, of course, this bill is divided about half discretionary spending, half on the mandatory side in terms of Federal retirement and Federal employment health benefits.

On the positive side, Customs and law enforcement have been funded

pretty much at the administration's request. The IRS tax system modernization has been accommodated under the administration's new estimate for fiscal year 1996. The committee bill also includes funding for tax systems modernization at the Internal Revenue Service. This broad effort to update all aspects of IRS's computer and processing systems is, Mr. Chairman, a very high priority for our country.

On the negative side, we have not been able to proceed with the funding of the IRS tax enforcement program off budget and, therefore, have had to spread the program over 7 years, a decision with which I did not agree, do not agree now and which will cost us money.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that last year we unanimously in a bipartisan fashion had agreement that we would fund the tax enforcement program off budget. Why? It was a \$2 billion, 5-year initiative that would gain us over \$9 billion, in other words a \$4 return for every dollar invested. CBO, OMB and the Congress agreed that it made sense to put that off budget in light of the fact it was a money maker, not a money loser.

However, we have not done that this year. In fairness to the chairman, however, the administration suggested that we put it on budget. Now, to the extent that it does appropriately and accurately reflect expenditures, that made sense. On the other hand, it forced the chairman and the committee to stretch this program over 7 years, and that will cost us revenues and make it difficult to administer at the Treasury Department.

Mr. Chairman, those are some of the more positive aspects. Unfortunately, I and this side of the aisle are very concerned about some aspects of this bill. I believe that there are a number of political decisions. I know the chairman disagrees with that. He says these are economic decisions, fiscal decisions, but I believe we are making some political decisions in this bill which are wrong. The elimination of the Council of Economic Advisors, every head of the Council of Economic Advisors, an institution which advises the President on macroeconomic issues, an institution which everybody that I have talked to says is one of the more objective, outside-of-government advisory groups that we have in Government to advise the President on macro- and micro-economic issues, this is critically important. The President, every day, needs to confront issues which are impacted by his information and perception of what the macroeconomic and microeconomic impacts are of decisions to be made by the White House.

It is wrong to eliminate this agency in the way it was done. There were no hearings. Now, I want to say that we cut the Administrative Conference of the United States the same way. I thought we were incorrect and we changed that decision. But the fact of

the matter is there were no hearings which were directed at elimination of this agency. And every head, Republican and Democrat, for the last two decades opposes this provision.

The most recent former administration head of the Council of Economic Advisors, Michael Boskin, has written a letter opposing this provision, as have Charlie Schultze and Herb Stein, CEA directors under President Nixon and President Carter.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we have cut the White House office. We have not cut it a great deal, but significantly enough to adversely affect the ability of the White House to run its shop. I will discuss this later in the bill, but this is wrong.

In fact, from 1981 to 1992, under a Democratic House and for the last 6 years of that period, under a Democratic Senate, we essentially accepted the White House's request. For the last 2 years this President has been subjected to cuts from the Republican side not based upon the finances of the office but based upon, in my opinion, the intent to impact adversely the political independence of the President of the United States to make policy judgment as he or she sees fit.

Mr. Chairman, that is wrong. There is not going to be an amendment offered, I understand, which will affect the transportation of the White House. But there are too frequently now folks who are willing to undermine the historical, two-century comity between the President and the legislative branch in the Congress, where the President says to the legislature, you pass your budget, and I will pass mine. Neither will impact the other because both of us have to go to the American public.

I am not talking about the executive departments. I am talking about the White House office. The Office of Management and Budget, and other executive branch offices were cut. I think that is unfortunate. We oppose that.

All reflect an initiative that is politically aimed at the President. The Committee on Appropriations has honored presidential requests, as I have said, in the last period of time that I have been on the committee. I have opposed cuts to President Reagan and President Bush's budget for exactly that reason.

Also, Mr. Chairman, there are cuts to the Federal Election Commission. The inclusion of language restricting the choices for Federal health insurance which we will oppose. They take on a political tone that I do not think is helpful for the bipartisan nature of this bill. I also believe that the elimination of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations will interfere, Mr. Chairman, with the executive branch's responsibility to monitor unfunded mandates.

The irony of this bill is we eliminate the Administrative Conference on Intergovernmental Relations, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for the purposes of saving \$1.4

million. We then provide in this bill a committee provision, protected under the rule language, which provides for an advisory committee on the mandates which we have just eliminated another agency to do. In other words, on the one hand we are going to have money spent, \$300-some-odd thousands to accomplish the purpose of an agency that we are now doing away with. It simply does not make sense, in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the full Committee on Appropriations took out a provision which was very foolishly included by the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government at markup that would have provided background checks for rich felons so that they could have received approval to have their guns back. We had information at the subcommittee and the full committee that we brought out where you had murderers reapplying for reinstatement of their privileges to have a gun and they were approved. That made no sense. No taxpayer is asking me to spend their money to make sure that criminals get their guns back. That does not make sense, and I am pleased that the chairman saw fit at the full committee to offer language to reinstate language included in our bill in 1992. That language was good then, it is good now. And I am pleased that the chairman put it back in.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that neither the President nor the committee has provided the full 5.9 percent increase that the Civil Service is due as employment cost index and locality pay increases under the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act. This was an act signed by President Bush in 1990. It tried to provide and did provide for a rational way to compare the private sector and the public sector and to make sure that our work force would be competitive and would be comparable to the private sector. Unfortunately, the President has only provided 2.4 percent in his recommendation. The bill is silent on this issue. And unless the President provides for a higher sum come August, next month, that will be limited to 2.4 percent.

I will be discussing with the President, and I know others will, as to the distribution of that 2.4 percent between comparability adjustment and locality pay, but it is very unfortunate that we are going to be falling further behind the private sector in pay comparability as a result of the actions of the President and of this committee.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I hope that the provisions that detract from the positive side of the bill can be changed on the floor and during the full legislative consideration of the bill. Again, I thank the chairman for all of his cooperation and inclusion in the work of this committee. I look forward to working with him as we consider the individual titles of this bill.

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

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

I would respond very briefly and thank the gentleman from Maryland for his kind words. When neither of us were chairman on this subcommittee, we started to forge a working relationship and that has continued through both of us having the opportunity to serve as chairman of the subcommittee.

Quite frankly, there are certain things that we have agreed to disagree upon and that is what this whole business is all about.

We both realize it is important that we get this spending bill through. It has to go through. We have to do it in a manner that I think has some common sense. Again, I appreciate his kind words and his cooperation as well.

Mr. Chairman, one of those areas that we agree to disagree on is the Council of Economic Advisors. We in effect cut the offices of the White House about 1.8 percent. I would just call to our colleagues' attention that through the legislative branch appropriation that went through the House, we cut our own budgets there about 8 percent. It is just part of the sharing concept, I think that is necessary as we move toward a balanced budget in 7 years.

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

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

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

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2020, the FY 1996 Treasury Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act. I particularly would like to commend the chairman of the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT] and his colleagues for their efforts in crafting this important legislation.

The bill contains \$75.641 million in continued funding for a vitally important project in my district on Long Island, the Central Islip Federal Courthouse. I deeply appreciate the willingness of Chairman Lightfoot and the other members of the subcommittee in working with me to meet this essential need. First announced by the General Services Administration [GSA] in 1991, the Central Islip Courthouse was designed to solve the problems of the only "space emergency" in our nation declared by the U.S. Judicial Conference. That "space emergency" for the Eastern District of New York, was first declared in 1989 and renewed in 1992. These declarations are unique in that these are the only times the Judicial Conference has ever taken such an action.

Without the completion of the Central Islip Federal Courthouse, eastern Long Island's 2.5 million people will continue to have to tolerate what has been described as a "security nightmare," with Federal judges facing the heaviest case load in its history while enduring dangerous, inefficient, costly temporary facilities scattered in five rented locations.

Unlike some other federal courthouse projects, the cost per square foot of the Central Islip Courthouse is well below the GSA average for similar projects. The courthouse will be cost effective, saving taxpayers huge amounts now paid for rent.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and sufficient funding for the timely completion of the Central Islip Federal Courthouse.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations bill, but my enthusiasm for it is tempered by the cuts in valuable programs this legislation proposes.

As a former member of this subcommittee, I feel that the agencies that are funded by this legislation are extremely important to our government. Agencies like the Treasury Department, and its component divisions such as the Customs Service, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, the IRS, the Secret Service and others are extremely important to the efficient functioning of our federal government. This legislation also funds the Executive Office of the President, a portion of the Postal Service, and some independent agencies such as the Federal Election Commission, the Federal Labor Relations Commission, the General Services Administration and others.

Because of the importance of all of the above, I am extremely disheartened by some of the cuts this bill makes to some of these agencies. For example, the bill proposes to eliminate the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council has served presidents of both parties for the past 50 years. This group provides long-term economic advice to the President that is both impartial and apolitical. This kind of advice is increasingly important during a time when economic advice a president gets is usually laced with political undertones.

I am also bothered by the reductions made to the Federal Election Commission [FEC] in an upcoming presidential election year. The \$2.5 million reduction made to the FEC combined with an earmark of \$1.5 million for computer modernization will interfere with the ability of FEC to carry out its duties and ensure the integrity of the upcoming elections. This is not the only agency that suffers a reduction in its budget. Other agencies take significant cuts to their budgets that will affect their ability to carry out their functions.

This bill is also silent on Federal pay. Neither the President nor the Committee has provided the full 5.9 percent increase that the Civil Service is due as employment cost index and locality pay increases under the Federal Employees Pay Comparability Act. Since 1981, Federal employees have lost more than \$163 billion in pay and benefits that they were scheduled to receive.

The 2.4 percent raise recommended by the President, which is adopted by this bill, is not fully funded. Even further, this is less than half of the raise owed to Federal workers under existing law. Agencies not involved in law enforcement are forced to absorb the additional cost of the pay increase from their program budgets. This unwise policy results in a hidden 2.4 percent cut in programs at agencies that are already facing severe budget constraints.

Another provision that bothers me directed toward Federal employees is the majority's decision to reinstate a provision in the bill which restricts a Federal employee's choice of a health care insurance plan by prohibiting

"Federal funds" from being used to purchase a policy which provides coverage for pregnancy termination, except in instances where the life of the mother is at risk.

Let me be clear, Mr. Chairman, that there are no Federal funds used for the purchasing of health care coverage for Federal employees. The compensation of Federal employees is in the form of salary, health care benefits and retirement benefits. Like private sector employees, they can use their compensation as they see fit. Federal workers choose a health insurance plan and a portion of that is paid for with their health coverage benefit. There are no "Federal funds" involved when a Federal employee decides what to do with his/her salary. The choice of policies is the employee's alone. The reasoning of the Committee that it is the employer's right to restrict the scope of coverage for legal medical services is wrong.

This tampering with the rights of Federal employees is wrong because they are one of our Nation's greatest assets. They are important to my congressional district where they number approximately 13,000 persons. Federal employees are among the finest, most honorable workers in this country. Yet, in this House, many insist on perpetuating an attitude of hostility toward Federal employees. They call them lazy bureaucrats, government vultures or worthless do-nothing Federal employees. This is wrong, Mr. Chairman, and it must be stopped. It should not take an incident like the Oklahoma bombing to change the minds of many in this country with regards to Federal employees.

While I have thus far focused on items I have not liked in this legislation, it does not have some good points. For one, the bill funds the Customs Service at a level that exceeds the President's request. I feel this is important because the Customs Service has a difficult job as the Nation's principal border agency. Customs' responsibilities run the gamut from fighting the scourge of illegal drug trafficking to assessing and collecting duties and tariffs. I would also like to mention that the Customs Service section of the report included items of importance to my congressional district. For instance, there is language supporting: additional Customs inspectors for El Paso, Texas, unified port management, and drug interdiction technologies such as cargo x-ray systems and FLIR's for UH-60 Black Hawk helicopters.

The report also includes \$560,000 for security improvements to the El Paso Federal Building. Other items of interest to my congressional district include report language supporting the Gang Resistance Education and Training Program, the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, and Operation Alliance.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the leadership of Chairman LIGHTFOOT. Throughout our hearings and deliberations, the Chairman was very fair and amenable by allowing of minority views and consideration. I am very grateful for his policy of "opening up" the hearings to questioning after allotted time for testimony had expired. The other members of the subcommittee, are also to be complemented for their diligence in pursuing the issues under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. I also would like to thank the staff of both sides for the hard work they displayed in putting together this legislation. They worked many long

hours to put together the final product we are debating today.

Mr. Chairman, I will support H.R. 2020, but it is my hope that some of the troubling provisions I have mentioned will be moderated by the Senate and we can settle those differences in conference.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2020) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1215

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on House Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and there are no objections.

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

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not object, it is my understanding the minority has been consulted about each and every one of these exceptions to the rule that we adopted in the beginning of the year, and we will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.