

while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on National Security, the Committee on Science, the Committee on Small Business, and the Permanent Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that our Democratic leadership has been consulted on this matter and we have no objection to the request, so I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, 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.

#### POSTPONING VOTES ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of H.R. 2076, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 198, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than 5 minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall not be less than 15 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RADANOVICH). Pursuant to House Resolution 198 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2076.

□ 1241

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GUNDERSON). When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, July 25, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has been disposed of and title I was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title I?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, domestic violence is not just a private matter anymore; these private dramas are spilling out into public places, endangering family members and strangers. In Colorado alone, the following incidents have happened:

May 3, 1995: A teenage boy entered a Denver grocery store, pulled a gun on his former girlfriend, whom he had been stalking, and her friend. Police shot and killed him, only to find out it was a fake gun.

April 28, 1995: A man walked into a Denver grocery store, where he shot and killed his wife, the store director, and a sheriff's deputy who arrived on the scene. He then left the store, as customers crouched in the aisles and shielded their children. He entered the parking lot, spraying it with bullets as people ran for cover. He hit a pregnant woman in the leg; she lived. He apparently had made several threats that he was going to kill his wife. A few days earlier, she had gotten a restraining order against him, but it hadn't been served yet because there was some missing information and the court clerk couldn't reach her. She had also just filed for divorce and had received temporary custody of their son.

April 1994: A Boulder police officer was shot and killed while responding to a domestic dispute. The male suspect shot and killed himself at the scene.

April 1994: In Aurora, a man allegedly shot and killed his ex-girlfriend and her 2½-year-old son and wounded his twin brother.

July 1993: An Aurora man threatened with divorce shot his wife, crippling her, and killed her sister.

January 1988: A man shot and killed his wife outside a divorce courtroom in Littleton. He also wounded the man he thought was her lover.

January 1986: An Aurora police officer shot and wounded his wife's divorce lawyer.

My colleagues, I am very sorry we did not fully fund the Violence Against Women Act.

I'm also very sorry we had to fight so hard for the money we got. It is clear that if the Congresswomen hadn't been constantly monitoring this—the amount would be zero. That is incredible when the act passed last year 421 to 0. What a difference a year makes. So there is some funding thanks to the hard work of NITA LOWEY, but we are still \$50 million short. Women still must beg for every dollar.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, a vote to restore some of the funds to the Violence Against Women Act is a vote to fulfill only a part of the promise Congress made to help victims of domestic violence. This promise was made to make America and the home a safer place for women.

Last August, the Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act, a promise to finally treat domestic violence like the crime that it is, to improve law enforcement, to make the streets safer for women, and to vigorously prosecute perpetrators. We promised more counseling and more shelters to provide a safe haven for abused women. Now this Congress threatens to backtrack on our promise and abandon these promises to combat domestic violence.

Under the amendment, the Violence Against Women Act receives only a fraction of the promised authorization of \$175 million to fund justice grants to combat violence against women. And while I appreciate the efforts of the committee to add \$50 million to the bill for the program, the shortfall is still severe and I fear may be interpreted as a message to battered women that there are few resources for them, only empty promises.

A shelter in San Pedro, CA, in my district, desperately needs the money authorized in the Violence Against Women Act to implement its programs to combat domestic violence. Two women whom Rainbow Services had been helping were killed in the last 6 months—women whose lives could have been saved had they been able to stay at the shelter longer. These women came forward and tried to do the right thing, but the resources were not there to keep them away from their abusers long enough. The grants in the Violence Against Women Act money translate into saving human lives.

Rainbow Services has waiting lists for counseling, beds, and all of its other services. The number of women who come seeking help has doubled in the last 3 months since a domestic violence hotline was established in May. The increased funds from California's grant only constitutes half of what they need for their emergency response program, a program operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. They just received a grant for a new shelter—the first shelter for battered elderly women in the area—and the Violence Against Women Act grants are critical to its operation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment to restore some funding for the Violence Against Women Act. It is critical that we keep our promise to help victims of domestic violence—they cannot wait any longer.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to increase funding for the Justice Department's violence against women programs.

Just 1 year ago, the Violence Against Women Act was passed in the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. Yet today, the funding allocation for these programs has

been reduced so drastically that it would cripple or eradicate many of the programs so recently created to address the needs of poor and abused women.

Programs covered under this funding include training for law enforcement and judiciary officials on violence issues and programs to address the serious problems of stalking and campus sexual assault against women.

How can we be satisfied with the efforts we have made to promote and address the problem of violence against women when the committee cannot see fit to fund adequately these necessary programs? This bill as written sends a clear message to the Nation that this Congress does not take violence against women seriously.

Women in danger of violence or sexual assault need our compassion, not deaf ears. I urge my colleagues to support Congresswoman LOWEY's amendment and to go on record with your commitment to the safety of America's women.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN to H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This amendment will provide much needed funds for community policing grants authorized by the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994.

The programs that we authorized last summer are aimed at preventing crime in our communities and have been supported by the mayors, police chiefs, and law enforcement officials throughout our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to acknowledge that the fight against crime requires more than simply adding prison space or new classes of punishment. It requires that we demonstrate the courage to champion the innovative programs which provide alternatives to drugs, gangs, and the random acts of violence which afflict our society. The Mollohan amendment realizes this and I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: On page 22, line 6, strike "\$102,400,000" and insert "\$152,400,000";

On page 22, line 13, strike "\$32,750,000" and insert "\$82,750,000";

On page 24, line 4, strike "\$3,333,343,000" and insert "\$3,283,343,000"; and

On page 24, line 6, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "\$1,950,000,000".

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this is a noncontroversial amendment. I think it is agreed to by both sides. It moves \$50 million from the local law enforcement block grant to the Violence Against Women Grant Program.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that these funds would have been spent out of the local law enforcement block grant for domestic violence programs, but moving these resources will ensure that local communities will target it to domestic violence issues.

Both the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] have worked closely with me and my ranking member on this amendment, and I applaud both of their efforts to pursue funding for this program and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: Page 25, after line 24, add the following:

"Provided further, That if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this title to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety service."

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, there is an awful lot of talk about cops on the beat, but there is no provision in any of our legislation that ensures there be more cops on the beat. As an old sheriff, sometimes they hire three on the street and push three up into administrative type jobs. My amendment says that there shall be a net increase in street cops.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 24, line 13, strike "\$475,000,000" and insert "\$505,000,000".

On page 24, line 18, strike "\$300,000,000" and insert "\$270,000,000".

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes, and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 15 minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 15 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I propose today to the body, I think, is about fairness in the distribution of scarce crime fighting dollars. It is really at the heart of it.

Mr. Chairman, for Members who do not know, or for whom, perhaps, it would be helpful for the purposes of this debate to refresh their memory, in the crime trust fund we have approximately \$4 billion that is allocated. Mr. Chairman, out of that \$4 billion, approximately a half a billion is spent on the Federal level, and that includes enhancements to the immigration initiative. It is enhancements to the FBI, to U.S. attorneys, to the DEA, to the Border Patrol, and to the Judiciary, and a number of other miscellaneous programs. Out of that \$4 billion, that is about half a billion dollars.

Then, Mr. Chairman, there is about \$116 million in budget authority for prevention programs. So, we are getting close up to a billion dollars there. Then, Mr. Chairman, when we go into the State and local assistance accounts, which are the biggest accounts, there is \$3.3 billion.

Out of that \$3.3 billion, \$2 billion goes into this program, the block grants, and last night we argued strongly that that \$2 billion be apportioned to the COPS Program. Then that leaves about \$1.3 billion. Out of that \$1.3 billion, Mr. Chairman, approximately \$475 million, about half a billion dollars, is apportioned for the Byrne Grant Program.

Now, all of my colleagues know about the Byrne Grant Program. It is an extremely flexible program, getting money down to local law enforcement, which is used for a variety of purposes. There are about 21 authorized purposes for Byrne grants and they are very good, because they are very flexible. Subsequently, they are very popular.

For example, the DARE Program is funded through Byrne grants. The drug task forces are funded by Byrne grants all across this country in every State of the country. Byrne grant money is used for flexible purposes at all levels of Government. There is a half billion dollars in here for that Byrne grant money which is available to every State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, out of that approximately \$1 billion left, we take the Byrne grant out and now we have just a little more than a billion dollars. \$500 million, or half a billion dollars, is appropriated in this bill to reimburse States, seven States, Mr. Chairman, and really principally one, for incarceration of illegal aliens; to pay for prison guards, if you will.

I am not suggesting during this debate, that we should not reimburse States for incarceration of illegal aliens. I think that is a proper purpose of the Federal Government within this crime trust fund. I do not object to the funding.

I do question the level of funding, because I think it is disproportionate. It

is, in fact, not fair. We have the Byrne Grant Program, which is about half a billion dollars, which is apportioned to all of the States, and we have the incarceration that goes to seven, and 80 percent of it to one State, to California.

Mr. Chairman, in committee I offered an amendment to combine these accounts. The Byrne Grant Program, money is sent out to all the States on a formula basis, based on population essentially. So, every State shares proportionately in the Byrne grant money. Every State, based on its population, receives money. We cannot get any fairer than that.

Under the Illegal Alien Program, it goes to States that incarcerate illegal aliens. The amendment that I offered in full committee would combine that money, send money to all the States, that billion dollars, and send that to all the States to be apportioned more fairly so that States have money to fight what is their particular crime problem, what is their particular priority.

Now, we lost that pretty much on a party line vote in full committee and we could not get a rule to offer it. So today this amendment that I offer is far more modest than that. Mr. Chairman, we take out of the \$500 million for incarceration of illegal aliens only \$30 million and we apportion it to the Byrne Grant Program which funds it at its authorized level of \$505 million.

Mr. Chairman, this means more money for every State in the Union for the Byrne Grant Program. More money to every State, even the seven States that receive money from incarceration of illegal aliens.

It does mean that the incarceration of illegal alien account is reduced by \$30 million. The only State in the Union that receives less total dollars is California. But let me emphasize, Mr. Chairman, California gets 80 percent of \$470 million; 80 percent of \$730 million if my amendment is adopted.

Mr. Chairman, it is a simple amendment, really. It is about fairness, it is doing what we can to get dollars apportioned across this country so that every jurisdiction can use these dollars for crime fighting. The benefits are set out in a handout that I will have for Members at the time of the vote, and it shows State by State, the benefit and the difference that this amendment would mean to the States and the difference is additional dollars to go into the Byrne Grant Program for local community law enforcement.

California gets \$3.6 more million for Byrne grant. New York would get \$2 million more for Byrne grant. Illinois would get \$1.3 million more for Byrne grant. West Virginia would get \$208,000 more, which may not sound like a lot of money, but \$208,000 for local law enforcement is a lot of money, particularly when it is used more efficiently for the Byrne Grant Program.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the Mollohan amendment. I agree that the State and local communities need more money to fight crime. My bill already provides more resources than ever before to all State and local agencies to fight crime.

We have already increased Byrne grants by \$25 million over 1995, and what the administration requested. Between the almost \$2 billion local block grant program, and the \$475 million Byrne formula grant program that I proposed, every State will receive approximately 5½ times more money to fight crime than they received this year; 5½ times more.

But for some States and local communities, addressing crime also means addressing the serious problems of illegal immigration, because often illegal immigration brings along with it other illegal criminal activities.

As my colleagues well know, along with addressing crime in our bill, we include a serious commitment to addressing the problem of illegal immigration. Our initiative is not only focused on controlling the borders; it is equally focused on addressing the growing population of deportable illegal aliens and is heavily weighted on the criminal illegal alien population.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that we should not just give money to the States to reimburse them for the costs they are incurring without having a strong plan to address the underlying problem. This is a Federal responsibility and we are responsible for getting it under control.

This bill, and the resources included in 1994 and 1995, provided during times when the subcommittee was under the watch of the gentleman from West Virginia, will significantly strengthen our ability to address illegal immigration.

Our hope is that States' burdens will decline as our efforts are successful in dealing with this problem. My bill attempts to address the costs that States bear as a result of crimes committed by aliens. The Department of Justice tells me that these resources will be available to all States based on the level of incarcerated illegal aliens.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Mollohan amendment and urge the Members to reject it.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] who worked so very hard on the Byrne amendment last year, the Super-Byrne program. He worked with our colleagues and created a real awareness for this program with the amendment. He did an excellent job.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, the Byrne program is built on one of the strongest principles I know: United we stand;

divided we fall. It helps us fight the scourges of drugs and crime united as one.

DARE is a good example of a partnership that unites parents, teachers, students, and police to keep our kids off drugs.

When I was in the Sterling Heights DARE class some time ago, I saw a young officer with enormous energy who had developed personal rapport with the kids in his class. DARE means a lot to the children in my home communities.

It also supports multijurisdictional task forces which unite law enforcement from all levels: county, State, and local. Criminals do not respect city limits, so these partnerships, like our local Combined Oakland-Macomb Enforcement Team, otherwise known as COMET, and our Narcotics Enforcement Team, otherwise known as NET, enable our law enforcement officials to pool resources and information across city lines.

Last year, my friends, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], and I gathered support of over 150 Members from both sides of the aisle in support of this program. I understand the need and Federal responsibility for criminal illegal alien incarceration. There is an increase here of 250 percent.

So, as a matter of priorities I believe we can afford this modest increase in Byrne without losing anything vital in our commitment to assisting the States with criminal illegal alien incarceration. We must never forget the front-line local enforcement people working to make our towns and our cities safer; to give our kids the heroes they deserve.

Vote for the Mollohan amendment.

□ 1300

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee that has just marked up comprehensive legislation to end the problem of illegal immigration, I rise in opposition to the Mollohan amendment on reimbursing our States for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens. The Mollohan amendment violates the commitment that we made to our Governors and ignores Congress' culpability in the problem of illegal immigration.

The solution to the problem of illegal immigration is to prevent illegal immigrants from entering the United States. And removing illegal immigrants if they arrive. My bill, the Immigration in the National Interest Act, will accomplish this goal. It fulfills one of the Federal Government's central functions: securing our Nation's borders.

In the past, Congress has been part of the problem, not the solution. Past

Congresses have ignored the problem of illegal immigration and failed to stem the tide of illegal aliens entering our country. While Congress dithered, illegal immigrants entered our Nation in record numbers, with upwards of 1 million illegal aliens permanently entering our Nation every 3 years.

Congress' failure to secure our Nation's borders has been a disaster for our citizens, our local government, and our States. Our citizens have been plagued by crime committed by illegal immigrants. And States have been forced to pay the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens whom the Federal Government did not prevent from entering our country and preying on our citizens. These State costs have resulted directly because, in the past, Congress refused to address the problem of illegal immigration.

What has been the cost to States of Congress' failure to stem the tide of illegal immigration? The General Accounting Office estimates that incarcerating illegal immigrant felons costs States at least \$650 million per year. That translates into \$66 million that New York cannot spend on schools, \$43 million that Texas cannot spend on roads, and \$400 million that California cannot spend on health care. All because the Federal Government failed to do its job.

Mr. Chairman, I do not generally favor reimbursement as a means of solving our illegal immigration problems. We should prevent illegal aliens from entering the country, rather than spending money on them after they get here. However, Congress has made a commitment to our governors to help reimburse some of the costs that they have incurred. The Mollohan amendment goes back on this commitment and breaks our word to our governors.

The Mollohan amendment is wrong for our citizens and wrong for our States. Keep Congress' word to Governor Bush, Governor Wilson, Governor Whitman, Governor Pataki, and others. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and I invite the gentleman from Texas to stay in the well.

The gentleman from Texas indicated that one of the premises of your talk was that there would be a net loss to States as a result of this amendment. I would just like to point out to you that, indeed, there is a net loss only to one State. That is California. For every other State in the Union, it is a net gain.

Let me explain why, and it is true. For example, Texas would gain approximately half a million dollars net. It is a close call for Texas.

Under my amendment, Texas would get an additional \$2 million, in Byrne grant money, with all the flexibility that represents, and they would get a decrease of about \$1.5 million from the illegal alien assistance program, for a net gain of \$500,000.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. If the gentleman will yield, I appreciate your point you just made. My concern is still the commitment we made to the Governors to reimburse the States.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time, one of the premises was there would be a net loss to the States. That is incorrect.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK], another distinguished Member who has worked so hard on crime fighting and been such an integral part of our crime task force on the minority side.

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

Yesterday we had a fight on this floor about the Clinton COPS Program and your local block grant that you wanted over there. You claimed there was no flexibility in the Clinton program. Now we have the Byrne grant, which gives us 26 different programs, including illegal aliens. So this is all kinds of flexibility you want, and now you say, "No, let us not do that, let us keep all the money in one pot for illegal aliens."

We are asking for 10 percent, or \$30 million, of a \$300 million pot to be used for the Byrne memorial grant which can be used for 26 different programs, which can be used with all the flexibility you need.

My colleague from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, spoke of DARE. In my district we do bake sales and pancake breakfasts to fund the DARE program. We are asking for a little help for the DARE program.

In my district, which has 23,000 square miles, we have undercover drug teams, which is a combination of Federal, State, and local officers, the same team, the TNT team, the Hunt teams, the upset teams. They do undercover drug work with the Byrne grant money. The arrests have gone up by 400 percent because of the cooperative efforts we have here. We could not do it without the Byrne Memorial grant.

What we are asking for underneath the Mollohan amendment is take 10 percent, \$30 million of the \$300 million, put it in the Byrne grants, and it still leaves \$270 million for incarceration of illegal aliens. In Michigan that means \$1 million more we have to work with under the DARE program and undercover drug teams.

The Mollohan amendment makes sense from a law enforcement point of view. It makes sense for 49 of the 50 States in the Nation. Our No. 1 priority in this country is crime and crime fighting. Here is a program that works, with all the flexibility you wanted yesterday. It is here. Do not gut this amendment. Please, support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY] who is chairman of the House task force on immigration.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of

the gentleman from West Virginia, which would eliminate \$30 million earmarked for reimbursing States for incarcerating violent criminal aliens.

Earlier this year the House passed H.R. 667, the Violent Criminals Incarceration Act of 1995. In that legislation was a provision sponsored by this Member which would authorize \$650 million per year to reimburse States for the burden of incarcerating illegal aliens that commit felonies.

In the bill before us today, there is only \$500 million set aside for that purpose and this amendment would reduce this amount by another \$30 million.

Mr. Chairman, the States can no longer afford to pick up the tab for the failure of the Federal Government to enforce its borders and enforce its immigration laws.

For some perspective, the cost of this failure to California alone is over \$500 million a year. But this is not only a California problem. There are over 4 million illegal aliens in our country and they are found in every State. Clearly, the States that are negatively impacted by this failure of Federal policy can no longer pay the bill for the fact that the Federal Government has shirked its responsibility to enforce its border and the law.

I would just like to make one statement in relation to the gentleman from West Virginia: California gets less money per capita than any other State in the Nation as it relates to reimbursement for the incarcerating of illegal aliens under this legislation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, first, let us give credit where it is due. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee that he is now the ranking member of, was the first person to put in money to reimburse costs for incarcerated illegal aliens last year.

Second, although my friend from West Virginia is looking at early disbursement of this year's funding to determine the percentages, the fact is if his amendment passes, increasing a good program, the Byrne program, we take away not only from California but from Texas, Florida, and New York City, not just State governments, but local governments, county jails that are dealing with this problem. We take away that which we are obligated to finance.

You cannot vote to compensate State and local governments for Federal mandates and then back away from the obligation to reimburse them for the costs of the failure of Federal policy. It is that simple.

If you are not from New York or Illinois or California or Florida or Texas, I can understand why you might think you would do better. It is not right.

I urge you to vote against this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida

[Mr. SHAW] who is chairman of the Human Resources Subcommittee in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, we heard this is a California problem. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Three thousand illegal aliens each and every day violate our borders and come into the United States. This is a national disgrace. It has gone on through administration after administration, Congress after Congress: Yet we have not acted.

Our own State cannot act because, under the Constitution, this is a Federal responsibility, and it is a failed Federal responsibility in which we have failed our States.

Right now 10 percent of the prison population in my home State of Florida is made up of illegal aliens. The Governor, Governor Chiles, just within the last hour has told me \$80.7 million a year this alien population is costing the State of Florida, and in addition to that, because of the fact that it is 10 percent of our jail population, we are going to have to build 4 or 5 new prisons at a capital cost of \$80 million to \$100 million.

Why in the world is this a State responsibility? Not only because of this, but only because of the impact on our prisons, but the impact on our hospitals, on our school systems. Down in south Florida, the Jackson Memorial Hospital is overrun with illegal aliens, and yet we are taking that as a local responsibility to our own State funding to take care of these people.

The impact is absolutely, absolutely incredible. For anyone to stand on this floor and talk about a Federal responsibility where we should take away 10 percent of the money that is not even funding half of the cost for the States today, I think, is very shortsighted and is overly parochial.

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

Mr. SHAW. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, we are not taking 10 percent. We are taking \$30 million out of the half a billion.

Mr. SHAW. I did not say you were taking 10 percent. I said the illegal aliens are 10 percent of our prison population in Florida, and it is a responsibility of the Federal Government to at least reimburse all of the States of this country, not just Florida, all of the States, to reimburse them at least a share of this extra cost, because of a failed Federal responsibility.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW], the point I wanted to make is we are trying to get Florida more dollars, and Florida is a net beneficiary under our amendment.

Mr. SHAW. I heard you.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Let me make my point. It is my time. I will let you respond to me.

Under the distribution, the first distribution of moneys under this program was \$43 million. California got \$33 million, Florida got \$1 million. Under my amendment, Florida gets \$1.5 million. It is a net gain for the State of Florida and for every other State if this money is put through the Byrne grant program, and Florida can spend the money, if they want, on incarceration of illegal aliens.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUTHER].

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment in order to bring some balance to this particular bill.

I can think of few initiatives here in Congress that work better for our local law enforcement officials than providing much needed assistance in drug prevention efforts, equipment acquisition, and overall support for law enforcement.

When I talk to my local police chiefs and other local law enforcement officials back home, they respond with a simple plea, and that plea is, "Please, provide us with assistance on basic equipment, like fax machines and other support so that we can fight crime in our communities and also support strong prevention efforts."

I ask Members to support this amendment. Bring some balance to this bill, and let us use a smart approach when it comes to criminal justice activities.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I speak in some pain here because I do respect tremendously the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], and especially with all the efforts he has undertaken to try to provide law enforcement with the resources it needs and given his efforts so far on the issue of immigration.

□ 1315

Mr. Chairman, I see this as an issue where we are robbing from Peter to give to Paul. Both areas involve law enforcement; one is in the incarceration area, the other is with the Byrne grants. I am a strong supporter of the Byrne grants, but I must say we have a Federal commitment to provide States with reimbursement for criminal alien incarceration and, when we have a Federal commitment, we should live up to that commitment to provide the funds.

Finally last year we took some action on the issue of providing reimbursement to States for the criminal incarceration of immigrants, and what we find now is that the President, having taken this first step, it should now be continued. We should continue with

this effort to try to provide the funds to reimburse the States.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to follow our talk with our walk, and I would hope that what we will see is that, although we have two good programs, the Byrne grant program and the criminal incarceration of undocumented immigrants issue, we should try to meld the two and make sure that we are not taking from one to give to the other, because both are very good. In a tough time we should try to do the best we can, and I would hope that what we would find is that it is time for us to live up to our obligation of giving money to reimburse States for those obligations that really should be Federal obligations.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia. I realize that the Byrne grant program is a worthy program, however, I strenuously object taking \$30 million dollars out of the funds which are committed to help reimburse States for the cost of incarcerating illegal aliens.

California will incarcerate nearly 19,200 illegal immigrant felons in State prisons this year. That is enough to fill eight new prison facilities to capacity. The cost to California taxpayers will be \$503 million. In fact, over the past 8 years, the total cost to California is over \$2.5 billion.

The current bill funds \$300 million dollars for this reimbursement and I commend Chairman ROGERS for his support for this program. However, the authorized level provides for funding up to \$650 million. As you can see, we are currently funding less than half of what we could. It may not seem like a lot of money to some, but \$30 million dollars is monumental to the States that have to foot the bill for what is widely recognized as a national problem.

Until the Congress is able to provide fully, the authorized level of funding, a handful of States will continue to be penalized by the Federal Government's failure to combat illegal immigration and assume its proper responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, a reduction in funding such as the one Mr. MOLLOHAN is proposing, unfairly increases the burden that California taxpayers will have to bear and increases what could be called an unfunded mandate. I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mollohan amendment.

When the original Thirteen Colonies agreed to join together to "form a

more perfect union", one of the powers they conferred on their new Federal Government was that of protecting the national borders from foreign invaders. Considering the fact that four million or more aliens are in our country illegally, it is abundantly clear that the Federal Government has woefully failed in its promise to the States to secure our national borders.

The very least we can do is to assist the States in paying for the costs of imprisoning illegal aliens who have committed felonies against the people and property of their citizens. This amendment would be a backward step and would say to the States that we are unwilling to pay the costs of our breach of promise.

Now is the time to reaffirm to the States our commitment to uphold our Federal responsibility and to attempt to reimburse them for the partial costs resulting from our failure to protect U.S. borders in the past and the present. We can never repay their citizens who have been murdered, raped, and robbed by those who should never have been allowed inside our country, but we can begin by paying the costs of imprisoning these felons.

I urge a "no" vote on the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as somebody who lives on the border, but as someone who was a mayor and a county supervisor, I recognize that law enforcement, neighborhood law enforcement, was the No. 1 responsibility of a locally elected official and a responsibility. The Federal Government's No. 1 responsibility was the integrity of our national frontiers, and it was nice when the Federal Government helped us with our local responsibilities. It was a great effort. But those of us that are impacted severely by the abandonment of the Federal Government of their No. 1 obligation needs to have redresses of those problems, and I say this to my colleague, "I understand your concerns, but you take care of your obligations before you start issuing people gifts, and this is a moral obligation."

Mr. Chairman, the fact is the State of California spends \$400 million-plus. In the existing formula, existing formula, there will still be a \$100 million debt owed to that one State. Now this is an obligation that my colleagues may say we can walk away from for a while, but the obligation to protect our borders is a responsibility. I say to my colleagues, "Don't abandon it because it is coming your way."

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN].

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

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. This amendment would reduce the funding for reimbursing State and local governments for the costs of incarcerating illegal criminal aliens by \$30 million.

Last year, in an amendment that I offered with several of our colleagues, Congress created the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program [SCAAP] in recognition of the serious burden that costs associated with incarcerating criminal alien place on State and localities—costs which are a result of the Federal Government's failure to enforce immigration controls. In addition, thanks to the efforts of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], Congress for the first time appropriated funds for the SCAAP Program. And, in February of this year, the House of Representatives approved an amendment H.R. 667, the Violent Criminal Incarceration Act, which provides that, before the Department of Justice can spend any funds authorized in the bill for prison construction, the Attorney General must reimburse States for at least \$650 million of the cost of incarcerating illegal aliens convicted of felonies.

This year also, largely because of the commendable efforts of Chairman ROGERS and the subcommittee, funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program [SCAAP] has been increased to \$500 million. This is still \$150 million below what is needed, but it would provide significant relief to the affected State and localities.

Criminal aliens are people who have entered our country in violation of Federal laws; that makes their incarceration a Federal responsibility, and thus a cost that should be borne by all U.S. citizens, not just those who live in regions with large numbers of illegal immigrants. As the House of Representatives recognized with the passage of unfunded mandate legislation earlier this year, the Federal Government should not continue to pass the costs of Federal actions—or in this case, lack of effective Federal action—onto State and local governments. Yet that is precisely what we have been doing for years by making States and localities pay for the Federal Government's failure to stop illegal immigration.

While State and local governments have the responsibility for incarcerating criminal aliens and processing their cases, they have no jurisdiction over the enforcement of immigration laws, no authority to deport aliens who are convicted of crimes, and no authority to ensure that those deported are not permitted to re-enter the country.

From 1988 to 1995, the number of illegal alien felons in California State facilities has soared by 235 percent—from 5,700 to an estimated 19,200 by the end of this year. During the same period, the total annual cost of incarcerating and supervising this population has skyrocketed from \$122 million to an estimated \$503 million by the end of the next fiscal year—a 310-percent increase. The cumulative cost during this 7-year period is in excess of \$2.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, shifting funds from the SCAAP Program to the Byrne grant program will disproportionately affect California, because of the enormously large population of illegal aliens in our State's prisons. California, like every other State, has drug and crime problems that are addressed by the Byrne

program—and we would all like to be able to approve more money for it. But our attempts to deal with these serious problems are being overwhelmed by the Federal Government's failure to deal adequately with illegal immigration, and to meet its full responsibility to the States with respect to criminal aliens. Reducing this funding is counterproductive and will only exacerbate a very serious problem.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Mollohan amendment. Taxpayers in my home State of Florida, as well as many other States, for too long have had to bear the burden of really failed Federal immigration policies. That is what we are talking about.

It is estimated that Florida spends in the area of \$80.7 million, not \$13 million. There was a number for \$13 million. That is an old number. The Governor's office now tells us that number is \$80.7 million annually to incarcerate illegal immigrants.

As a matter of fact, costs are so high for this and other immigration related services that Governor Chiles had to file suit against the Federal Government for reimbursement, and I think everybody knows that Governor Chiles is in the same party as the President. He should not have had to do that. This is a clear Federal obligation, and earlier this year in H.R. 667 we took positive action to help our States with the financial burden.

The Federal Government cannot shirk its responsibility in this, which is what the Mollohan amendment would allow. This amendment would take us back in the wrong direction, and that is why I am very strenuously in opposition to it and urge my colleagues to oppose it, as well, because when we look at the facts, it is going the wrong way.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI].

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Mollohan amendment.

In the United States there are over 50,000 prisoners in State and Federal facilities who are not American citizens. The incarceration of criminal aliens costs taxpayers between \$15,000 and \$30,000 per inmate annually.

Last year, American citizens spent between \$800 million and \$1½ billion feeding, clothing, and housing illegal aliens.

It is a grave injustice to hold States like New Jersey hostile to such expenses for the Federal Government's failure.

Mr. Chairman, illegal immigration has taken a toll on this country. Illegal aliens who commit crimes exact personal costs to the people they hurt as well as economic costs to those States who have to burden those costs.

I urge an opposition to this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has 30 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, there have been some comments made about meeting our obligation to fight the illegal alien problem, and I would say in this bill, with the chairman's leadership, we have provided resources to do just that. We have provided resources under the INS for illegal alien problems: 700 new Border Patrol agents, 400 new inspectors, 945 new detention personnel, and 750 new investigators, and that is very robustly funded to the tune of about a half-billion dollars in the crime trust fund. We have provided \$500 million in this bill for reimbursement to States for incarceration of illegal aliens. There is only \$30 million out of that to spread around the country.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important moment. For the first time the Federal Government has stepped up to the plate to acknowledge its responsibility with the issue of illegal immigration.

There is a perception this is simply going to benefit California. I was joking with the gentleman from West Virginia about that a few minutes ago. The fact of the matter is California will proportionately get less than any other State involved in this based on the number of illegals we have in California, and the figures that have been thrown about here, especially by my friend from West Virginia, are way off base. The best example was Florida, where we have seen an increase from 13 to 80.7 million as the cost for the incarceration of illegals in that State.

This is a very serious Federal problem. Let us defeat the Mollohan amendment and move ahead with the committee position.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCOTT: Page 24, line 6, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and insert "\$2,300,000,000".

Page 24, line 23, strike "\$500,000,000" and all that follows through page 25, line 1, and insert "\$200,000,000".

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There were no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of the amendment, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a fairly straightforward amendment. It moves \$300 million from prison construction funds to the local law enforcement block grant so that programs for prevention and cops can be funded to a larger extent. Mr. Chairman, this will have no effect on the money for incarcerating illegal aliens that we just heard the debate on. The prison grant program requires an increase in incarceration on a massive basis. We already have one of the highest incarceration rates in the world, over five times the international average.

Mr. Chairman, increasing incarceration wastes the scarce resources that could be better spent on prevention. In Virginia, for example, Mr. Chairman, we have a program that we have just embarked on that will cost the State of Virginia \$1 billion per congressional district over the next 10 years in increased prison expenses, and the estimates are that the reduction in crime will be less than 4 percent, statistically insignificant. Mr. Chairman, that is a national equivalent of spending \$435 billion without any reduction in crime.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year we heard the city of Philadelphia needs about \$2½ billion to build prisons, and again that is just one city. So more money and prisons will be a drop in the bucket as far as the crime rate is concerned. That money could be better spent, Mr. Chairman, on drug courts which take low-level drug abusers, possession only, nonviolent, and refer them into rehabilitation rather than prisons at a cost of 5 percent of what the prisons cost and will result in 80 percent reduction in crimes.

□ 1330

We heard last night about community policing and how that works, Job Corps, education programs, recreation programs. We have heard midnight bas-

ketball savaged on this floor, yet we do not hear that the crime rate went down 60 percent in Landover, MD when the midnight basketball program went into effect.

Mr. Chairman, I have 3 cities in my district that are in the top 30 in murder rate, so I want to make sure that we use our scarce resources in a way that will actually reduce crime. It is clear we will get more return for our money by putting it into local law enforcement, like crime prevention and community policing, rather than just in general increasing incarceration.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, in the words of the poet Joseph Malins, in his poem "A Fence or an Ambulance," "It is better to put a strong fence around the top of a cliff than an ambulance down in the valley."

Mr. Chairman, let us build fences, rather than buying ambulances, and support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Scott amendment. The truth is that this amendment would eliminate what the Congress passed back in February in the crime bill. It would eliminate truth in sentencing grants to States and shift that money to local government law enforcement block grants.

Now, we already provide in the bill 5½ times more for local crime programs than was ever provided in history by the Congress, and particularly 1995. They are going to have plenty of money to work with.

What the gentleman would eliminate with this amendment, however, is a very critical part of the crime package that passed back in February as a part of the Contract With America, and that was to allow States to have grants if they lock up their violent criminals for a certain period of time.

Convicted felons serve only 38 percent of their sentences now on average. This revolving door of justice is the heart of the crime problem. Truth in sentencing grants are a vital and sensible response to this problem. Lack of prison space is a national problem. It is appropriate for the Congress to respond by setting aside funds specifically for the purpose of increasing prison capacity on the State level for violent offenders.

Local law enforcement block grants provide funding directly to local communities. States, not local communities, have the responsibility of building prisons. The Scott amendment would prevent States from receiving any funds for prison construction. The State prisons grant program ensures that States will have the resources to keep violent offenders locked up. Do not tear that from this bill. It will be a very critical part of the States' efforts and our effort on their behalf to fight violent criminals across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Scott amendment. Stay with us on the crime package.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the chairman's attention to this very important matter.

Mr. Chairman, it has been only about a year since the citizens of the State of Georgia had a legal lottery, and it apparently is doing somewhat well. Unfortunately, in Georgia, as in many other States, however, we have had a lottery for many, many years, and it is the lottery of revolving justice. Every criminal in our State, as well as all across this country, when they go out to commit a crime, they are purchasing a lottery ticket. They are betting the State in which they commit the crime will not have the wherewithal and the will to keep them incarcerated for a major part of their sentence, and they are getting out, as the chairman has already indicated, within, on average, after serving only 38 percent of their time, and in many instances it is far less than that time.

The bill that we passed very soundly and very strongly in this body just a few months ago tells our States that, at least insofar as American taxpayer dollars are concerned, we are not going to stand for that, and when we the taxpayers of this country, through us in this Congress, direct the taxpayer money go back to the States to construct prisons, we want to see that those prisons are constructed and housed with inmates who are going to serve at least 85 percent of their time.

I wonder what motivation anybody on the other side could have for saying we do not want them to serve 85 percent of their time. As a matter of fact, I would prefer if they served 100 percent of their time. But it is a very sound provision that we in this body passed, with very strong support of the American people, to tie prison construction funds, which go to the States, these are not local community block grants, the responsibility for building prisons in this country is essentially with our States. These moneys go to the States, but we are telling the States, "Keep your prisoners in these prisons at least 85 percent of the time." This is very sound policy. It is at the core of why we are seeing such tremendous recidivist rates in our country.

Mr. Chairman, there is in fact a direct correlation over the years between a decrease in the amount of prison time that those convicted of crimes serve and the recidivist rate.

As the prison inmate rate goes up, as people serve more of their sentence, crime rates do in fact go down. That is the very sound reason and demonstrable public policy behind the provisions in the bill, and the efforts of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] will in fact aid revolving-door justice

in this country. We are telling the American people let's stop that revolving door, at least insofar as we are able through taxpayer dollars being used to construct prisons that will go to those States that have the will, the wherewithal, to say we are going to build those prisons, and, more importantly, we are going to ensure when we put somebody in one of those prisons, they are going to stay there for at least 85 percent of the time.

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am not aware of any studies that show that increasing the time served reduces the recidivism rate. The testimony we have heard in fact is that there is no reduction in recidivism rate generated by increasing the time served.

This revolving door that we have is a revolving door because we are not putting our money into prevention. We are trying to build our way out of the problem. If we are going to be honest, we ought to acknowledge that 38 percent figure. If you want to move it up to a 100-percent figure, you ought to add up and tell the American people what it is going to cost.

In Virginia, proposal X that recently has been enacted, but not fully funded, increases the time served from about 25 to 50 percent, and that cost will cost Virginia \$11 billion in the next 10 years. That is a national equivalent of spending \$400 billion trying to build our way out of this problem.

If we want to be honest, we will tell the people what result we are going to get. The studies have shown the result will be statistically insignificant. So this little \$300 million we are talking about will not make any difference if we put it into incarceration. It is an insane strategy to try to build our way out of the problem. We ought to put our money where it will make a difference, and that is in prevention. That is why I have introduced the amendment, and hope it is agreed to.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin briefly on another subject, by complimenting Chairman ROGERS and other members of the subcommittee in both parties for the emphasis they have placed in supporting assistant U.S. attorneys and agents in the field for the Federal Government, because that is where the proverbial rubber meets the road in terms of law enforcement. More crime is investigated and prosecuted with more professionals assigned to do that.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Scott amendment for several reasons. The gentleman from Virginia I think stated that his district was in the top 30 in the Nation in burglaries.

I strongly suggest that if more of those burglars were off the street there would be less burglaries in the gentleman's district.

The question was, in prison population related to crime. Well, first, I would point out that we have all heard the statistics that the number of people incarcerated in the United States has been going up. We all know that. But more recently, there have been a number of news articles pointing out that the percentage of crime, the crime rate in many areas, including violent crime, has been going down. So there is a general correlation that I think is obvious, that as the prison population goes up crime goes down.

It is not that I think prisons are wonderful places, but if you take perpetrators off of the street, we have less crime. In fact, the U.S. Bureau of Statistics, I am informed, stated that in a study, those offenders who serve more than 5 years in prison actually were repeaters less often than those who served less than 5 years in prison.

But the main point is when that criminal is out of prison, particularly repeat criminal, then that criminal is repeating crimes on the street, in the district of the gentleman from Virginia or any district.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the cost of prisons is high. There is no doubt about that. I think it can be reduced in many ways. But the fact of the matter is, it will never be inexpensive in a due process country that respects human rights. But I submit the cost of crime, particularly repeat crime, is greater than the cost of prisons, that a repeat offender committing crimes, particularly burglaries, because the average burglar does not commit one burglary a week, he commits one or more burglaries every single day, 365 days a year. It does not take long to compute the fact that even with moderate gains from each burglary, the cost to society in crime in pure dollars, not even talking about the human heartache of people having their homes invaded or businesses taken over, but the cost to society in pure dollars of having repeat criminals on the street is worse than the cost to society of prisons.

This is not to say that there is not room for alternatives. Nothing in this truth in sentencing says that every single person convicted of any crime must go to prison. I do not believe that is appropriate in every case. But what truth in sentencing does recognize is that those States that are trying to make headway by establishing truth-in-sentencing laws, which have come to mean requiring those who are sent to prison to serve at least 85 percent of their sentences, and I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR], I think individuals deserve 100 percent of their sentences, whatever the sentences might be, but truth in sentencing has come to mean serving 85 percent of sentences.

That is often double what is served in many States. I regret to say in my own



State of New Mexico the good time law there is one of the most liberal in the Nation. There is up to 50 percent off of sentences to prison for all kinds of crimes, including murder. So when the people of New Mexico see in their newspapers that a particular criminal is sentenced to a certain number of years in prison, that will be the headlines. They then have to read in the fine print the fact that that is not the real figure. The real figure is half of what is in the headlines.

Now, truth in sentencing in the bill recognizes that keeping offenders, particularly repeat offenders, in prison longer will cost the States more money. That is an obvious fact, too. Every day someone is in prison is a cost to the State. I think it is a cost to the State that is warranted in a number of cases, because it saves money on the cost of crime. But, nevertheless, it occurs.

Truth in sentencing does not force States to adopt truth-in-sentencing laws. Truth in sentencing recognizes that because of the increased cost of keeping offenders, particularly repeat offenders, off of the street, there is an increased cost to the States to do so. For that purpose, the bill provides an incentive to support States economically with their difficult decision to keep offenders off of the street.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the truth in sentencing is an important part of the bill to keep offenders, repeat offenders, off of the streets, and I urge rejection of the Scott amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 10 seconds of my time to clarify a word that was used.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1345

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Third Congressional District of Virginia has three of the top murder rates. I meant to say murder. I just wanted to correct the RECORD.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional seconds.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's correction that his district is in the top in murder rate, not burglary rate. But I think that my point, that keeping criminals off the street may help alleviate that problem, still stands.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

By eliminating the truth-in-sentencing prison grants, the amendment would let violent criminals loose on the streets to continue to prey on innocent Americans.

The American people are tired of the liberals' soft-on-crime, hug-a-thug approach. The American people want murderers and rapists behind bars.

The senseless murder of a young girl named Cora Jones in rural Wisconsin tragically underscores what I've heard from thousands of people in northeast Wisconsin:

It's time to get tough on criminals.

Cora was killed by a criminal released on parole. If that criminal were in prison where he belonged, Cora would be alive today.

People are scared about rising crime rates, and they are demanding action.

The statistics are frightening.

Every year, nearly 5 million Americans are victims of violent crime.

Another 19 million are victims of property crime.

A murder is committed every 21 minutes in the United States.

A rape, every 5 minutes.

A robbery, every 46 seconds.

Why such staggering figures?

Because we aren't keeping criminals in prison.

Sixty-nine percent of young adults released from prison are arrested again within 6 years, after committing an average of 13 new crimes.

Overall, 7 percent of criminals commit 70 percent of all violent crimes.

It's no wonder Americans are fed up.

We need a new approach to fighting crime.

If a thug is behind bars, he can't commit another murder, rape, or robbery.

But under this amendment, we will have no new prisons to hold violent criminals.

These prison grants will go only to States that enact truth-in-sentencing laws.

Truth-in-sentencing laws mean a 30-year sentence is just that: 30 years, no parole.

Criminals will think long and hard before committing an offense if they know they won't be back out on the street in a few months. It's wrong that law-abiding Americans—who work hard, pay their taxes, and raise their kids—have to live in fear.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot rest until every man, woman, and child in America can walk down any street in America and feel safe.

Vote against the Scott amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STUPAK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. STUPAK: Page 24, line 7, after "Grants" insert "of such amount \$600,000,000 shall be available for rural areas in which the unit of local government in such area has a population of less than 50,000".

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, No. 41, is what I would consider the rural setaside amendment. What this amendment does is set aside approximately \$600 million for rural law enforcement programs. The money would come from the \$2 billion set aside for the local law enforcement block grant.

When this bill was being considered by both authorizers and appropriators, the President had requested over \$10 million to be set aside for rural law enforcement needs. As we went through the appropriation process, no money was set aside for rural America. As we had our discussions yesterday on the local law enforcement block grant program, to put money into local block grants, we found during the debate yesterday that the money will go to those communities which have the highest crime rates, the highest crime rates.

Those of us who live in rural areas find ourselves relatively safe and free from high crime rates. Therefore, our communities will not be able to benefit underneath the existing appropriation as passed yesterday by the House, especially when we talk about the local law enforcement block grant. The high crime rate areas usually are urban areas. The money, therefore, this \$2 billion would go to the urban areas. Rural law enforcement has no access to money for police officers or for equipment underneath this program.

Those of us in rural areas were very pleased that the President's COPS Program recognized the specific needs of rural areas. The President had recognized rural areas as being those communities of less than 50,000. Therefore, my amendment has also recognized rural areas as being those of less than 50,000 population.

Twenty-seven to 30 percent of the people in this country live in rural areas. We pay taxes. We need help with law enforcement. We need help with all kinds of programs with the Federal Government. What we are asking for is that some of this money in this local law enforcement block grant be set aside. Yesterday the Clinton COPS Program was defeated. Therefore, our access to law enforcement, to equipment, to personnel, to help rural areas has been denied underneath the majority vote yesterday.

So what my amendment says is of this \$2 billion set aside in the local law enforcement area, 30 percent be set aside for rural areas. It is interesting to note that where we are asking the money to come from is local law enforcement block grants. We are taking the word "local" as being the small communities including our rural areas.

So, as you consider this amendment, if you have a community in your district where your population is less than 50,000 you would be denied any kind of funding. The only place we can find where rural areas are considered at all in this bill is found on page 38 in the report where it says, for domestic violence and child abuse enforcement

they have set aside \$7 million annually for 27 to 30 percent of the country. Rural areas have more than just domestic violence and child abuse enforcement. So, therefore, we are asking the Federal Government for some help.

With this amendment, amendment No. 41, we are asking then that 30 percent of the total local law enforcement block grant money be set aside for rural areas.

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against this amendment under clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Stupak amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, because it attempts to earmark \$600 million for a program for rural areas which is not authorized in law. The amendment attempts to amend the local law enforcement block grant which is an unauthorized program that is permitted to remain under the rule.

According to the ruling of the Chair on July 12, 1995, where an unauthorized appropriation is permitted to remain in a general appropriation bill, an amendment directly changing the amount in that paragraph and not adding legislative language of earmarking separate funds for another purpose is in order as merely perfecting. Clearly, this amendment does more than merely change the amount in the paragraph. It adds legislative language and earmarks a portion of the funds for a new purpose and so constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill.

I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, on this point of order, if we look on page 39 of the report and even coming back to H.R. 728, which we debated on February 14, 1995, under the title local law enforcement block grant, throughout the bill we talk about local law enforcement block grant. What we have merely done was do the perfecting that is allowed underneath hereby defining what local is. We are not saying that what the local law enforcement block grant is those communities with populations less than 50,000. This is a perfecting amendment to the authorized program.

When we talk about local law enforcement, nowhere in the bill, whether it is the authorizing bill or whether it is this appropriation bill, do they identify and state to us what local is. This would be a perfecting amendment. Therefore, I feel it would be appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Kentucky regarding unauthorized earmarking, the point of order is sustained.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Page 18, line 2, strike "\$2,574,578,000" and insert "\$2,539,578,000". Page 77, line 8, strike "\$233,000,000" and insert "\$268,000,000".

## POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would increase the level of budget authority/outlays in the bill in violation of clause 2(f) of rule XXI. This rule states that "it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill without increasing the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill."

The amendment would increase the level of budget authority outlays in the bill. We have CBO scoring which shows a net increase in outlays of \$1,753,000. So, therefore, it violates a rule of the House.

I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I have a colloquy with the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot conduct a colloquy on a point of order. The gentleman may be recognized on the point of order.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, more importantly, I seek unanimous consent to amend the amendment as offered, to increase the measure as proposed by \$33 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman say to increase or to decrease?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am seeking an increase of \$33 million. The gentleman's point of order says I am a million plus over. I now ask unanimous consent to amend my amendment to increase by \$33 million the funding that I seek.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that this amendment be withdrawn while he has a chance to discuss the matter with this Member, perhaps, to see what can be worked out.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's admonition.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. NORTON: Page 29, strike line 12 and all that follows through line 18.

Redesignate succeeding sections accordingly.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes and that the time be equally divided between the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

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

Mr. Chairman, this Congress did the right thing in 1993 when it finally allowed women in prison to elect an abortion among the medical services provided them. We overturned the barbaric policy that allowed such abortions only when the life of the mother was endangered or when rape had occurred, not even apparently when incest was involved.

Women in prison, Federal prisons, earn between 10 and 40 cents an hour. There is no hope that they could get the average \$231 that an abortion in the first trimester costs. Yet these are the women most in need of choice. These are the women in our country who have led the most chaotic lives. These are the women who are least capable of taking care of themselves. They have not been able even to keep within the law. These are the women least able to bear and relate to children.

Who will speak for these children? We must speak for these children. We must speak for these women.

I strongly favor and would rise just as adamantly to protect the rights of these women to bear children in prison, if they desire. But surely we would not want to deny a woman the right to choice in prison. Two-thirds of these women are drug offenders. More than two-thirds are 40 or under. Most of them are of reproductive age. Many of these women are HIV infected or have full-blown AIDS. Many are addicts who have landed in prison, very often.

In the last 11 years, the number of women in Federal prisons has more than doubled, more than tripled. These

women have themselves been the victims of wholesale physical and sexual abuse.

What happens to these women happens to their fetuses or to their children. In prison they are subjected to a high-starch prison diet. Nobody brings in the right WIC food for women in prison.

□ 1400

Prison is not where people go to get prenatal care. These women have to contemplate the fact that if they were to bear a child to term, they would have to be separated from that child. These are the women in our society most in need of choice—those in Federal prisons. They do get counseling, including religious counseling and social counseling. This is not, for a woman in prison, any more than for any other woman, a decision that can or should be made lightly. In effect, if these women do not have choice, of course, we are forcing women who are incarcerated to bear children. This is not America if that is what we are prepared to do, particularly given the particular kind of population that we find in Federal prisons today.

Mr. Chairman, we must, even at this time in the proceedings, try to be remembered for other than being the Congress who looked for each and every opportunity to deny women the most fundamental of rights. We have done it to women in the military who are serving their country, we have done it to Federal workers, we have done it to Federal planning overseas, and today in committee we passed, or the committee passed, a provision making it optional for States to fund for rape and incest. How low are we willing to sink on the question of abortion? How far are we willing to go to deny the most fundamental of rights?

Mr. Chairman, whatever we think and wherever Members stand on the notion of choice generally, I hope Members will now allow themselves to be recorded as forcing women who are incarcerated to bear children against their will.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON]. This bill reinstates a provision which was carried in the bill prior to fiscal 1994. That provision prohibits Federal tax dollars from being used to pay for abortions for Federal prison inmates. This amendment would strike that provision, that prohibition.

The issue here is very simple and clear. The question is should taxpayers' money be used to pay for an abortion. Time and again, the Congress has debated this issue. Time and again the Congress' answer, and more importantly, the answer of the American taxpayer, has been no. I urge rejection of the gentlewoman's amendment, and urge that the bill be supported.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Norton amendment which would remove the ban on access to abortion services for incarcerated women, except in cases of rape or life endangerment.

There are currently 5,984 women incarcerated in Federal Bureau of Prisons facilities, the majority—68 percent—of whom are serving sentences for drug offenses. Most of the women are young, were frequently unemployed, and many were victims of physical or sexual abuse. According to a 1987 survey, 6 percent of women in prisons and 4 percent of those in jail were pregnant when admitted. Limited prenatal care, isolation from family and friends, and the certain loss of custody of the infant upon birth present unusual circumstances that exacerbate an already difficult situation if the pregnancy is unintended.

Because Federal prisoners are totally dependent on health care services provided by the Bureau of Prisons, this ban, in effect, prevents these women from exercising their constitutional right to abortion. Most women prisoners were poor when they entered prison, and they do not earn any meaningful compensation from prison jobs. This ban then closes off their only opportunity to receive such services, and thereby denies them their rights under the Constitution.

I urge my colleagues to support the Norton amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. I think this is absolutely a very essential thing that we should be doing. The gentlewoman from Maryland also made an important point in that when women are in prisons as prisoners, first of all, they are not in the best of shape, obviously, to start or raise a family. Second, one never really knows about their total health condition, and they have no option to go outside if they disagree with what is being imposed upon them.

I thought it was outrageous to impose this on women in the military and dependents in the military who are overseas, but they certainly have more options than women in prisons. What we are really doing is mandating motherhood for them, and denying them the right to full health care benefits that women would have on the outside.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is no exemption here for

incest or for many other things that I think concern people very much. I really would hope that the membership would think about this. My understanding is that the Congressional Budget Office has scored the amendment and said that there was no scoring effect to that. I would like to ask the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia if that is correct.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentlewoman, this has not been a huge spending item, obviously, or they would have found this was a terrific cost?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentlewoman, indeed, there have been only nine abortions since this right has been in effect, and women in prison have fewer abortions than women outside, and more choose to carry their babies to term, considerably more than choose to have abortions, so that what we are asking for here is merely for genuine choice.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman makes a very good point. There is some kind of image out there that this is some benefit to women in prisons and so forth and so on, but the statistics show just the opposite, just as they did with the women in the military, where there were a whole 10 abortions. Most people figured this was because of some disease-related complication or many other kinds of complications that could occur.

I find it really amazing that we are doing this type of thing to women. It seems like women were maybe the fad last year, but we cannot unroll their rights fast enough this year. We keep unrolling them. I urge Members to vote for the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute and 40 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I hear some people saying we have too many votes on abortion. I frankly do not like a lot of votes and debate on this issue. Let me just say very candidly and clearly that absent the votes and the amendments and the language we will be paying for, in one appropriations bill after another, abortion on demand.

This is not a benign process. If there is not explicit language proscribing the use for abortion, we will then be subsidizing abortion on demand. This language that is included by the gentleman from Kentucky, HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the subcommittee, would stop funding abortions in the Bureau of Prisons. Forty or so abortions were done prior to the language going into effect some time ago in the 1980's. The gentleman from California, BOB DORNAN, was the author of that language.

It seems to me it is worth the inconvenience, it is worth the difficulty, and again, I do not like going through this time and time again, but it is worth it if we can cease the facilitation and the subsidization of the killing of at least one child, and in this case we are talking about dozens of children. It seems to me that again we are talking about Government subsidization of abortion on demand.

The pendulum, without question, is swinging in favor of life. People no longer want to subsidize and pay out of their pockets for the chemical poisoning or the literal dismemberment of an unborn child's body. We happen to believe that the women are the victims as well, the co-victim, if you will. We want to see positive, nonviolent solutions to women who have pregnancies that were unintended, not the killing of their unborn babies.

Please, do not force me, my wife and my family and all of us, to pay for it. Again, the language the gentleman from Kentucky has put in would do that. Defeat the Norton amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask who has the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has the right to close. He has 11 minutes and 20 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia has 6 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Prisons has gone to great lengths to make sure that it is operating within the law, and indeed, has attached conditions to abortion that do not obtain in every State of the Union. For example, there must be medical, religious, or social counseling sessions offered. There must be written documentation that these sessions have taken place. The process is laid out in great detail in order to make sure that there are no violations. Those who are on the staff and somehow involved also have their rights protected. No staff or supervisory person need be involved with these decisions at all. The Bureau of Prisons, it seems to me, has handled this sensitive issue in just the right way, and the question before the House is are we prepared to handle this issue in just the right way.

Almost all of these women will be faced with two choices: Either make the choice for abortion, or make the choice to have a child who they will have very little, if anything, to do with. Most of these children, if they are carried to term, will go to the State. Since the majority of these women are women of color, in effect that means putting children born in prison into the foster care system.

Mr. Chairman, the foster care system cannot absorb the children of parents who are not in prison. The GAO has written a report on the foster care systems in a number of States. It is an appalling report. The situation is the same all over the country: too few fos-

ter parents, too many children. If a woman decides when she is incarcerated that she would like to choose an abortion, society, it seems to me, should be where she wants to be, just as it would be if she made that choice and were not in prison.

Remember, Mr. Chairman, of whom we are speaking. Since more than two-thirds of these women are in prison for drug offenses, understand that most of them were selling drugs because they were addicts themselves, many of them crack addicts. That says all we need to hear about their own pregnancies. The decision to carry a child or not carry a child should not be circumscribed by whether one happens to be incarcerated or not. The nature of the duress is even greater if the woman involved is, indeed, incarcerated.

I recognize that this issue is now and always will be contentious in this House. I would hope that at some point and for some women, we would understand the consequences sufficiently so we would not vote in knee-jerk ways on this sensitive issue. I ask, therefore, Mr. Chairman, for support of the Norton amendment, in the name of these women who cannot speak for themselves.

□ 1415

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Ms. NORTON's amendment. My colleagues, what we have seen throughout this appropriations process is a direct assault on the right to choose. The ban on Federal funds for abortions for women in prison is just the next in a long line of rollbacks on women's reproductive freedoms. This assault on the constitutional rights of women must be stopped.

The antichoice forces have not directly confronted the basic right, because they know that the vast majority of American people support women's reproductive rights. Rather, they have chipped away at it, hoping that American women will not notice. We must prove them wrong. We must stand up and say "We do notice, and we will not stand for it."

What is particularly shameful about the strategy of the abortion foes is that they have singled out groups of women for attack. I suppose that their theory is that most American women will not notice until it happens to them, and then it will be too late. Just look at their record in both the appropriating and authorizing committees this summer:

In the Labor-HHS bill, funding for abortions for indigent victims of rape and incest was cut;

Also in the Labor-HHS bill, funds for family planning services for poor women were zeroed out;

In the Treasury-Postal bill, Federal employees have been barred from purchasing insurance with abortion coverage;

Earlier this summer, in the DOD authorization bill, military women were barred from purchasing abortions on bases overseas with their own funds;

At the Judiciary Committee, they are considering authorizing legislation that would ban one of the safest procedures for women who face a late-term abortion due to a severe threat to her life or health, or a severe fetal anomaly;

And now, they want to ban abortion funds for women in prison.

Poor women. Victims of rape and incest. Federal employees. Women in the military. Women facing severe health crises. Women in prison. Who is next? It could be any of us. We must stop this assault on reproductive rights now.

I urge my colleagues to support the Norton amendment, and to say no to this rolling back of the reproductive rights of American women.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief, as the issue is starkly simple. Do we use Federal funds to pay for abortions? Time and again, Congress has said no. Time and again, the American people have told us to say no, that these moneys should not be used for that purpose.

The amendment would strike the prohibition in the bill that prevents funds from being used for that purpose. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. FIELDS OF LOUISIANA

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 46 offered by Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana: Page 24, line 6, strike "\$2,000,000,000" and all that follows through "1995" on line 9 and insert "\$1,800,000,000 shall be for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, pursuant to H.R. 728 as passed the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995; \$200,000,000 for crime prevention and model grants as authorized by title III of the 1994 Act;"

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Kentucky opposed to the amendment?

Mr. ROGERS. I am opposed, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman and the ranking member on our side of the aisle for all the hard work they have done on this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very straightforward amendment. It is an amendment that many Members of the House have already considered in one form or another.

This amendment will take 10 percent of the \$2 billion and use that money for crime prevention. This bill appropriates \$2 billion in the form of a block grant. This amendment will simply take 10 percent of that, which would be about \$200 million, and \$200 million will be used for the precise purpose of prevention.

When we passed the crime bill in 1994, we enumerated several crime prevention programs within that legislation and we balanced the bill such that money will not only go into jails and prisons but also go into crime prevention.

If we pass the Fields amendment, this amendment will provide the \$200 million that could be used for the Ounce of Prevention Council which was a part of the 1994 crime bill; Local Crime Prevention Block Grant Program; the Model Intensive Grants Program; Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program.

All these programs are very conducive programs for preventing crime so that we will not spend the kind of money that we spend today in locking people up and putting them behind bars: Family and Community Assistance Program; Assistance for Delinquent and At-Risk Youth; Police Retirement; Local Partnership Act; the National Community Economic Partnership; the Urban Recreation and At-Risk Youth Program; Community-Based Justice Grants for Prosecutors; the Family Unity Demonstration Project; substance abuse treatment in Federal prisons as well as State prisons; and Gang Resistance and Education Training, which is a great program that many people in many States across the country use.

I think this is a very important amendment and I would hope that Members accept this amendment. We spend \$60,000 to build a jail cell in this

country, \$30,000 to maintain it. This is prevention. I think it is in the best interests of our country to spend money where it is most needed.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It takes \$200 million from the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program to fund crime prevention programs like midnight basketball, homework assistance, after-school programs, nutrition services, family counseling, job programs to prevent crime, grants for education, recreation facilities and so on and so forth.

We have voted on these things now time and again. We voted yesterday on this. The House by a huge majority rejected this type of funding. These are the midnight basketball programs that are back with us again. We turned them down in the Mollohan amendment yesterday.

They are back with us again today. I have no doubt they will be with us tomorrow and from here on to eternity. But nevertheless the House says "no." How many times do we have to say no? I hope that the House will do short order on this and will vote down this amendment as it has repeatedly.

What the amendment says is that we believe that Washington knows how local communities should spend their money to prevent crime. Instead of letting communities decide what they want to do with the money, this amendment spreads \$200 million over a host of programs, tells them how much they can spend and for what purposes, whether they like it or not.

We are back to the same old thing of "one size fits all," all communities are just exactly alike, and Washington knows how to administer funds to all of them irrespective of their own peculiarities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to reject this effort, stay with us on sending money back to the local communities for them to decide how they would like to spend their money in preventing crime and in punishing crime once it takes place.

I urge Members to reject again midnight basketball for the 18th time.

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support his amendment. I think it makes good sense. What we do here in Washington is basically try to strike a balance between Federal planning and priorities and local planning. Not all local planning is good, not all Federal planning is bad.

The gentleman's amendment simply says, let's give 90 percent of the money

to the locals and let them make the decisions, but let 10 percent reflect certain national priorities. The specific national priority he is talking about is crime prevention.

When I talk to local law enforcement officials, they say crime prevention is essential. We cannot arrest ourselves out of the crime problem. We have to have prevention.

What is important about the prevention programs provided in this amendment? I would like to refer specifically to two: The first is substance abuse treatment in Federal and local prisons. Why? Because substance abuse leads to recidivism which means prisoners come out of prison, commit more crimes because they have substance abuse problems, and then they go back in the prison system and we the taxpayers pay \$25,000 a year to keep them in prison. We need substance abuse treatment.

Second, I refer Members to the Gang Resistance Program, called GRATE. We have it in my district and it works. One of the biggest threats in our society today is the emergence of organized gangs. To the extent that at a national level we say that it is important to thwart the emergence of these gangs, we are making good Federal decisionmaking.

I would urge my colleagues not to say that all Federal decisionmaking is bad and all local decisionmaking is good, but to strike a reasonable balance that enables us to impart certain Federal priorities for fighting gangs and for substance abuse treatment as well as other programs that have been proven to work. Prevention works. Please vote for prevention.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking member.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I express great appreciation to our colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS], for his leadership in this area, and his efforts to make sure that when we address this crime issue, that we do it in a comprehensive sort of way and look to prevention.

I want to note that the chairman, in his mark, does look to prevention as I add up the numbers. There is \$166 million in the crime trust fund for prevention programs. We have just recently added \$50 million, through the chairman's good graces, to the violence against women account. The subcommittee transferred \$40 million over to Labor-HHS, all for violence against women.

All of these are prevention programs. What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] does here is simply add a few more dollars to prevention programs, recognizing that intervention, particularly with our youth at an early stage, can prevent the crime that we are trying to fight here, and prevention

is just that, prevention. For every dollar we spend there, we pick up a lot of dollars on the crime-fighting side.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment. It is a relatively small amount of money added to the already \$166 million that the chairman supports, as I add it up here, and it is a little complicated because we have a number of different counts.

But the point is, our chairman has supported prevention, we are supporting it. The Fields amendment would support it, give greater resources, and we need them. We need them for programs like family demonstration grants and at-risk youth grants. I do not think anybody in this body can deny that.

I strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there is a reason why this bill refers to the Local Law enforcement Block Grant Program. These are law enforcement block grants. They are not education block grants, they are not family counseling block grants, they are not after-school program block grants, they are not nutrition block grants. These are law enforcement block grants. This is to enforce the law, not just to prevent crime but also to punish it after it takes place.

There are hundreds of programs on the books of this Federal Government that provide moneys for those types of programs. In the Department of Education, in the Department of Health and Human Services, and so forth, there are all sorts of moneys available for those types of things.

□ 1430

This money in this bill is for law enforcement and we have voted on this time and again, as recently as yesterday, to reject this type of an approach.

I urge my colleagues to stay with the bill's provisions for providing local governments block grants to fight crime with a Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program. Do not water it down with midnight basketball. We can do that elsewhere.

I urge a "no" vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings

were postponed. They will be considered in the following order:

Amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]; amendment No. 36 offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]; amendment No. 54 offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON]; and amendment No. 46 offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings. This will be a 17-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 171, noes 256, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 572]

AYES—171

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Browder  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Chabot  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Creameans  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Engel  
Evans  
Fattah  
Fields (LA)

Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Hilliard  
Hinchev  
Hobson  
Hoke  
Holden  
Hoyer  
Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klink  
LaFalce  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lowey  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton

Markey  
Mascara  
McCarthy  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Ney  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Portman  
Poshard  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders

Sawyer  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Spratt  
Stokes

Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Tucker  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento

Vislosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Watt (NC)  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Zeliff

NOES—256

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brewster  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chambliss  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Deal  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Everett  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox

Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrist  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hoekstra  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Martini  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Meek  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)

Mineta  
Molinari  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Myers  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Ortiz  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Traficant  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White

Whitfield Woolsey Young (FL)  
Wicker Young (AK) Zimmer

Watt (NC)  
Waxman

Williams  
Woolsey

Wynn  
Yates

Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Traficant

Upton  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldboltz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)

Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Wyden  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman Dingell Reynolds  
Chenoweth Jacobs  
Collins (MI) Moakley

NOES—321

Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bentsen  
Bevill  
Billbray  
Bilirakis  
Biley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Borski  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chapman  
Christensen  
Chryster  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Condit  
Cooley  
Costello  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorman  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Evans  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler

Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourrette  
Skeen  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Luther  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martini

Bateman  
Chenoweth  
Collins (MI)

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell  
McKinney  
Moakley  
Olver  
Reynolds

□ 1501

So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. NORTON

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 281, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 574]

AYES—146

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 105, noes 321, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 573]

AYES—105

Abercrombie Foglietta Pastor  
Ackerman Ford Payne (NJ)  
Becerra Frank (MA) Payne (VA)  
Beilenson Gutierrez Pelosi  
Bereuter Hastings (FL) Peterson (MN)  
Berman Hilliard Pickett  
Bishop Hinchey Pomeroy  
Bonior Hoekstra Rahall  
Boucher Inglis Rangel  
Brown (CA) Jackson-Lee Roybal-Allard  
Brown (FL) Jefferson Rush  
Brown (OH) Johnson, E. B. Sabo  
Cardin Kanjorski Sanders  
Clay Kleczka Schroeder  
Clayton LaFalce Scott  
Clement Lantos Serrano  
Clyburn Lazio Shays  
Coleman Lewis (GA) Sisisky  
Collins (IL) Lofgren Skaggs  
Conyers Lowey Slaughter  
Coyne Maloney Smith (MI)  
DeFazio Markey Stark  
Dellums Martinez Stokes  
Dicks McDermott Studts  
Dixon Meek Thompson  
Doggett Mfume Torres  
Ehlers Miller (CA) Towns  
Engel Mineta Tucker  
Eshoo Minge Velazquez  
Farr Mink Moran  
Fattah Morán Vento  
Fields (LA) Nadler Waters  
Filner Oberstar  
Flake Owens

Abercrombie Frelinghuysen Moran  
Ackerman Frost Morella  
Andrews Furse Nadler  
Baldacci Gejdenson Olver  
Barrett (WI) Gonzalez Owens  
Becerra Green Pallone  
Beilenson Greenwood Pastor  
Bentsen Gutierrez Payne (NJ)  
Berman Harman Pelosi  
Bishop Hastings (FL) Peterson (FL)  
Boucher Hilliard Pickett  
Brown (CA) Hinchey Rangel  
Brown (FL) Horn Reed  
Brown (OH) Houghton Richardson  
Bryant (TX) Hoyer Rivers  
Cardin Jackson-Lee Rose  
Chapman Jefferson Roukema  
Clay Johnson (CT) Roybal-Allard  
Clayton Johnson, E. B. Rush  
Clyburn Johnston Sabo  
Coleman Kelly Sanders  
Collins (IL) Kennedy (MA) Sawyer  
Conyers Kennedy (RI) Schroeder  
Coyne Kennelly Schumer  
DeFazio Kolbe Scott  
DeLauro Lantos Serrano  
Dellums Levin Shays  
Deutsch Lewis (GA) Sisisky  
Dicks Lofgren Skaggs  
Dixon Lowey Slaughter  
Doggett Luther Stark  
Dooley Maloney Stokes  
Durbin Markey Studts  
Engel Martinez Thompson  
Eshoo Matsui Torres  
Evans McCarthy Torricelli  
Farr McDermott Towns  
Fattah McKinney Traficant  
Fawell Meehan Velazquez  
Fazio Meek Vento  
Fields (LA) Menendez Visclosky  
Filner Meyers Ward  
Foglietta Mfume Waters  
Ford Miller (CA) Watt (NC)  
Frank (MA) Mink Waxman  
Franks (CT) Mink Williams  
Franks (NJ) Molinari

Wilson Wyden Yates  
Woolsey Wynn Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Williams Williams  
Wise Wyden Wynn  
Yates

NOES—281

NOES—296

Allard Geren Neumann  
Archer Gibbons Ney  
Army Gilcrest Norwood  
Bachus Gillmor Nussle  
Baesler Gilman Oberstar  
Baker (CA) Goodlatte Obey  
Baker (LA) Goodling Ortiz  
Ballenger Gordon Orton  
Barcia Goss Oxley  
Barr Graham Packard  
Barrett (NE) Gunderson Parker  
Bartlett Gutknecht Paxon  
Barton Hall (OH) Payne (VA)  
Bass Hall (TX) Peterson (MN)  
Bereuter Hamilton Petri  
Bevill Hancock Pombo  
Billbray Hansen Pomeroy  
Billarakis Hastert Porter  
Bliley Hastings (WA) Portman  
Blute Hayes Poshard  
Boehlert Hayworth Pryce  
Boehner Hefley Quillen  
Bonilla Hefner Quinn  
Bonior Heineman Radanovich  
Bono Herger Rahall  
Borski Hilleary Ramstad  
Brewster Hobson Regula  
Browder Hoekstra Riggs  
Brownback Hoke Roberts  
Bryant (TN) Holden Roemer  
Bunn Hostettler Rogers  
Bunning Hunter Rohrabacher  
Burr Hutchinson Ros-Lehtinen  
Burton Hyde Roth  
Buyer Inglis Royce  
Callahan Istook Salmon  
Calvert Jacobs Sanford  
Camp Johnson (SD) Saxton  
Canady Johnson, Sam Scarborough  
Castle Jones Schaefer  
Chabot Kanjorski Schiff  
Chambliss Kaptur Seastrand  
Christensen Kasich Sensenbrenner  
Chrysler Kildee Shadegg  
Clement Kim Shaw  
Clinger King Shuster  
Coble Kingston Skeen  
Coburn Kleczka Skelton  
Collins (GA) Klink Smith (MI)  
Combest Klug Smith (NJ)  
Condit Knollenberg Smith (TX)  
Cooley LaFalce Solomon  
Costello LaHood Souder  
Cox Largent Spence  
Cramer Latham Spratt  
Crane LaTourette Pratt  
Crapo Laughlin Stearns  
Cremeans Lazio Stenholm  
Cubin Leach Stockman  
Cunningham Lewis (CA) Stump  
Danner Lewis (KY) Stupak  
Davis Lightfoot Talent  
de la Garza Lincoln Tanner  
Deal Linder Tate  
DeLay Lipinski Tauzin  
Diaz-Balart Livingston Taylor (MS)  
Dickey LoBiondo Taylor (NC)  
Doolittle Tejeda  
Dornan Lucas Thomas  
Doyle Manton Thornberry  
Dreier Manzullo Thornton  
Duncan Martini Thurman  
Dunn Mascara Tiaht  
Edwards McCollum Tucker  
Ehlers McCreery Volkmer  
Ehrlich McDade Vucanovich  
Emerson McHale Waldholtz  
English McHugh Walker  
Ensign McInnis Waldholtz  
Everett McIntosh Walker  
Ewing McKeon Walsh  
Fields (TX) McNulty Wamp  
Flake Metcalf Watts (OK)  
Flanagan Mica Weldon (FL)  
Foley Miller (FL) Weldon (PA)  
Forbes Minge Weller  
Fowler Mollohan White  
Fox Montgomery Whitfield  
Frisa Moorhead Wicker  
Funderburk Murtha Wise  
Gallegly Myers Wolf  
Ganske Myrick Young (AK)  
Gekas Neal Young (FL)  
Gephardt Nethercutt Zeliff

Bateman Dingell Smith (WA)  
Chenoweth Moakley  
Collins (MI) Reynolds

□ 1510

Mr. OBEY changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. DURBIN changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, on the amendment offered by the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], I voted "no." I was in error as to the order that the votes were being called. I would like for the RECORD to reflect that I would have voted "aye" on rollcall 574.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FIELDS OF LOUISIANA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 128, noes 296, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 575]

AYES—128

Abercrombie Gibbons Neal  
Ackerman Gonzalez Oberstar  
Baldacci Green Obey  
Becerra Gutierrez Olver  
Beilenson Hastings (FL) Owens  
Berman Hilliard Pastors  
Bishop Hinchey Payne (NJ)  
Bonior Horn Pelosi  
Borski Hoyer Rahall  
Brown (CA) Jackson-Lee Rangel  
Brown (FL) Jacobs Reed  
Bryant (TX) Jefferson Richardson  
Clay Johnson, E.B. Rivers  
Clayton Johnston Roybal-Allard  
Clyburn Kennedy (MA) Rush  
Coleman Kennedy (RI) Sabo  
Collins (IL) Kildee Sanders  
Conyers LaFalce Sawyer  
Coyne Lantos Schroeder  
DeFazio Levin Schumer  
DeLauro Lewis (GA) Scott  
Dellums Lofgren Serrano  
Deutsch Luther Shays  
Dicks Maloney Skaggs  
Dixon Manton Slaughter  
Doggett Markey Stark  
Engel Martinez Stokes  
Eshoo McDermott Studds  
Farr McKinney Stupak  
Fattah McNulty Thompson  
Fazio Meehan Torres  
Fields (LA) Meek Torricelli  
Filner Menendez Towns  
Flake Mfume Tucker  
Foglietta Miller (CA) Velazquez  
Ford Mineta Vento  
Frank (MA) Mink Visclosky  
Frost Mollohan Waters  
Furse Moran Watt (NC)  
Gejdenson Morella Waxman  
Gephardt Nadler

Allard Franks (CT) Mica  
Andrews Franks (NJ) Miller (FL)  
Archer Frelinghuysen Minge  
Army Frisa Molinari  
Bachus Funderburk Montgomery  
Baesler Gallegly Moorhead  
Baker (CA) Ganske Murtha  
Baker (LA) Gekas Myers  
Ballenger Geren Myrick  
Barcia Gilcrest Nethercutt  
Barr Gillmor Neumann  
Barrett (NE) Gilman Ney  
Barrett (WI) Goodlatte Norwood  
Bartlett Goodling Nussle  
Barton Gordon Ortiz  
Bass Goss Orton  
Bentsen Graham Oxley  
Bereuter Greenwood Packard  
Bevill Gunderson Pallone  
Billarakis Gutknecht Parker  
Bliley Hall (OH) Paxon  
Blute Hall (TX) Payne (VA)  
Boehlert Hamilton Peterson (FL)  
Boehner Hancock Peterson (MN)  
Bonilla Hansen Petri  
Bono Harman Pickett  
Boucher Hastert Pombo  
Brewster Hastings (WA) Pomeroy  
Browder Hayes Porter  
Brown (OH) Hayworth Portman  
Brownback Hefley Poshard  
Bryant (TN) Hefner Pryce  
Bunn Heineman Quillen  
Bunning Herger Quinn  
Burr Hilleary Radanovich  
Burton Hobson Ramstad  
Buyer Hoekstra Regula  
Callahan Hoke Riggs  
Calvert Holden Roberts  
Camp Hostettler Roemer  
Canady Houghton Rogers  
Cardin Hunter Rohrabacher  
Castle Hutchinson Ros-Lehtinen  
Chabot Hyde Roth  
Chambliss Inglis Roukema  
Chapman Istook Royce  
Christensen Johnson (CT) Salmon  
Chrysler Johnson (SD) Sanford  
Clement Johnson, Sam Saxton  
Clinger Jones Scarborough  
Coble Kanjorski Schaefer  
Coburn Kaptur Schiff  
Collins (GA) Kasich Seastrand  
Combest Kelly Sensenbrenner  
Condit Kennelly Shadegg  
Cooley Kim Shaw  
Costello King Shuster  
Cox Kingston Sisisky  
Cramer Kleczka Skeen  
Crane Klink Skelton  
Crapo Klug Smith (MI)  
Cremeans Knollenberg Smith (NJ)  
Cubin Kolbe Smith (TX)  
Cunningham LaHood Smith (WA)  
Danner Largent Solomon  
Davis Latham Souder  
de la Garza LaTourette Spence  
Deal Laughlin Spratt  
DeLay Leach Stearns  
Diaz-Balart Lewis (CA) Stenholm  
Dickey Lewis (KY) Stump  
Dooley Lightfoot Talent  
Doolittle Lincoln Tanner  
Dornan Linder Tate  
Doyle Lipinski Tauzin  
Dreier Livingston Taylor (MS)  
Duncan LoBiondo Taylor (NC)  
Dunn Longley Tejeda  
Edwards Lucas Thomas  
Ehlers Manzullo Thornton  
Ehrlich Martini Thurman  
Emerson Mascara Tiaht  
English Matsui Torkildsen  
Ensign McCarthy Trafficant  
Evans McCollum Upton  
Everett McCreery Volkmer  
Ewing McDade Vucanovich  
Fawell McHale Waldholtz  
Fields (TX) McHugh Walker  
Flanagan McNinn Walsh  
Foley McIntosh Wamp  
Forbes McKeon Ward  
Fowler Metcalf Watts (OK)  
Fox Meyers Weldon (FL)



Weldon (PA)	Wicker	Young (FL)
Weller	Wilson	Zeliff
White	Wolf	Zimmer
Whitfield	Young (AK)	

NOT VOTING—10

Bateman	Dingell	Rose
Bilbray	Lazio	Stockman
Chenoweth	Moakley	
Collins (MI)	Reynolds	

□ 1517

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 575, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, July 25, I missed rollcall vote No. 571 during consideration of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, rather than call up the amendment that I had filed on this topic, I want to discuss briefly with the subcommittee chairman an issue concerning a provision in the bill that would transfer a significant number of departmental lawyer positions to the U.S. Attorney's offices.

Mr. Chairman, after our subcommittee completed its work on this bill, I learned from the Department of Justice that they had some serious concerns about this proposal, which was to transfer several lawyers out of the Environment and Natural Resources Division and the Tax Division out into the offices of the several U.S. Attorneys. In particular, a letter from the Assistant Attorney General Lois Schiffer about this complained that it would cause " \* \* \* severe problems for the Environment Division" and would " \* \* \* threaten the effective enforcement of our environmental laws, clean water, clear air, and clean land." I share these concerns.

As the chairman knows, the U.S. Attorneys have broad responsibilities, including prosecution of many, many different kinds of cases involving narcotics violations and other criminal offenses. I am just concerned that this transfer might have the unintended and unfortunate effect of lessening our ability to adequately represent the interests of the United States and the American people in these environment and natural resource cases.

I wonder if the subcommittee chairman could assure me he is willing to consider these problems raised by the Department of Justice and would be open to working with the Department on their concerns as we proceed through the rest of the process with this bill in the Senate and in conference?

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the gentleman that it is our intent to continue enforcement of our environmental and tax laws, at least at the current rate. We state this in our report to the bill. I will carefully review the objections of the Justice Department and will remain open to working with the Department on this issue as we proceed on the bill.

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for his observations.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Colorado and the chairman of the subcommittee. I wanted to confirm as well the response to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. Chairman, you are saying that you would yield maximum flexibility to the Attorney General to determine who would be transferred and where they would be transferred from and give them an opportunity to get some feedback from the attorneys themselves, so that we would not see the loss in cost of time and money that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] referred to in the letter we received from the Assistant Attorney General?

I am equally concerned that this move, which I know is intended to accomplish efficiencies, might in fact backfire because we have so many cases tried in Washington that it might wind up costing us more money, and, if there is to be a transfer, you would rely upon the advice of the Attorney General in letting the Attorney General reach those decisions on how to carry out the language that is in the report.

Mr. ROGERS. I think I have responded adequately.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, because I, too, had some of the similar concerns that have been brought up in the colloquy about the transfer of the 200 attorneys from the Environment and Natural Resources Division and Tax Division of the Department of Justice to the U.S. Attorney's Office. It has been well-intended, as we know, and yet there are unintended consequences with regard to the disruption to Federal law enforcement, the question about whether we would even save money. It may slow down the Justice Department's ability to resolve caseloads, and it may increase the number of cases that would be handled by the Tax and Environment Divisions that are heard in local courts in Washington, as well as the cost.

So I appreciate the fact that the subcommittee chair is going to try to ameliorate this situation, to remedy it, and I support the colloquy. I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], for having initiated it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida: Page 18, line 2, strike "\$2,574,578,000" and insert "\$2,537,078,000."

Page 77, line 8, strike "\$233,000,000" and insert "\$268,000,000".

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 20 minutes, and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of the amendment, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to increase by \$35 million the funding for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This amendment would bring the EEOC to the administration's requested level of \$268 million.

I have offset this increase by taking \$37.5 million from Federal prisons, salaries and expenses, because I believe that fighting discrimination will yield greater results than buttressing the prison system. The committee increased the appropriation for Federal prisons by \$236 million and recommended that \$57 million of these dollars go toward activating 10 new and expanded facilities.

In this particular matter, despite the effectiveness of reforms undertaken by the EEOC, I do not believe that they will be able to fulfill their duty in a timely manner unless they have the resources to do so. Every day new cases are added to the caseload of this agency. The committee report states that the committee is confident that the EEOC will be able to streamline the process and thereby reduce the case numbers. However, I do not share such blind confidence.

There are approximately 771 caseworkers at the EEOC. This means that the average caseworker is handling more than 135 cases at one time. Gilbert Cassellas, chairman of the EEOC stated during the May 11, 1995 hearings before the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, that even if the Commission took no more cases, it would still take the organization 18.8 months to finish its present caseload.

Consider the fact that 97 percent of this country's Fortune 500 companies'

senior management positions are filled by white males. Women and minorities still make significantly less than white males. In 1992, white women made 70 cents for every dollar white males made, and black males made 74 cents for every dollar made by their white counterparts. These facts demonstrate that considerable discrimination is continuing in this country, unfortunately.

It is unconscionable that we create a commission such as the EEOC and not give them the tools to meet their goals. This country is divided over the issue of race and gender. We must not undermine programs that actively deal with such discrimination.

The work of the EEOC is not complete, as evidenced by the fact that almost 100,000 complaints have yet to be examined. Given the recent attacks on affirmative action, I feel it is imperative that the EEOC is able to fulfill its mandate of protecting all American workers from discrimination.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to rise in support of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, would take \$35 million out of vitally needed resources to open new prisons. I am not talking about the merits of the gentleman's proposal to help EEOC. I am just talking about what it is going to do to us if we do this amendment.

□ 1530

These are prisons that are almost complete and will be coming on line in 1996. Mr. Chairman, we have spend hundreds of million of dollars to build five new prisons and expand five others, all of which will be ready for occupancy in 1996. These facilities will not open if this amendment should pass. They will sit there empty. Meanwhile we have got crowded prisons all over the country.

We are at 140 percent or so of occupancy in the Federal prison system, at least. And these 10 new facilities are absolutely vital to relieve the overcrowding that exists in the present prisons, not to mention the heavy influx of new prisoners that we expect in 1996.

Here is an example of some of the facilities that will not open if this amendment passes: A low- and minimum-security facility in Beaumont, TX, a low- and minimum-security facility in Taft, CA, and a facility in Forrest City, AR. Five new expansions will not be available in Tallahassee, FL, in Milan, MI, in Lompac, CA, Fort Worth, TX, and Lexington, KY.

As a result, nearly 9,200 more Federal prison beds will be sitting vacant and unused if this amendment passes. The Federal prison system is the second most overcrowded system in the Na-

tion. Overcrowding would increase by 132 percent in 1996. We simply cannot tolerate this when the Federal prison system is housing the most volatile Federal inmate population in history.

So I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment. The gentleman, I am sure, has a legitimate argument to make on the EEOC question. I am just saying to my colleagues, this is something we cannot afford to take the money from.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, most respectfully to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], I would urge him to be mindful that the Federal prison system had a carryover of \$35 million from the 1994 budget and has a \$2 billion budget; and I do not think that that can reasonably be argued that they cannot make their requirement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

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

I rise as a former chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission who was able to get rid of the backlog of the commission not only through greater efficiency but because the President of the United States gave me enough money to do it and said the rest would have to be done by efficiency. And we did that.

Mr. Chairman, I just heard a stark contrast. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] says, give a few dollars to get rid of discrimination. The chairman says, no, give a few dollars to put people in jail.

Watch out for the message you send. The message you send is that this Congress does not want to devote the money it would take to process cases of intentional discrimination but instead refuses to do that and says the money has to go to prisons.

I know what this means in the society at large, and I know what that means at EEOC. The agency is under ever so much greater pressure than when I was there. There is a whole new complicated statute. We have court decisions, the Adarand decision, and we have a level of funding that will not allow the job to get done.

The majority says, what we want to go after is intentional discrimination. These are backlog cases of intentional discrimination. This is a very difficult agency to run. It is much more like a manufacturing agency than a Government agency because you have to put out and account what you put out and account what you take in.

If we do not want to pay the money, if we do not want the money to go for antidiscrimination enforcement, then do not be heard to say that you are for ending discrimination, because when the time came, when the test was before you, you refused to allow the money to go to enforce antidiscrimination.

I thank the gentleman for this amendment. It draws the line. Let us ask the Members here today which side of the line are they on.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the gentleman's amendment.

We see Members every day run down to the well and say, I believe in a colorblind society. If there is discrimination, take it to EEOC. EEOC cannot do that job unless we pass this amendment. The bulk of EEOC's work involves investigation, processing and resolution of complaints. This requires interviewing, reviewing files, not computer work. This requires old-fashioned legwork.

In order to do legwork, you need personnel. But over the past 14 years, EEOC has experienced a reduction of 500 full-time employees. This comes despite a significant increase in responsibility.

In terms of private-sector complaints, they increase by 47 percent, up 29,000 additional charges.

The Federal sector: Again, up over 7,000 additional charges. More complaints, less personnel, it cannot work.

As a result, each investigator now has 135 cases. Four years ago they only had 55. They say, Mr. Chairman, justice delayed is justice denied. Pass this amendment. Eliminate the backlog. Help EEOC do its job.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] my friend, who wished to have been a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I rise in strong support of the Hastings amendment.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is about the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Equal. This is not about affirmative action. This is not about set-asides. This is about enforcing the law to make sure that people are treated equally in this country. Instead of funding the mechanism in our country that is designed to ensure that, we have allowed equal employment opportunity to become a joke.

Three hundred twenty-eight days behind in their processing, 97,000 cases in backlog, and we say that we want to stand for equality in this country.

I remind my colleagues, this is not about affirmative action. It is about equal treatment under the law.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hastings amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hastings amendment to provide funds to the

EEOC. The EEOC has a backlog of 97,000 cases of alleged discrimination. These are hard charges of discrimination in the workplace that need to be investigated. The Hastings amendment would provide funds for the EEOC to handle these discriminatory claims.

The facts speak for themselves. Over 95 percent of the top jobs in America go to white males, according to the "Glass Ceiling Report." It seems to me that some people want a guarantee of 100 percent of those jobs by eliminating affirmative action programs.

It's like my grandmother's sweet-potato pie. Some folks, white males, have pretty much had the whole pie to themselves for a very long time. Affirmative action has helped minorities get a small slice of that pie.

Full enforcement of equal employment laws is critical. I urge my colleagues to support the Hastings amendment so the EEOC can fully pursue discrimination charges.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO].

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman's amendment.

I think the point that a lot of Members miss on this issue is that in the Federal workplace and in the workplace in general, there are many people who rely on this agency for their last resort. Their ability to deal with the system, to deal with discrimination, to get some relief comes from this agency. What the gentleman is trying to do is deal with the fact that has been stated here before; the backlog of cases in this agency, the inability to process all the cases is really creating a very unfair situation.

This is, as has been stated before, about equality. This is an agency and a program that is truly in the best tradition of American democracy. Not to support this amendment is really to continue to say that equality in this country is not important. If you do not build a Federal prison, you can create a slight problem. If you do not give someone their due rights in this society, you create a major unfair problem.

This is a good amendment, and every Member should vote for it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank very much the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and his staff and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], and his staff for being considerate of the circumstances giving rise to this hastily drawn but very important measure.

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

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

Let me say that I want to, with all fervor and heart, support the amendment by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

This is not a time for us to retract and say that this is not a time to defend civil rights. This is an opportunity for us to say to all of America that we

understand the value of passage of the Civil Rights Act back in the 1960's, and this is a chance for us to tell all Americans, every American, regardless of their race, creed, or color, that it is time to increase pressure on all those who might discriminate.

I do not know if it has been mentioned, but over 100,000 allegations of discrimination have been filed with the EEOC over the past several years, each year. This is a time to make sure we have a strong, a vibrant EEOC. This is a time for us to say that we understand that the Federal Government has a role in enforcing our laws against discrimination.

I would hope that, along with the gentleman from Florida, what we do is understand that this is a time to recognize that all Americans should be treated equally. So I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the Hastings amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS].

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. This country must make a commitment to equal opportunity in the job place, and that is what this amendment does.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this amendment, however well intentioned, would have a devastating effect on the prison activation program that we are entering into for 1996. We have 10 new prison facilities that will be ready to open in 1996. This amendment, if it passes, will prevent us from opening those facilities.

We would be at 132 percent of capacity next year. A result of this amendment would be that 9,200 more Federal prison beds will be sitting vacant and unused and in empty, new or expanded buildings. I do not think the Congress wants that to be printed in the newspapers, that is, pictures of those empty prisons when we have overcrowding in the others.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment. If this amendment passes, new prisons will not open in Texas, California, and Arkansas; expanded prisons will not be allowed to be opened in five other States.

I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague from Florida, Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. Chairman, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is the Federal Government's frontline agency in the fight against racial discrimination in employment—a fight which I know we all support.

The amendment before us would increase the appropriation for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission by \$35 million—an amount equal to the President's request for fiscal year 1996.

Recent reforms put in place at EEOC, including the use of mediation as an alternative for resolving disputes and a new system for prioritizing incoming cases, show great promise for reducing the tremendous backlog which has built up in recent years.

And I would here like to thank the Chair of the subcommittee, my good friend from Kentucky, Mr. ROGERS, for his recognition of those reforms in the report language for the bill.

However, additional resources are needed to make those reforms a true success. The gentleman from Florida's amendment would fully fund the President's budget request for EEOC for fiscal year 1996—and help put the teeth back in civil rights enforcement.

I urge my colleagues to vote "aye" on the Hastings amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Hastings amendment.

This amendment would fully fund the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and provide it with the necessary resources to wage wholesale battle on its more than 100,000-case backlog.

I realize that there are some who contend that we must tear down equal opportunity programs as if racial discrimination were ancient history.

And at the same time, they would eliminate every program that holds out even the hope of opportunity and equality.

Sure, there are some businesses that want to do away with the EEOC because they think it is a burden, but I am not thinking about the businesses. I am thinking about the hard-working men and women who must labor day-in and day-out under glass ceilings, and employers who break the law and refuse to judge their employees on their abilities as opposed to their gender or race. If the EEOC is not there to protect these hard-working Americans then who will?

Discrimination is not an evil of the past. Unfortunately, contrary to this Nation's best hopes, today, unlawful employment discrimination is a very painful reality. Just look at the 100,000-case backlog.

As much as we would all like to believe that the problem of employment discrimination has been resolved, both the quantity and the nature of the charges provide evidence to the contrary.

In fiscal year 1994, the EEOC received 91,189 new complaints. As of the second quarter of fiscal year 1995, the backlog of complaints reached 108,106.

Unfortunately, business is still too good for the EEOC. The agency remains as needed, and as relevant today, as it was when Congress created it 30 years ago.

The Hastings amendment says to America, and to this body, that we should be opening the door to opportunity, not slamming it shut. I encourage my colleagues to support the Hastings amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS].

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the

Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 576]

Abercrombie DeFazio Hilliard  
 Ackerman DeLauro Hinchey  
 Allard DeLay Hobson  
 Andrews Dellums Hoekstra  
 Armev Deutsch Holden  
 Bachus Diaz-Balart Horn  
 Baesler Dickey Hostettler  
 Baker (CA) Dicks Houghton  
 Baker (LA) Dixon Hoyer  
 Baldacci Doggett Hunter  
 Ballenger Dooley Hutchinson  
 Barcia Dornan Hyde  
 Barr Doyle Inglis  
 Barrett (NE) Dreier Istook  
 Barrett (WI) Duncan Jackson-Lee  
 Bartlett Dunn Jacobs  
 Barton Durbin Jefferson  
 Bass Edwards Johnson (CT)  
 Becerra Ehlers Johnson (SD)  
 Beilenson Ehrlich Johnson, E. B.  
 Bentsen Emerson Johnson, Sam  
 Bereuter Engel Johnston  
 Berman English Jones  
 Beville Ensign Kanjorski  
 Bilbray Eshoo Kaptur  
 Bilirakis Evans Kasich  
 Bishop Everett Kelly  
 Bliley Ewing Kennedy (MA)  
 Boehlert Farr Kennedy (RI)  
 Boehner Fattah Kennelly  
 Bonilla Fawell Kildee  
 Bonior Fazio Kim  
 Bono Fields (LA) Kingston  
 Borski Fields (TX) Kleczka  
 Boucher Filner Klink  
 Brewster Flake Klug  
 Browder Flanagan Knollenberg  
 Brown (CA) Kolbe  
 Brown (FL) Foley LaFalce  
 Brown (OH) Forbes LaHood  
 Brownback Ford Lantos  
 Bryant (TN) Fowler Largent  
 Bryant (TX) Fox Latham  
 Bunn Franks (CT) LaTourette  
 Bunning Franks (NJ) Laughlin  
 Burr Frelinghuysen Lazio  
 Burton Frisa Leach  
 Buyer Funderburk Levin  
 Callahan Furse Lewis (CA)  
 Calvert Gallegly Lewis (GA)  
 Camp Ganske Lewis (KY)  
 Canady Gejdenson Lightfoot  
 Cardin Gephardt Lincoln  
 Castle Geren Linder  
 Chabot Gibbons Lipinski  
 Chambliss Gilchrest Livingston  
 Chapman Gillmor LoBiondo  
 Christensen Gilman Lofgren  
 Chrysler Gonzalez Longley  
 Clay Goodlatte Lowey  
 Clinger Goodling Lucas  
 Clyburn Gordon Luther  
 Coble Goss Maloney  
 Coburn Green Manzullo  
 Coleman Greenwood Markey  
 Collins (GA) Gunderson Martinez  
 Collins (IL) Gutierrez Martini  
 Combest Gutknecht Mascara  
 Condit Hall (TX) Matsui  
 Conyers Hamilton McCarthy  
 Cooley Hancock McCollum  
 Cox Hansen McCreery  
 Coyne Harman McDade  
 Cramer Hastert McDermott  
 Crane Hastings (FL) McHale  
 Crapo Hastings (WA) McHugh  
 Cremeans Hayes McInnis  
 Cubin Hayworth McIntosh  
 Cunningham Hefley McKeon  
 Danner Hefner McKinney  
 Davis Heineman McNulty  
 de la Garza Herger Meehan  
 Deal Hilleary Meek

Menendez  
 Metcalf  
 Meyers  
 Mfume  
 Mica  
 Miller (CA)  
 Miller (FL)  
 Mineta  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Molinari  
 Mollohan  
 Montgomery  
 Moorhead  
 Moran  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myers  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Nethercutt  
 Neumann  
 Ney  
 Norwood  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Orton  
 Owens  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Parker  
 Pastor  
 Paxon  
 Payne (NJ)  
 Payne (VA)  
 Pelosi  
 Peterson (FL)  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Pickett  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Poshard  
 Pryce  
 Quillen  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich

Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Reed  
 Regula  
 Richardson  
 Rivers  
 Roberts  
 Roemer  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rose  
 Roth  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Sabo  
 Salmon  
 Sanders  
 Sanford  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaefer  
 Schiff  
 Schroeder  
 Schumer  
 Scott  
 Seastrand  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Shadegg  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Shuster  
 Sisisky  
 Skaggs  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Solomon  
 Souder  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm

Stockman  
 Stokes  
 Studds  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Talent  
 Tanner  
 Tate  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Tejada  
 Thomas  
 Thompson  
 Thornberry  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Torkildsen  
 Torricelli  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Tucker  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Vucanovich  
 Waldholtz  
 Walker  
 Wamp  
 Ward  
 Waters  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 White  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Callahan  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Canady  
 Cardin  
 Castle  
 Chabot  
 Chambliss  
 Chapman  
 Christensen  
 Chrysler  
 Clinger  
 Coble  
 Coburn  
 Coleman  
 Collins (GA)  
 Combest  
 Condit  
 Cooley  
 Cox  
 Cramer  
 Crane  
 Crapo  
 Cremeans  
 Cubin  
 Cunningham  
 Danner  
 Davis  
 de la Garza  
 Deal  
 DeFazio  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 Deutsch  
 Dickey  
 Ford  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Dornan  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Dunn  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Ensign  
 Eshoo  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Farr

Stokes  
 Studds  
 Thompson  
 Torres  
 Towns  
 Tucker

NOES—321

Fawell  
 Fazio  
 Fields (TX)  
 Flanagan  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Fowler  
 Fox  
 Franks (NJ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frisa  
 Frost  
 Funderburk  
 Furse  
 Gallegly  
 Ganske  
 Gephardt  
 Geren  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Greenwood  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall (TX)  
 Myrick  
 Hamilton  
 Hancock  
 Hansen  
 Harman  
 Hastert  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Hefner  
 Heineman  
 Herger  
 Hilleary  
 Hobson  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Horn  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hunter  
 Hutchinson  
 Hyde  
 Inglis  
 Istook  
 Jacobs  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson (SD)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kasich  
 Kennedy (RI)  
 Kennelly  
 Kim  
 Kingston  
 Kleczka  
 Klug  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 LaFalce  
 LaHood  
 Lantos  
 Largent  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Laughlin  
 Lazio  
 Leach  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lightfoot  
 Lincoln  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 Livingston  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Longley  
 Lowey  
 Lucas  
 Luther  
 Maloney  
 Manzullo  
 Markey  
 Martinez  
 Martini  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCollum  
 McCreery  
 McDade  
 McDermott  
 McHale  
 McHugh  
 McInnis  
 McIntosh  
 McKeon  
 McKinney  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek

□ 1605

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and three Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HASTINGS] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 84, noes 321, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

AYES—84

Abercrombie Fattah Lantos  
 Ackerman Fields (LA) Lewis (GA)  
 Barrett (WI) Filner Lofgren  
 Becerra Flake Martinez  
 Berman Foglietta McCarthy  
 Bishop Ford McDermott  
 Bonior Frank (MA) McKinney  
 Brown (CA) Franks (CT) Meek  
 Brown (FL) Gejdenson Menendez  
 Clay Gibbons Mfume  
 Clayton Gunderson Mineta  
 Clyburn Gutierrez Mink  
 Collins (IL) Hastings (FL) Moran  
 Conyers Hilliard Nadler  
 Coyne Hinchey Olver  
 Dellums Jackson-Lee Owens  
 Diaz-Balart Jefferson Pallone  
 Dixon Johnson, E.B. Pastor  
 Durbin Johnston Payne (NJ)  
 Edwards Kennedy (MA) Rangel  
 Engel Kildee Richardson  
 Evans Klink Ros-Lehtinen

DeFazio  
 DeLauro  
 DeLay  
 Deutsch  
 Dickey  
 Dicks  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Dornan  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Dunn  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Ensign  
 Eshoo  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Farr  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 LaFalce  
 LaHood  
 Largent  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Laughlin  
 Lazio  
 Leach  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Lightfoot  
 Lincoln  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Longley  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MI)

Smith (NJ)	Taylor (MS)	Wamp
Smith (TX)	Taylor (NC)	Ward
Smith (WA)	Tejeda	Weldon (FL)
Solomon	Thomas	Weldon (PA)
Souder	Thornberry	Weller
Spence	Thornton	White
Spratt	Thurman	Whitfield
Stearns	Tiahrt	Williams
Stenholm	Torkildsen	Wilson
Stockman	Torrice	Wise
Stump	Traficant	Wolf
Stupak	Upton	Wyden
Talent	Vento	Yates
Tanner	Vucanovich	Young (FL)
Tate	Waldholtz	Zeliff
Tauzin	Walker	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—29

Archer	Graham	Oxley
Bateman	Green	Reynolds
Blute	Hall (OH)	Stark
Chenoweth	Hoke	Volkmer
Clement	King	Walsh
Collins (MI)	Livingston	Watts (OK)
Costello	Manton	Waxman
Dingell	McIntosh	Wicker
Duncan	Moakley	Young (AK)
Gekas	Neal	

□ 1612

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Stark for, with Mr. Neal against.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 577, the Hastings amendment, and the previous quorum call, I was unavoidably absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on the Hastings amendment.

□ 1613

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BECERRA: Page 59, line 9, strike "16,400,000" and insert "\$8,400,000".

Page 16, line 5, strike "\$1,421,481,000" and insert "\$1,429,481,000".

Page 17, line 2, before the period insert, "": *Provided further*, That \$8,000,000 shall be available to promote and expedite naturalization, in accordance with section 332 of the *Immigration and Nationality Act*".

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their thoughtfulness as they approached this amendment, and try to address the body on this particular issue.

The issue at hand is that of naturalization. Too often when we talk about the Immigration and Naturalization Service within the Department of Justice, we forget what the "N" in INS stands for.

Naturalization is one of the principal components of the work of the INS. Unfortunately, too many people do not see the naturalization efforts of the INS.

Mr. Chairman, by the end of this decade, before we reach the 21st century, there will be nearly 11.5 million people in this country who will be eligible for

U.S. citizenship. Let me give some quick information on where we are right now.

The INS approved during fiscal year 1994 roughly 420,000 applications for naturalization, people who wanted to become U.S. citizens. At the end of that fiscal year, they had a backlog of 300,000 people wishing to become U.S. citizens.

This fiscal year, the INS estimates that it will have 900,000 people who will come through their doors applying for citizenship. They estimate that with the current funding they have, plus some reprogramming funds from fee accounts that they receive of about \$22 million, they will be able to process about 700,000 people.

Mr. Chairman, fully 200,000 people will be added to the 300,000 backlog, so we will end up with 500,000 people, half a million people, seeking citizenship who have gone through the entire process and are still not able to become citizens, after they paid their fees and waited their time.

The amendment I have, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt to try to address that major backlog that we have. We are talking about people who in some cases have waited 12 to 15 years to enter this country, to get the permission to get to this country. People who, once in this country, pay every single tax that a citizen does, abide by every single law that a citizen does, and in many cases, like citizens, have defended this country in time of war, whether the Gulf War or any other theater of war. They are on their way to becoming full-fledged American citizens, and now we find at this time that we cannot accommodate them.

This amendment is an effort to try to do just that and help relieve the backlog.

I believe it is important for us to send a message to people who have gone through every step the correct way to come into this country, that they are entitled to get processed through because they have paid a fee to do so. It seems anomalous to me to consider the fact that we have hundreds of thousands of people who have said they are willing to relinquish their current citizenship and adopt this country fully and faithfully, yet we cannot get there because we are unable to get through the bureaucracy to get them sworn in.

For some people to have to wait fully 2 years between submitting their fees and their application and actually getting to be sworn in, to say, "I do become a U.S. citizen," is abysmal. We must change that.

The money that I am requesting through this amendment, \$8 million for the INS, would not resolve the whole problem, but it would get us part of the way there and help us stay more current with our applications and relieve, or at least eliminate a good portion of the backlog, if not all the backlog.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason, I believe this amendment is very worthy of consideration.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECERRA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, under the leadership of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. PASTOR] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GUTIERREZ] the Hispanic Caucus has undertaken an ambitious, nationwide program to get more naturalized Americans. As a naturalized American myself, I know how important this process can be.

One of the problems, a serious problem that we have had, is the incredible backlog in every major urban center, whether it is Miami, Los Angeles, New York, Chicago. Freeing up more money and making sure that INS, as the gentleman from California, [Mr. BECERRA] points out, puts the "N" back in INS, is very important to clear up this backlog.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from California for highlighting this concern.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her words.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying the following: We have actually increased the funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service dramatically, and it is about time, because we know we need to do more to try to regulate our borders. We know we have to do a better job of verifying those who have come into this country with visas and ultimately overstay their visas and no longer have the permission to be here.

We have the job to do to make sure that people who are entitled to work do work, and those that do not have the authority to work do not. We have a lot of things to do, and much of the money that we are providing to the INS goes to those areas.

But, Mr. Chairman, we unfortunately do not do the job that we can, and certainly that the INS should do, to try to eliminate the backlog of people who say, "We are ready to become full-fledged participants in this American society."

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is consistent with a great Nation to say that we will be there with them to carry them through the process.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has gone a long way to bring to the attention of this body, and our subcommittee, the problem that exists in the backlog of applications for naturalization at INS. The subcommittee, as the gentleman has said, has provided record sums, even a record increase in funding for INS, but the funding for the naturalization still is low, as the gentleman has pointed out, given the backlog that they have.

The gentleman and other Members, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms.

ROS-LEHTINEN] and others, have pointed out the shortcomings, and the subcommittee will be having an opportunity to help the INS solve the problem.

There are reprogramming procedures that the gentleman is aware of where we are able to reprogram from one part of INS to another, funding for various purposes, and I assure the gentleman that in the next round of reprogramming, funds will be provided to stay current and eliminate the backlog in naturalization applications; I assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for that assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BECERRA was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his recognition of this problem, and for working with a number of us to try to resolve this.

Mr. Chairman, we know that there are program accounts which are funded through fees, and those funds, with those fees, are subsequently allocated by the administration with the approval of Congress.

Is it the chairman's intention that the next time we have reprogramming done by the INS, as they come to the Congress for approval of those reprogramming priorities, that we make it clear to the INS, and it may be our efforts in Congress, to assure as they reprogram those dollars, that it is the intention to eliminate the backlog of naturalization applications and stay current with those applications for naturalization that are coming in?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his time and his great efforts on this issue, because I think as most people will recognize in this Chamber, anyone who pays for a service is entitled to get it. What we are trying to do is accelerate the process.

Mr. Chairman, I hope now we have as much cooperation with the administration as we have had from the committee on this particular matter.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I would hope, on that assurance, that the gentleman would withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, with that assurance, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. GUTIERREZ.  
Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUTIERREZ: Page 17, line 2, before the period insert "Provided further, That \$4,000,000 shall be available to promote the opportunities and responsibilities of United States citizenship with the assistance of appropriate community groups, in accordance with section 332(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act".

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is very simple and I believe it should be supported by anyone who believes that the Federal Government should do all it can to encourage immigrants to our Nation to become citizens.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is about using Federal dollars efficiently. It is about providing desperately needed community outreach and resources to people who want to become U.S. citizens, and it is about making an important statement that this Government wants to take every action it possibly can to encourage U.S. citizenship.

My amendment earmarks \$4 million in funding to allow appropriate community groups to work with the Immigration and Naturalization Service to promote the opportunities and responsibilities of United States citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues how this program works. In my city of Chicago, our regional INS office cannot possibly keep up with the volume of people who desire to become citizens of our great Nation. To help try to provide the basic and vital service of naturalizing qualified individuals, the office has empowered community groups to prepare citizenship applications.

All across my city respected and effective community organizations have been approved by the INS office to sponsor and promote citizenship workshops. After these workshops, volunteers help eligible applicants complete their application forms, take the photos and the fingerprints as required by law.

In many cases, volunteer attorneys double check the applications to make certain everything is in order. The community organizations then again check the applications for accuracy and turn them into the regional INS office for processing.

This convenient, efficient, and affordable practice has allowed tens of thousands of Chicagoans to start on the road to citizenship. It has saved hundreds of thousands of Chicagoans lengthy waits in lines at regional INS offices, bringing government services right to the neighborhoods.

In short, Mr. Chairman, it is a rare action that the Federal Government has taken to actually make its services more efficient; to respond effectively to a need; to send a strong message to people that Government will solve problems instead of create them.

How do I know? Because on July 8, Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus sponsored a National Citizenship Day in conjunction with

NALEO in nine cities. From Houston to New York, from Miami to Los Angeles, in 1 day we efficiently and effectively helped more than 9,000 people start toward citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, my office alone in Chicago in the last year has handed in over 5,000 applications for citizenship and it is a program that should be encouraged and expanded. My amendment simply provides the resources to the INS to work to expand this program across the country; to invest in empowering community groups at the local level who can help share the responsibility of an increasing number of citizenship applications.

The vast majority of immigrants come to our Nation looking for nothing more than a chance to contribute, a chance to share in the freedom and the prosperity that is America. An opportunity one day to become full partners in the fight for the American dream by becoming American citizens.

□ 1630

All my amendment does is make it a little bit easier for them to have that opportunity. It is not a dramatic amount of money, simply enough to expand the modest work already begun. It is reasonable and an expenditure that puts this Congress on record as supporting and helping in an efficient manner people who want nothing more than to contribute to our Nation.

My friends, we all know these are dangerous days for immigrants in our Nation. This body has gone on record in supporting dramatic cuts and elimination of services to noncitizens, people who reside in our Nation perfectly legally. I emphasize legal, people who are in this Nation as all of us are here as Members of Congress today, and I ask my friends to help and support in reaching the goals of tens of thousands of others who wish to share in the American dream.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I just want to share with our colleagues what happened in New York. The gentleman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] and I encourage the people to come to the July 8 citizenship day. We set up an 800 number. One thousand people showed up and were processed for citizenship, but 29,000 phone calls came in that we were able to record.

Every time 40 phone calls came into the machine, the system closed down until we cleared it out, so the estimate is that maybe over 100,000 people called up.

Again, to reiterate, people who are here with documents, people who are here legally, as we say, people who want to be American citizens, we were able to process them on their way to full citizenship.

I think it is important to support this amendment and to say if we, indeed, wish people to follow the law,

then what we should be supportive of is this kind of amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, based on the assurances that I am prepared to make to him, if he might be willing to withdraw the amendment. Let me say this to this gentleman: It is my intent that from within funds provided to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, funds be provided to community based organizations to promote the opportunities and responsibilities of U.S. citizenship with the assistance of appropriate community groups in accordance with section 332(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and we will work with the gentleman to make sure that happens.

Based on that assurance, I would hope the gentleman would be able to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. If the gentleman would yield, if I could enter into a colloquy with the gentleman and ask him one question, No. 1, I would like to thank the gentleman for working and making those assurances, and certainly we are going to be willing to withdraw our amendment.

I would just like to ask to make sure that community based organizations are actually going to get dollars so that they can go out and sponsor these workshops and be viable in terms of helping, and I say that, and I want to let all the Members know that when someone goes to an INS office with an application that is badly done, the INS personnel there have to turn that back to that individual, wasting dollars and time. When community organizations do these events, we have lawyers checking them, doing the fingerprinting, and if the INS finds anything wrong, anybody authorized by the INS to conduct these workshops, if they find anything wrong, the INS sends back the application directly back to the community organization and says, "Fix it," "If you do not get it right, do not bring it back to us," which I think is very appropriate.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman has made a very eloquent case and need not make it further.

It is my intent, as the gentleman requested, that we will work with the gentleman to see that funds are provided.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished

gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that following the closure of the border patrol checkpoints at San Clemente and Temecula, CA, approximately \$7.5 million will be available for INS border and infrastructure improvements, subject to approval by your committee.

I would request that, in the course of evaluating proposals for this funding, that you would consider using the funding for construction of fencing along the border area in San Diego. The comprehensive immigration reform legislation that is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, that is, H.R. 1915, includes the authorization for an additional border fencing project and road improvements in the San Diego sector, and this would augment our program increases for border security and the enforcement of our immigration laws.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman is one of the champions of border protection and has done more than anyone that I am aware of in this body to protect the borders of our country, and I am aware that the construction of barriers at certain points along our southern border has greatly enhanced the operations of the border patrol.

I will work with the Commissioner of the INS and the gentleman in securing funding for those projects.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman. We owe him a debt of gratitude for the increases he has made in border enhancement, and the gentleman from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purposes of entering into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you the importance of a program, the community-based justice grant program, which was contained in last year's crime bill, which has been a part of the local law enforcement block grant.

This is a very, very impressive program that was initiated by the district attorney in Middlesex County, MA, Tom Riley.

Several years ago I went up to Lowell, MA, on a hot summer day. In the morning I met with over 100 residents of the city of Lowell, MA, who were meeting with five young top police officers. This was a tremendous program where 100 residents of the city of Lowell, MA, got together with five young police officers from the Lowell department with a couple of young prosecutors and identified some of the worst violent criminals in the city of Lowell. They went after these criminals in a way that was unprecedented and, as a result, we saw the crime rate in Lowell, MA, drop by 50 percent.

Last year, for the first time in scores of years, we saw the crime rate drop to its lowest point. There was not a single murder committed in Lowell, MA, last year.

We expanded the program into Somerville, MA, Malden, MA, a range of other cities and towns throughout the State. In each case the crime rate was dropped in half or better as a result of the people taking the streets back, working hand in glove with the local police department and taking the time to identify specific criminals that were perpetrating violent crimes against others. If they think there are drugs being dealt in at a particular apartment, they tell the local prosecutor, tell the police officers, and work together to eliminate and eradicate those individuals that are responsible for these crimes. It really is a tremendous program.

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Lowell, MA [Mr. MEEHAN], who was a prosecutor in that program and did some fine work in bringing many of the criminals to justice as well.

Mr. MEEHAN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. No doubt I was probably one of those young prosecutors before I got down here and became an old Member of Congress.

In any event, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his efforts over the years in this program.

The tremendous thing about this program is not only does it identify those worst offenders and have the community identify those worst offenders and remove them from society, but once those individuals are removed, there is a program in place where the police officers coach soccer leagues and football leagues and work with the rest of the communities so they get kids headed in the right direction. They opened up gymnasiums, opened up the schools. That is a program that is working extremely effectively.

I think when the Justice Department looks for a model in terms of community-based prosecution, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] said, they have to look no further than Lowell, MA, and Somerville, MA, as well. This program has been implemented there.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his efforts. I think this is extremely important.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just would hope that you might encourage people under this block grant. I know that in the past we have been able to set aside some funds for this program under the new leadership that has been determined to make decisions at the local level. I hope you would join with me in encouraging police departments and prosecutors from around the country to apply for the

funds that are available under this program because of the tremendous successes it has had.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing to our attention the efforts that are ongoing in your State.

As an old State prosecutor, I can appreciate very much the efficacy of what they are doing there. I support the type of efforts at the local level you have mentioned to control crime and certainly would encourage local communities to use block grant funds that are in this bill to fund efforts of this type, and would join the gentleman in encouraging your communities as well as others across the country to get those block grant applications in at the appropriate time to fund this type of activity.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title I?

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy. Mr. Chairman, in the report language for H.R. 2076, there is a section entitled "State and local enforcement assistance," under which grants are provided for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and local law enforcement assistance programs.

In that report language, Mr. Chairman, it states this:

The committee also encourages the attorney general to provide grants to public or private agencies and private nonprofit organizations for advanced education and training of criminal justice personnel and to provide educational assistance to students who possess a sincere interest in public service law enforcement. The committee expects the Bureau of Justice Assistance to submit a report to the committee on its intentions for this proposal by November 15, 1995.

Now, based on our previous conversations, mine with you, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the intent of this language was to strongly urge the Department of Justice to provide a portion of the funding in the Byrne Grant Program to fund State and local police corps programs as well as State and local law enforcement scholarship programs as previously authorized by Congress in the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

Am I correct in this assessment, sir?

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely correct. As I have stated to the gentleman previously, it is my intention to strongly urge that the Attorney General use a portion of the Byrne Grant Funding Program for the purposes that you have described.

Mr. DORNAN. Excellent. I thank the chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for bringing this to our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title I?

If not, the Clerk will designate title II.

The text of title II is as follows:

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
AND RELATED AGENCIES

TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT  
RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE  
REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$20,949,000, of which \$2,500,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$98,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, \$42,500,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 1517; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed \$30,000 per vehicle; obtain insurance on official motor vehicles; and rent tie lines and teletype equipment; \$264,885,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to 15 U.S.C. 4912; and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including

costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding ten years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed \$15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 401(b); purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law; \$38,644,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE  
PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, \$328,500,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project, when in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, \$20,000,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, as amended, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, \$32,000,000.

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM

ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration



for participation in the White House Conference on Travel and Tourism, \$2,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1995: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended.

ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE  
ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS ADMINISTRATION  
REVOLVING FUND

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to disseminate economic and statistical data products as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 1525-1527 and, notwithstanding 15 U.S.C. 4912, charge fees necessary to recover the full costs incurred in their production. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, receipts received from these data dissemination activities shall be credited to this account, to be available for carrying out these purposes without further appropriation.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing, and publishing statistics, provided for by law, \$136,000,000.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to collect and publish statistics for periodic censuses and programs provided for by law, \$135,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND  
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, \$19,709,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of the NTIA in furtherance of its assigned functions under this paragraph and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING FACILITIES, PLANNING  
AND CONSTRUCTION

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, \$19,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of the Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,200,000 shall be available for program administration as authorized by section 391 of the Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 391 of the Act, the prior year unobligated balances may be made available for grants for projects for which applications have been submitted and approved during any fiscal year.

INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS

For grants authorized by section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, \$40,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by section 391 of the Act, as amended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$4,000,000 shall be available for program administration and other support activities as authorized by section 391 of the Act including support of the Advisory Council on

National Information Infrastructure: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated herein, not to exceed 5 percent may be available for telecommunications research activities for projects related directly to the development of a national information infrastructure: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the requirements of section 392(a) and 392(c) of the Act, these funds may be used for the planning and construction of telecommunications networks for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public information, public safety or other social services.

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks; \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds made available under this heading are to be derived from deposits in the Patent and Trademark Office Fee Surcharge Fund as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the amounts made available under the Fund shall not exceed amounts deposited; and such fees as shall be collected pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1113 and 35 U.S.C. 41 and 376, shall remain available until expended.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND  
TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND  
SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$263,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$8,500,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund".

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Manufacturing Extension Partnership of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, \$81,100,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$500,000 may be transferred to the "Working Capital Fund": *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this heading in this or any other Act may be used for the purposes of carrying out additional program competitions under the Advanced Technology Program: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances available from carryover of prior year appropriations under the Advanced Technology Program may be used only for the purposes of providing continuation grants.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c-278e, \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC  
ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES  
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including acquisition, maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; not to exceed 386 commissioned officers on the active list; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and alteration, modernization, and relocation of facilities as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 883i; \$1,690,452,000, to remain available until ex-

ended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302 but consistent with other existing law, fees shall be assessed, collected, and credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections to be available until expended, to recover the costs of administering aeronautical charting programs: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such additional fees are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final general fund appropriation estimated at not more than \$1,687,452,000: *Provided further*, That any such additional fees received in excess of \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996: *Provided further*, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of the national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That in addition, \$55,500,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": *Provided further*, That grants to States pursuant to sections 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$2,000,000.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

Of amounts collected pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1456a, not to exceed \$7,800,000, for purposes set forth in 16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(A), 16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(2)(B)(v), and 16 U.S.C. 1461(c).

CONSTRUCTION

For repair and modification of, and additions to, existing facilities and construction of new facilities, and for facility planning and design and land acquisition not otherwise provided for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$42,731,000, to remain available until expended.

FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING AND  
CONVERSION

For expenses necessary for the repair, acquisition, leasing, or conversion of vessels, including related equipment to maintain and modernize the existing fleet and to continue planning the modernization of the fleet, for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, \$20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FISHING VESSEL AND GEAR DAMAGE  
COMPENSATION FUND

For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 95-376, not to exceed \$1,032,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1980 (b) and (f), to remain available until expended.

FISHERMEN'S CONTINGENCY FUND

For carrying out the provisions of title IV of Public Law 95-372, not to exceed \$999,000, to be derived from receipts collected pursuant to that Act, to remain available until expended.

FOREIGN FISHING OBSERVER FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975, as amended (Public Law 96-339), the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, as amended (Public Law 100-627) and the American Fisheries Promotion Act (Public Law 96-561), there are appropriated from the fees imposed under the foreign fishery observer program authorized by these Acts, not to exceed \$196,000, to remain available until expended.

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION  
UNDER SECRETARY FOR TECHNOLOGY/OFFICE  
OF TECHNOLOGY POLICY  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Under Secretary for Technology/Office of Technology Policy, \$5,000,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed \$3,000 for official entertainment, \$29,100,000.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1-11 as amended by Public Law 100-504), \$21,849,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF  
COMMERCE

SEC. 201. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 202. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902).

SEC. 203. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support the hurricane reconnaissance aircraft and activities that are under the control of the United States Air Force or the United States Air Force Reserve.

SEC. 204. None of the funds provided in this or any previous Act, or hereinafter made available to the Department of Commerce shall be available to reimburse the Unemployment Trust Fund or any other fund or account of the Treasury to pay for any expenses paid before October 1, 1992, as authorized by section 8501 of title 5, United States Code, for services performed after April 20, 1990, by individuals appointed to temporary positions within the Bureau of the Census for purposes relating to the 1990 decennial census of population.

SEC. 205. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As I was saying in title I and now in title II, I had been prepared to offer an amendment to this title of the measure which would have, in effect, cut the funding for the general administration of the Department of Commerce by 25 percent, the objective being, in effect, to indicate that the first three-quarters of next year of the Department of

Commerce would be funded, but the last quarter would not, contemplating the dissolution of the Department of Commerce by that time.

Mr. Chairman, the department serves a number of important functions, but I believe any of these functions, any of these functions can be performed just as well or perhaps better in the private sector or the State or local level or elsewhere in the Federal Government. Those functions that are unnecessary should be terminated.

I think we would all agree the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee has already eliminated funding for the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration and the Advanced Technology Program. I would like to see us go the next step forward, which is to have all committees with jurisdiction over this department work on an expedited basis to find an appropriate home for necessary Commerce Department programs, eliminate those that are not necessary, and ultimately abolish the Department, and this we can do within the reconciliation process.

Functions of the Commerce Department overlap with 71 agencies and 60 percent of the agency is not focused on trade or commerce, which, in my view, should be the focus of the Department. It is instead devoted to NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which is 60 percent of the funding and the manpower of the department. Responsibility for the trade functions of the department are spread out among multiple undersecretaries, assistant secretaries and others.

□ 1645

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, there is room to preserve and improve the central functions of government without maintaining the sprawling bureaucracy of the Department of Commerce. It is my view that because it is so diverse, running from the prior administration to the patent office, NOAA and all the rest of it, that the principal focus, which should be on the trade mission and promoting U.S. trade, both at home and abroad, it does not get the attention that it really deserves in this huge, loaded bureaucracy.

So Mr. Chairman, I will not offer my amendment today, as I have confidence that we can work, and are working, on a very regular and expedited basis with the authorizing committees, of which there are many, to effect a timely dismantling of this department through the reconciliation process.

I would urge my colleagues to support these efforts.

Mr. BROWBACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for final passage of the appropriations bill because this is the beginning of the end of the Department of Commerce. Yes, the bill could have gone further and more programs could be eliminated outright, yet this will be done in cooperation, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] just stat-

ed, with all of the relevant authorizing committees as part of the reconciliation process in moving forward.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Commerce cannot and should not be eliminated in one appropriations bill. We must craft responsible legislation to do certain things. Privatize certain functions, localize certain functions back to State and local government. Consolidate certain functions within the Federal Government and eliminate some outright from the Department of Commerce.

While we speak, authorizing committees are moving to construct legislation to do just this. We have received solid commitments and firm commitments from the leadership and from the authorizing committees to move this package forward aggressively this year.

Mr. Chairman, our goal of improving commerce in our vast and diverse Nation will not be accomplished by a centralized bureaucracy. We do not promote commerce by erecting crippling taxes and a regulatory maze that you need a cabinet and department level to break through. I think we promote it by free enterprise.

A recent Business Week poll of executives illustrated their support of eliminating the Department of Commerce by calling for its elimination by a vote of two-to-one. The American people have spoken. They want a smaller, more limited, more focused Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to work with the authorizing committees to eliminate the Department of Commerce this year.

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

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding. I also thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his work in not funding many of these agencies within the Department of Commerce, and I also thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] on his efforts for 21st century government to give us less government and lower taxes and letting people keep more of what they earn and save.

Mr. Chairman, I too intend to vote for final passage of this appropriation bill. As the gentleman from Kansas has said, we have received assurances from the speaker and the majority leader that the Department of Commerce will be dismantled as part of this year's budget reconciliation package.

Our task force study on the Department of Commerce found that all but 3 of the 100 programs in Commerce are duplicated someplace else within the Federal Government and/or by the private sector. Here is what the business community says about the Department of Commerce: Just a few weeks ago, the Wall Street Journal carried a story reporting that business sheds few tears over the calls for the department's elimination.

A recent Journal of Commerce headline declared the Commerce Department seen less vital than deficit cut. Business support wanes for the agency.

From my own experience in my business of over 1,200 employees, in doing business in 52 countries around the world, not once did we call for help from the Department of Commerce and/or did they call us. American businesses would be much better served if the Federal efforts were focused on cutting taxes and enacting regulatory and tort reform, and most importantly, balancing the Federal budget. Yet the voice of business, the Department of Commerce, remains notably silent on all of these issues.

Mr. Chairman, by dismantling the Department of Commerce, not only will we be creating a more efficient and effective Federal Government, we will be saving taxpayers \$8 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we will look forward to working with the authorizing committees to put the Department of Commerce out of business.

Mr. BROWNBAC. Mr. Chairman, we look forward to working with the appropriate authorizing committees and thank very much the appropriating committee for working with us.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Are there amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 44, line 4, strike "\$1,690,452,000" and insert "\$1,752,652,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike "\$1,687,452,000" and insert "\$1,749,652,000".

On page 43, line 16, strike "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 45, line 14, strike "\$42,731,000" and insert "\$32,731,000".

On page 51, line 4, strike "\$2,411,024,000" and insert "\$2,388,824,000".

On page 57, line 4, strike "\$1,716,878,000" and insert "\$1,706,878,000".

On page 59, line 3, strike "\$363,276,000" and insert "\$353,276,000".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 44, line 4, strike "\$1,690,452,000" and insert "\$1,724,452,000".

On page 44, line 14, strike "\$1,687,452,000" and insert "\$1,721,452,000".

On page 45, line 23, strike "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$8,000,000".

On page 62, line 7, strike "\$870,000,000" and insert "\$858,000,000".

On page 42, line 6, strike "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$90,000,000".

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment be con-

sidered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Mollohan amendment, my substitute amendment, and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of his substitute, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this substitute amendment adds \$34 million to the NOAA programs, of great interest to Members from coastal areas of the United States and to Members from the Great Lakes region of the country.

The programs are as follows: We add \$20 million to the National Marine Fisheries Service, an increase of \$20 million; the Great Lakes Environmental Research Labs, an increase of \$4 million; the Coastal Ocean Science Program, authorized by the House Committee on Science, an additional \$5 million; and the Coastal Zone Management Program, an increase of \$5 million.

The purpose of this substitute is to address concerns raised by a number of Members about coastal and fisheries programs. This substitute is paid for by three offsets. One, it reduces the NOAA Fleet Modernization Program by \$12 million; two, it reduces contributions to international organizations by \$12 million; and three, it reduces the Patent and Trademark Office by \$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment represents a compromise to the Mollohan amendment, which would have, in my opinion, made a number of unwise choices in the bill; namely, cutting the judicial system funding to offset increases in the Commerce Department.

We realize how important fisheries, and coastal programs are to many of our Members. We also realize how important it is that we balance the competing priorities and important programs in this bill. Adjustments may be necessary as we proceed to conference on the bill. But I assure my colleagues that we will work diligently to address the concerns of all Members to the best of our ability.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the compromise agreement to restore \$34 million to programs under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Mr. Chairman, this compromise will be completely offset. Specifically, this compromise would add \$20 million to important programs under NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service. It would restore funding for the popular Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory, and increase funding by \$5 million for the Coastal Zone Management grants. Finally, Mr. Chairman, it would add \$5 million for the Coastal Ocean Program.

Mr. Chairman, NOAA's fishery and coastal ocean programs have traditionally been underfunded and they took really painful cuts in this year's bill. Restoring the programs to the levels that these numbers reflect will prevent the deterioration of vital national resources.

Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation to all of those who have supported our efforts with regard to my original amendment. Also, I would like to express appreciation to the chairman for his accommodation in reaching a compromise which is reflected in his substitute amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], chairman of the Committee on Science.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] for working out this substitute. I think that they have helped strengthen and improve the bill.

Mr. Chairman, although it still funds the NOAA discretionary programs above the level of H.R. 1815, our authorization bill, it does track H.R. 1815 to a much greater extent than previously. The substitute funds the Coastal Ocean Program at \$5 million, which H.R. 1815 authorizes. It reduces the funding for the fleet modernization account which was eliminated in H.R. 1815. This reduction is consistent with the support of the Committee on Science for privatizing the NOAA Fleet and eliminating the NOAA Corps.

The substitute is also notable for what it does not do. It does not reduce NIST construction funding, allowing the people at NIST to move forward with the programs that they need to have to upgrade and modernize those laboratories. It does not endanger the National Weather Service modernization. That would also have been tragic, to move forward on something that would undercut our ability to do the next generation of weather radar.

I support the substitute of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for that measure.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the

distinguished gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1995 levels of funding of two very important programs are not being fully funded in this bill. I assume that with the restoration of some of the funds in the substitute amendment, which is now pending, that these two programs will have a chance to survive. These are two essential programs for the saving of the Hawaiian Monk Seal Program and the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Program.

Mr. Chairman, there is a tremendous possibility that if the programs are not funded, that these species will actually go extinct, and it will be a tremendous loss, not just to Hawaii, but to the whole world. These two species do not occur anywhere else on this planet, and it is extremely important that this 15-year program be funded and be continued and not be sacrificed, because without the support of the National Government in this effort, these two species will likely disappear.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to restore funding for Hawaiian monk seal and Hawaiian sea turtle recovery programs, which have for the last 15 years worked to assure that these valuable species would not be doomed to extinction. My amendment asks a mere \$760,500 to maintain these severely underfunded programs at fiscal year 1995 levels—\$520,500 for the Hawaiian Monk Seal Program and \$240,000 for the Hawaiian Sea Turtle Program. Discontinuation of these programs at this point would mark a shameful waste of substantial Federal investment in these species and lead to their irreversible disappearance from Hawaii's marine ecosystems.

These funds are desperately needed to assist my State of Hawaii as it suffers the effects of a devastating endangered species crisis. Despite the fact that in land area, the Hawaiian Islands make up a mere 0.2 percent of the United States, an overwhelming 21 percent of listed endangered and threatened species and 18 percent of candidate species in the United States are Hawaiian species. The majority of these are indigenous only to Hawaii—once these species go extinct, they will never exist on this earth again.

The Hawaiian monk seal and Hawaiian sea turtle are two of the State's species in extremely precarious positions. Decades of polluted runoff and ocean discharges have harmed Hawaii's coastal waters and made 13 percent of the shoreline unhealthy habitat for marine life. Highly trafficked areas in Hawaiian waters constantly traversed by cruise ships, glass bottom boats, scuba diving tours, jet skis, snorklers, kayakers, surfers, and other popular ocean activities have disrupted many areas around the islands. Longline, net

and other types of fishing have further produced unfriendly territory for many marine species. These human disturbances have plagued the monk seal and sea turtle.

The Hawaiian monk seal, after facing tragic decline for more than 50 years, has come to be designated the most endangered marine mammal within U.S. waters. This 50-million-year-old species can only be found within the Hawaiian Islands and half of its numbers have vanished since the 1950's. In 1976, the animal was listed as depleted under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. Hawaiian monk seal recovery programs were finally initiated in the 1980's, and critical habitat was designated in 1988 from beaches to a depth of 20 fathoms around breeding islands and Maro Reef.

Because of these crucial rehabilitation and recovery programs put into place by the National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS], the decline of the Hawaiian monk seal has slowed to 5 percent a year. The animal can be found in discrete populations at eight locations in the northwestern Hawaiian Island chain, and in rare birth sightings within the main Hawaiian Islands. Single births have occurred on the Island of Kauai in 1988 and 1991 and the Island of Oahu in 1991.

Only three types of monk seals have ever been known to exist during the Earth's history. The Caribbean monk seal vanished during this century. The Mediterranean monk seal lies on the verge of extinction with only 250 to 300 animals remaining. The Hawaiian monk seal clearly has the best chances at survival with approximately 1,300 animals remaining, according to environmental group Earthtrust. The Federal recovery program for the Hawaiian monk seal could be the last effort worldwide to save the monk seal.

Major causes of mortality specific to the Hawaiian monk seal include predation by tiger sharks, fatal entanglement in marine debris, parasites, heart anomalies, and ciguatera poisoning. In incidents termed "mobbing," groups of adult male seals are seen to kill adult females at breeding islands where the number of adult males is significantly greater than the number of adult females. NMFS has worked to monitor monk seal populations for patterns of reproduction, survival, number of seals at sites, causes of injury, and death and behavior. Undersized female pups have been rehabilitated for release into the wild. NMFS removes debris from island beaches and releases seals trapped in debris. Seals are also translocated to stabilize adult sex ratios to decrease mobbing. It is essential that Hawaiian monk seal research and management programs are allowed to continue to assure the survival and success of this rare and unique animal.

The status of threatened and endangered Hawaiian sea turtles is also perilous. Of the world's seven sea turtle species, five can be found in Hawaiian waters. Of these, the hawksbill and green sea turtles are seen most frequently and found to nest in Hawaii. NMFS efforts have centered around the green sea turtle, which nests almost exclusively in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. In 1993, 400 to 500 turtles were recorded nesting at the French Frigate Shoals.

Federal research dollars have worked to combat the spread of the deadly fibropapilloma disease, which had become a worldwide problem. This untreatable disease, which has no known cause, produces fatal tumors that interfere with the animals' ability to move, feed, and see. Recent research has shown that the tumors may be viral in origin, opening up the possibility for inoculation against the disease. Without continuation of this research, sea turtles in Hawaii, Florida, and worldwide will be stricken with this rapidly spreading disease.

Hooking mortality has been another major threat to the Hawaiian sea turtle. Many animals drown due to entanglement in gill nets set for fin fish and lobster, and death or amputation of flippers due to entanglement in fishing line is a common tragic occurrence, according to the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund. NMFS programs have worked to save these precious animals from being fatally snared in fishing nets and lines, and from ingestion of plastic debris.

Alteration and destruction of sea turtle habitat has encompassed a wide range of specific problems, including vehicle traffic on nesting beaches which has crushed eggs and emerging hatchlings. Hatchlings have been distracted by beach fires and lighting, stranding them or otherwise drawing them away from the ocean. Erosion, siltation, and vegetation changes have made it impossible in certain nesting areas for turtles to dig nests. Predation in the sea by tiger sharks and on land by mongooses and feral cats has also led to a reduction in several turtle populations. Federal research to track these threats and to study population dynamics of Hawaiian sea turtles species must be maintained for effective mitigation of dangers facing these animals.

My amendment seeks to restore a small amount of funding to continue a meaningful Federal commitment to two dwindling species. The State of Hawaii's endangered species crisis cannot be ignored because it in turn affects all coexisting ecosystems and each species is eliminated. Termination of Federal programs for the Hawaiian monk seal and Hawaiian sea turtle would cause the rapid deterioration and eventual extinction of these species. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which ventures to restore a small amount of this entire appropriation bill we are debating today to save these priceless species from tragic extinction.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATOURETTE].

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and support his substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I say "Thank You" because I had planned to offer an amendment with Congressman QUINN to the bill that addressed funding for the Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab. We approached the committee staff with our case and Chairman ROGERS' amendment addresses our concerns and saves from extinction this most valuable of scientific centers.

The Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab is a fact-finding and fact-interpreting agency. It helps the Federal

□ 1700

Government meet its scientific, ecosystem, and management responsibilities under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement with Canada. This responsibility spans 8 States, two provinces, and contains a 1,000-mile international border. The loss of the research lab would put these responsibilities in severe jeopardy.

The GLERL has recently completed studies in Lake Erie to help figure the role of wetlands in reducing the effects of nutrient inputs from non-point agricultural sources. This information will help farmers develop coherent, non-regulatory pollution control.

So far, GLERL work has saved billions of dollars. Its nutrient dynamics and modeling work contributed to saving more than \$10 billion dollars of ineffective additional sewage treatment. The present GLERL appropriations level is \$5.6 million per year; these savings are equivalent to over 1,000 years of GLERL funding.

The research lab's expertise and research related to contaminated sediments were key to the findings and recommendations of a scientific panel, led by GLERL scientists, that the Coast Guard relax their proposed regulations, thus saving the shipping industry tens of millions of dollars in lost time and additional costs.

The GLERL also helps saves lives. GLERL's Great Lakes Atmospheric Wave Model gives local emergency preparedness agencies the ability to make advanced predictions of shoreline flooding caused by storm surges. GLERL's research will give property owners and industries time to protect their property and evacuate to higher ground.

GLERL's PATHFINDER model for oil/chemical spill trajectory is used by NOAA on the Great Lakes for spill response and by the Coast Guard to help guide search and rescue operations.

When zebra mussels clogged the water intakes in Monroe, MI, and cut off drinking water supplies, GLERL went to work to determine not only how to control zebra mussels, but how to keep them clear of vital water lines.

When the people of Milwaukee became sick—and some died—from contaminated drinking water, GLERL began an intensive search to understand near-shore water conditions which will help prevent future health catastrophe caused by drinking water contamination.

The United States is tremendously lucky to have the Great Lakes, which account for 20 percent of the world's fresh water surface. A vital link in the competitiveness of the Great Lakes region are the Great Lakes themselves—a system of five lakes which connects our breadbasket and heavy industries to other destinations across the globe.

The Great Lakes are key to our past, and they are key to our future. The Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab is a multifaceted lab that provides a great and vital service. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], who knows an awful lot about this issue.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the time. I also want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and I can tell from his expression a moment ago the best way to do that would be to sit down. I want to thank him and the gentleman from West Virginia. These are modest programs, but they are immensely important to the coastal regions of this country, and I think sometimes that those who talk fairly glibly about eliminating this department ignore the fact that this part of it is crucially important. In fact, it is over half of the budget, NOAA is, and for the living marine resources of the country, for the stressed coastal areas and the stressed commercial fisheries, this compromise is very, very welcome. So I thank both gentlemen for being willing to work it out.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the compromise amendment, which increases funding for Coastal Zone Management programs.

Coastal Zone Management is critical and vital to both the environment and the economy of shoreline States such as my home State of Connecticut. Thanks to this program we have restored over 1,500 acres of the State's critical tidal wetlands, and 10 miles of new public access has been added along the shores of the Long Island Sound. From 1991 to 1993 the number of beach closings along Long Island Sound in Connecticut was reduced from 292 to 174. Still, much remains to be done. More than 25 percent of Long Island Sound's beaches are chronically closed due to pathogen contamination.

Coastal Zone Management State grants are not a Federal give away. Federal funds are met with a dollar for dollar state match. These are exactly the kind of government partnerships that we should be encouraging. They are economically and environmentally sound.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the amendment and for protecting America's coastal resources.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the compromise amendment to restore crucial funding to NOAA, and in particular, the Coastal Zone Management Program.

President Nixon signed the Coastal Zone Management Act into law in 1972 and since then it's been remarkably successful in achieving the dual goals of environmental protection and economic development.

This is a voluntary program that allows states which choose to participate to establish their own programs based upon their own needs. The fact that 34 out of 35 eligible States have chosen to participate in CZMA is a testament to the program's overall success. Indeed, this Federal partnership with the States has encouraged coastal-dependent industries, enhanced commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational uses of marine resources, and protected natural and scenic treasures.

Why is this program so important? Almost 50 percent of our country's population lives along our coasts and 80 percent live and work within 50 miles of our coasts. Of course, millions more visit our beautiful coasts each year. These growing numbers generate competing demands for coastal resources and create an increasing need for coastal management.

The Federal matching grants from the Coastal Zone Management Program are critical for allowing local coastal managers to continue doing the jobs they do so well.

Retreating from our Federal commitment to the coasts will not make coastal problems or coastal needs go away. It will just saddle cash-strapped state and local governments with more of the responsibility.

What does this mean? It means less protection for our beaches, environmentally sensitive habitats, and wetlands. All of these are critical to the fishing, tourism, and recreation industries which together contribute more than \$50 billion to our economy and support hundreds of thousands of jobs.

It means less money for flood control and natural disaster protection. In short, it means a lower quality of life for the growing numbers of people who choose to live, work and visit our coastal areas.

Mr. Chairman, I happen to have one of the most beautiful sections of coastline in my district and I want it to remain that way so that my grandchildren can enjoy it as much as I do.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise also today in strong support of this compromise amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to represent 140 miles of coast in Marin and Sonoma Counties, CA, the two counties north of San Francisco, across the Golden Gate Bridge. Each year visitors come to see one of our Nation's most picturesque scences, our coast. It is

hard for these visitors to imagine that there are troubled waters off our coast, Mr. Chairman, but there are. Extensive recreation and commercial use takes a serious toll on our coast. This toll threatens the health of our marine resources and our coastal economies.

If California's coast is to be utilized by future generations as it is today, it must have strong protection now. Funding for the coastal zone program will help provide that protection.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to take our commitment to the national marine sanctuary and the coastal zone management programs seriously. Please join with me in fighting for the future well-being of our coastal waters; our coastal economies; and the Nation as a whole. Vote "yes" on this compromise amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], who has been extremely interested in these issues.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to Members of this body that this is a very, very important issue to the coastal States of the United States. This issue affects how we manage where the land mass of the United States meets the water mass of the United States. That is a very delicate zone in this country, and the fact is 80 percent of Americans live and work within 50 miles of a coastline. So all of the pressures of on-land meet the pressures of off-land, and that very fragile area needs special attention, and that is what this budget does. Frankly I wish we had restored more. We restored \$20 million and a \$37 million cut, so they are going to get less money, and in the NMFS budget, that was a 20 million of 37, and in the coastal zone management budget, restored \$5 million of a \$9.5 million cut. So there is still a substantial cut, and I just want to support the compromise, but I want to point out that this is such an important area, important issues to all Americans, that we need to pay attention to these fundings and hope in a subsequent amendment that my colleagues will also support an increase in the sanctuaries.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

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

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, The Great Lakes are home to 25 million people and some of the most productive cities and agricultural areas of our Nation.

The Great Lakes contain 20 percent of the world's—20 percent—fresh surface water, and they contain 95 percent of the fresh surface water in the United States. The Great Lakes supply drinking water, fish, and other food to millions of Americans.

A vital link in the competitiveness of the Great Lakes region are the Great Lakes themselves, a system of five lakes which connects our breadbasket and heavy industries to other destinations across the globe.

For decades we have relied upon the good assistance of NOAA's Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab to provide sound science to our mariners, State and local governments, and citizens on a variety of Great Lakes issues.

GLERL costs U.S. taxpayers a little less than \$5 million. The benefits it provides to taxpayers far surpasses its costs by providing crucial data and information to decisionmakers at all levels, while providing the science necessary to protect the world's largest body of fresh surface water—one of our Nation's most precious and vital natural resources.

GLERL IS A FACT-FINDING AND FACT-INTERPRETING AGENCY

GLERL helps the Federal Government meet its scientific, ecosystem, and management responsibilities under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement with Canada. This responsibility spans eight states, two provinces, and contain a 1000-mile international border. Losing GLERL would put these responsibilities in severe jeopardy.

GLERL is one of only two nonregulatory Federal lake/coastal-waters-related research labs in the Great Lakes basin. The Great Lakes Science Center is the other, which is scheduled to close due to the Interior appropriations bill.

GLERL and Ohio State University created a system being used by the Great Lakes coastal forecasting system on Lake Erie that provides forecasts of currents, waves, water levels. These forecasts are of critical importance to lake shore residents, the fishing and shipping industries, and recreational users. This cutting edge system will soon be turned over to the National Weather Service to be used in their forecasting data.

GLERL has recently completed studies in Old Women Creek, Lake Erie, to help figure the role of wetlands in reducing the effects of nutrient inputs from nonpoint agricultural sources. This information will help farmers develop coherent, nonregulatory pollution control.

GLERL WORK HAS SAVED BILLIONS

GLERL's nutrient dynamics and modeling work contributed to saving over \$10 billion dollars of ineffective additional sewage treatment. Note: At the present GLERL appropriations level of \$5.6 million per year, these savings are equivalent to over 1,000 years of GLERL funding.

When zebra mussels clogged the water intakes in Monroe, MI, and cut off drinking water supplies, GLERL went to work to determine not only how to control zebra mussels, but how to keep them clear of vital water lines.

GLERL has worked extensively with private industry, providing models to help them with a host of problems. An example being a model created by GLERL of the Detroit River for Detroit Edison to aid with their hydro-power predictions.

GLERL's expertise and research related to contaminated sediments were key to the findings and recommendations of a scientific panel, led by GLERL scientists, that the Coast Guard relax their proposed regulations, thus saving the shipping industry tens of millions of dollars in lost time and additional costs. These regulations were modified as a result of the sound science provided by GLERL.

GLERL's CoastWatch Synthetic Aperture Radar Applications Program has developed better means of identifying ice type and ice concentration on the Great Lakes. GLERL's

data is used by the National Weather Service and the U.S. Coast Guard in their ice forecasting, search and rescue, and ship assistance activities. This function of GLERL is critical to the billion dollar fishing and shipping industry in the Great Lakes basin.

GLERL is currently studying the rainfall-run-off relationship of the 121 watersheds within the Great Lakes basin. This work is essential to predicting lake levels, information which is essential to shipping and hydroelectric power.

GLERL HELPS SAVE LIVES

When the people of Milwaukee became sick—and some died—from contaminated drinking water, GLERL began an intensive search to understand near-shore water conditions which will help prevent future health catastrophe caused by drinking water contamination.

GLERL's Great Lakes atmospheric wave model gives local emergency preparedness agencies the ability to make advanced predictions of shoreline flooding caused by storm surges. GLERL's research will give property owners and industries time to protect their property and evacuate to higher ground.

GLERL's wind wave models have provided the National Weather Service with a more accurate forecasts and warnings of wave conditions on the Lakes, thus helping safeguard the lives of commercial and recreational boaters.

GLERL's Pathfinder model for oil/chemical spill trajectory is used by NOAA on the Great Lakes for spill response and by the Coast Guard to help guide search and rescue operations.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to praise the good work of our chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their cooperation in bringing about this bipartisan compromise. As a member of the Committee on Science and chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development for the Committee on National Security, I am very concerned about the cuts that are being made to the NOAA accounts and the cuts that are being made in ocean research and ocean programs. While I am not totally pleased with the amount of money this puts back in, I think this does make a statement that we want to keep our ocean research programs in place, that we want to place additional funds into the coastal zone management program, that we want to support the marine fisheries programs, all of which are extremely important.

This is a necessary compromise. I wish we could go further, but in this tough budget environment it is the best we could get. I want to thank both sides for working this agreement out, and hopefully we can continue to work in a bipartisan manner for the good of our world oceans and world cooperation in these issues in the future.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate the compromise that has been worked out on both sides of the aisle. A couple of quick comments to show the Members the importance of these little-known issues:

The National Marine Fisheries Service is the entity that collects the biological data on coastal fisheries worth billions and billions of dollars to this country. Even if we stopped fishing in all the oceans, we could still lose 70 percent of the commercially caught fish if we did not have any sense of where these fish spawn and where these fish spend a good deal of their life. The National marine Fisheries Service collects that biological data, and I appreciate the increase in the amount of money. The Great Lakes is an enormous attribute to the United States, so we need to have some sense of the fisheries in that area. The coastal ocean program forged grants, which is very valuable to coastal States, the Coastal Zone Management Act, a voluntary organization which provides valuable data on the biological health of our coastal economies.

I would ask the Members though, as we pursue this effort, the National Marine Sanctuary program should use a little bit of attention as we move along on this issue.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. It maintains the funding which I believe is very crucial and important to the coastlines of these United States. By maintaining funding for the Coastal Zone Management Act we are maintaining stable and crucial resources for some of our country's most pristine, valuable, and ecologically sensitive real estate.

Over the years, the Coastal Zone Management Act or CZMA has proven to be a cost-effective tool, which relies on State authorities to accomplish its objective of effectively balancing national, State, and local interests in the utilization of our Nation's finite coastal resources. This is a clear example of a program that empowers State and local decisionmakers. However, because States rely on Federal funding generally for between 50 and 100 percent of State program costs, significant reductions in Federal funding would severely reduce State capabilities to manage their coastal areas. In most States, the impacts would be felt most acutely at the local government level, where many of the Federal dollars end up.

Mr. Chairman, I just hope that in future discussions we can address the issue of the national marine sanctuaries.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make sure my colleagues understand this is not a coastal vote. Those of us that really want to see environmental strategies work and want to see cooperative efforts between the local governments and the Federal Government need to support this motion. Those of us that want to see the old command-and-control environmental regulations done away with and new progressive, aggressive environmental preservation move forward need to stand up and support this motion because it is really showing the kind of things that we can do right in protecting our environment, and I pointed out where we have done wrong, and I will continue to fight what we have done wrong, but I think we have an obligation when we point out where environmental regulations are wrong to also stand up for it when they are right, and this program and this strategy is one that we should support.

So I ask those of my colleagues that want to protect private property rights, want to protect local control, now is the time to join with us that really want to protect the environment, to protect those rights and protect the environmental by supporting this cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the citizens at large.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALLARD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLARD: Page 47, strike lines 1 through 6, relating to the Under Secretary for Technology and the Office of Technology Policy.

□ 1715

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we limit debate on this amendment to 10 minutes, 5 minutes on each side.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] will be recognized for 5 minutes in support of

the amendment, and the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for putting together a strong bill. I applaud the efforts he made to reduce the funding for programs which must be downsized in this tight budgetary climate. Nonetheless, we must not pass up an opportunity to eliminate a needless layer of bureaucracy and save \$5 million.

As a member of the Committee on the Budget, I am personally committed to eliminating redundant and unnecessary bureaucracies. In this vein, I offer this amendment, which would zero out the funds for Undersecretary of Technology. Besides being redundant, this office helps to put the government in an area in which it should not be, the office assisting government "in picking winners and losers," as stated by the OMB's fiscal year 1996 budget report, by benchmarking the competitiveness of industrial sectors.

These programs do little to enhance our overall economic welfare. Although they may indeed help certain sectors or individual companies within those sectors, it harms the welfare of the Nation as a whole by wasting our limited tax dollars and by diverting resources toward those sectors in which we are relatively inefficient. This is the perfect definition of corporate welfare.

However, even if we support these industrial policy programs, this amendment would not destroy the actual policies. It only cuts an office which the budget resolution claims is duplicative and unnecessary in its administrative and other responsibilities.

A vote in favor of my amendment sends a strong signal that the House is in support of ending this unneeded office rather than continuing to fund it at a decreased level. We must completely eliminate unnecessary bureaucracies, rather than phasing them out over time. As in the private sector, a gradual approach only allows the affected agencies to grow back.

Citizens for a Sound Economy and the National Taxpayers Union have strongly endorsed this amendment stating,

In this time of making government smaller and more efficient, the Office of Technology Policy is one bureaucracy that serves virtually no purpose for American taxpayers. Its elimination will show that Congress is serious about downsizing government and allowing Americans to keep more of their own money.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment and think it is a very unwise one, I certainly do not share his sentiments.

This world is changing. We are increasingly becoming a smaller international community. It is becoming very apparent to everyone that we are going to have to be increasingly competitive in the technology areas.

The Department of Commerce generally, Mr. Chairman, is the department that is strategically focusing on these issues, trying to promote international trade, and at the same time promote technology development in key areas, targeting areas that will be growth sectors into the future.

The Technology Administration is the place that looks at these issues. It is not a lot of money. It is a very small investment to have this kind of strategic thinking. I think this elimination amendment is extremely unwise. The Technology Administration works with American industry to maximize the technology's contribution to economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I really hope that the body will not move on this issue in this appropriations bill. If there is some effort to reconstruct the Commerce Department, to look at Commerce generally, to look at its role into the future, the authorizing process is the proper place to do that, not here today. We have not had any hearings to suggest elimination of the Technology Administration during our appropriations hearings. We simply do not have a factual foundation to intelligently make this kind of a decision.

The facts we do have are that increasingly this is a competitive international community. Our opposition, our competitors around the world, Europe, Japan, the emerging nations, are all focusing strategically on technology development.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the gentleman's amendment for all of those, I think, very good reasons.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Allard amendment to eliminate the Technology Administration.

The Technology Administration is a redundant bureaucracy that is tasked with overseeing other departments. The elimination of this office will not harm other programs under the Department of Commerce jurisdiction, and some contend it may even cause other functions to perform better.

In our efforts to downsize government, it is important for us to eliminate all layers of unnecessary bureaucracy. In my opinion the Technology Administration fits that category and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

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

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition. This may be one of

the more shortsighted amendments that we will address in this Congress this year. In a time of global competition, the Office of Technology Administration is the one place in the Federal Government where the government is an ally, not an enemy, of our businesses here in this country. The Technology Administration acts as a focal point for all industry concerns, both foreign and domestic, such as the activities of foreign firms and their parent governments, the unintended consequences of legislation and regulations, and, as I said, a rapidly changing global economy.

The Office of Technology Assistance is an advocate for industry in this country, at a time when our American businesses need help from the Government, not a silent voice here as they struggle to meet this worldwide competition.

This would be a disaster for this country. The Office of Technology Administration manages and oversees the very things that make our businesses competitive. In a time where the marketplace in this country is squeezing the ability of our firms here in America to research and develop products over a long period of time without a short, virtually lifespan payback, this is the very thing that other countries are doing to gain a competitive edge.

So I would urge all Members to reject this shortsighted amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Commerce Department's Technology Administration serves several important roles in the Federal Government that assist the private sector in maintaining a competitive edge. We should not only provide social assistance but we should also assist the private sector which is the backbone of our economic vitality.

More than ever before, U.S. economic growth and prosperity depend on technological innovation. Here are just a few of the responsibilities of the Technology Administration.

First, the Technology Administration is the only Federal agency charged with maximizing technology's contribution to the U.S. economy.

Too often in the past, technology development, particularly by the Government, has ignored business issues that affect the ability of the private sector to bring new technologies to the marketplace.

The Technology Administration works not only to see that America leads the world in creating new technologies, but that Federal economic, tax, trade, and regulatory policies help our business community, not hinder it.

Second, the Technology Administration monitors the policies of our foreign competitors to ensure that U.S. firms are not handicapped in the global marketplace.

The Technology Administration works to ensure that American firms have access to foreign government sponsored technology development programs, while protecting U.S. intellectual property rights.

Third, the Technology Administration acts as a focal point for industry concerns, such as the activities of foreign firms and their parent governments, the unintended consequences of legislation and regulations, and a rapidly changing global economy. The Technology Administration is an advocate for industry in

addressing issues which affect U.S. competitiveness.

Finally, the Technology Administration manages three organizations vital to U.S. competitiveness: The National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Technical Information Service, and the Office of Technology Policy.

Eliminating the Technology Administration will have a negligible impact on the Federal deficit, but it will deprive U.S. industry of an advocate within government at a time of intensifying global competition.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about change in the Congress, and we hear all sorts of reasons why there should not be change, that it is shortsighted if we work for change to take an agency like this that is working and doing so much for business. But in reality, the future shortsightedness is we need to balance the budgets and we need to look at where duplication is occurring, and this Technology Administration is a classic example of where we need to look.

How many people do we need speaking on behalf of business? We have under the Office of the Undersecretary of Technology, the Office of Technology Policy. Currently, we have under the National Institute of Standards and Technology. We have the National Technical Information Service. I would have to compliment the appropriation members for recognizing that we no longer need the National Technical Information Service. So that is being eliminated. They reduced by 50 percent the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and basically what we have is the Office of Technology Policy.

Now, we have oversight of just this one and a half divisions under the Office of Undersecretary, a full Secretary. It seems to me that what we need to do is eliminate an administrative layer and let the head of the Office of Technical Policy report directly to the Secretary or the Deputy Secretary. I think it makes lots of sense. It is a tremendous opportunity for this Congress to make an effort to cut spending, to reduce duplication in programs.

So I am urging a "yes" vote on the Allard amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the very distinguished ranking minority member on the Committee on Science.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, of course I rise in opposition to the Allard amendment. I want to compliment the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee for the fine job they have done.

Mr. Chairman, what we are doing here in this action and a number of



others is to try and define the terms of what is admittedly a revolution that is taking place in our concepts of government and the way it should operate. This is not a new phenomenon. I have been here long enough to have been through several revolutions in the way government sought to operate and the Congress sought to operate.

What we are looking at here in the Technology Administration was really a part of the so-called Reagan revolution. This was created by a bill which President Reagan signed just before the end of this term, and it sought to change a situation that we all knew was bad, namely, the adversarial relationship that existed between the government and industry and business in this country.

President Reagan wanted to establish a new, friendlier relationship in which industry and the government could in many areas become partners and work together in the best interests of this country. The Technology Administration was one of the primary features of the Reagan revolution effort to change the relationship between business and industry in this country.

Now, I do not know what the current generation of Republicans wants to do in terms of the revolution. I had thought that they wanted to extend and build upon some of the earlier aspects of the Republican revolution, but apparently they want to throw out everything, the baby with the bath water.

I hope we can do better than that. I hope we can look at these previous programs, determine whether they are working, and, if they are, continue to support them or to change them wherever necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, further proceedings on this amendment will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KLUG

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, No. 17, printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KLUG: Page 43, line 25, strike "386 commissioned officers" and insert "358 commissioned officers".

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, this is an amendment supported both by myself and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY]. What this amendment attempts to do is to capitalize on the agreement reached just a short time ago by our distinguished chair-

man and the ranking member from West Virginia. As you know, we just reduced funding for the NOAA fleet by roughly \$12 million.

□ 1730

At the same time, what this amendment will do is to correspondingly reduce the number of NOAA officer corps members by 25 slots. NOAA, believe it or not, has its own navy and numerous admirals which receive full military pay and retirement benefits while, frankly, never facing any kind of enemy.

Corps officers spend roughly two-thirds of their time behind desks because there are so many of them in relation to the size of the fleet. Since today we are beginning to reduce the NOAA fleet, it obviously makes sense to reduce the officer corps level.

The NOAA authorization bill passed last month by the Committee on Science specifically terminates the NOAA Corps over 3 years, so this begins to reduce the size of the corps correspondingly. And I would point out that our amendment, mine and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is supported by both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources.

In 1995, the commerce inspector general questioned the need for the NOAA Corps. The budget resolution calls for the elimination of the NOAA Corps. NOAA, quite frankly, does not need its own high-priced militia. In fact, the concept of a uniformed NOAA Corps predates NOAA and is an anachronistic throw-back to World War I, World War II, when mapping the U.S. coastline was considered a military, not a civilian endeavor.

I think the amendment we have in front of us is budget neutral today, but in the long run will save a minimum of \$700,000 a year, as we begin to reduce the size of the officer corps several million dollars a year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to join the gentleman from Wisconsin on this very important issue. Every time the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] finds an item that we can privatize, I am ready to join with him in that effort because we came to Congress to make a difference and reduce the size of the Federal Government. This clearly is an amendment that will allow for that slow elimination of the NOAA Corps, which are costing the taxpayers significant dollars.

So I associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin, urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this amendment to continue our mission to downsize the Federal Government.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we accept this amendment and think it is a good one and hope that it is approved.

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

Mr. KLUG. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have to objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman. I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR: On page 44 of the bill, line 22, strike "\$55,500,000" and insert instead "\$57,500,000".

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the transfer from the fund to promote the development of fishery products to NOAA's operation, research, and facilities account. This increase of \$2 million would provide additional funding for the National Marine Sanctuaries Program.

In 1995, \$9.2 million was available from the fund for the fisheries development grants but only \$7.2 million in the grants were awarded. This amendment maintains the level of funding for fishery grants from this fund while partially restoring reductions to the marine sanctuaries program.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores about 15 percent of the 25 percent of the marine sanctuaries program that was cut. I think that it goes a long way to try to help a program that is not a very big one. It is a \$12 million program in total.

The program is very important because there are dozens of marine sanctuaries around the United States, not only in California but in Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, North Carolina, Texas, and Washington. So Members from those States are very interested in making sure that those programs are run effectively.

Mr. Chairman. I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] who also shares the largest marine sanctuary, the Monterey Bay Sanctuary.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment and additional funding for the National Marine Sanctuary Program. It is going to be of great assistance in law enforcement programs as well as giving opportunities to provide sanctuary educational materials to boaters and also to provide rescue service to stranded boaters in the sanctuary.

This is of crucial importance to the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary in my district. The sanctuary produces a majority of the seafood harvested in California. It is a highly sensitive ecosystem and in my own possibly biased opinion is one of most beautiful coastal waters in these United States.

To eliminate significant funding, whether it is for the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary or the beautiful Monterey Bay sanctuary, I think

would be a mistake. We have to be prepared for oil spills and other emergencies. I think for this reason and aforementioned points, I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

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

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr amendment, which reinstates funding for the coastal zone management program and marine sanctuary program.

I would just like to say something about the word sanctuary. Whenever anyone hears that word, we think of something being precious, something being holy, as it were. There have been great battles in California to designate our precious areas of our coast as marine sanctuaries. These are gifts of our Nation that we share with all of our citizens and the citizens of the world, because they come to see it.

So I think that funding should match the nobility of what we have. I rise to support what the gentleman from California is doing. He has been on the forefront of this issue for many, many years. I think that the Congress of the United States would distinguish itself in appropriating some money so that we can continue saying that this is indeed sanctuary, it is holy, it is something special, and we should treat it that way.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Farr amendment, which reinstates funding for the Coastal Zone Management Program and the Marine Sanctuary Program.

Our Nation is largely a coastal one, with 80 percent of Americans living within 50 miles of the coast. The increasing demands on our coastal resources that result from the growing number of people and industries residing in coastal areas require sound policy and an adequate level of protection.

The Coastal Zone Management Program is a proven State Federal partnership that protects our national treasures and promotes economic development. It is a voluntary program that 34 of 35 eligible States have chosen to participate in. They have elected to participate in this program because it allows them to establish their own programs based upon their own needs.

The \$9 million that the Farr amendment seeks to reinstate is critical for allowing local coastal managers to continue doing their jobs. I remind my colleagues that the increasing demands on our coasts will not go away if we choose to retreat from our Federal commitment. Indeed, failing to adequately fund this program will only result in a declining economy and a declining quality of life for the majority of Americans that choose to live and visit our beautiful coasts.

The sanctuaries program protects and conserves our Nation's most precious marine resources. Limited funding in the past has barely kept pace with this rapidly growing program. But the 50 percent cut proposed by the Republicans would require closing some sites and drastically reducing funding for others.

Mr. Chairman, these programs are vital to our coastal and marine resources. I urge my colleagues to support the Farr amendment.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we accept this amendment. We want to thank the gentleman for bringing it to our attention and hope the body will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEFLEY: Strike page 36, line 21, through page 38, line 4.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes and that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], who is opposed to the amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, would the Chair explain that arrangement to me again?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has asked unanimous consent that all debate time on this amendment and all amendments thereto conclude within 50 minutes and that the time be equally divided between the proponent of the amendment, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and an opponent, in this case the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I will yield half of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 12½ minutes in opposition, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 12½ minutes in opposition, and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be recognized for 25 minutes in favor of the amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be

recognized for 25 minutes, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], will be recognized for 12½ minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 12½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

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

Mr. Chairman, I was going to come here today and tell my colleagues what I think about the Economic Development Administration, but I have decided I am not going to do that. After all, I am not the one who audits the EDA's books.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the EDA, I should be telling Members what the Department of Commerce inspector general says about the EDA. Let us start with the March 1995 report. The inspector general said that the CPA firm was unable to express an opinion on the revolving funds statement of financial position because of multiple, material weaknesses in EDA's internal control structure. The IG went on to note that the nature and extent of the internal control deficiencies reported by the CPA firm indicate serious problems in financial mismanagement at EDA.

Several of these issues were previously raised by the inspector general in the past. However, little progress has been made since the survey report was issued 2½ years ago.

Here is a list of the audit headlines in the March 1995 report. In order to be fair, I will read the positive results first. South Carolina city earned full Federal funding of public works project. City in Texas properly managed public works grant. Those are the two positive reports.

Let us get to the negative ones. Michigan county committed serious grant violations, \$1,285,000. A New Jersey public works project not financially feasible, \$34,000. Revolving loan fund created to relieve impact of Hurricane Andrew, not needed, \$1,900,000. Grant to Michigan organization should be terminated, \$243,000. Louisiana grantees mismanage revolving loan fund, \$388,000. Indiana recipient violated Federal regulations and grant requirements, \$475,000. Cost question on South Carolina public works project, \$120,000. Iowa recipient mismanaged grant funds, \$1,500,000.

And in September 1994, the IG report said more of the same. Georgia revolving loan fund operator directed to return \$3 million in overcharges and excess cash, \$3 million. Ohio revolving loan fund grantee violated EDA approved plan, \$90,000. Grantee mismanaged Tennessee revolving loan fund, \$34,000. City of South Carolina inadequately accounted for revolving loan fund, \$238,000. And get this, this money is still missing. Arizona public works project, jeopardized by grantee mismanagement, \$504,000.

Unneeded public works project in New Mexico should be terminated,

\$400,000. Texas grantee improperly solicited matching share from borrower, \$50,000. Audit of proposed grant reveal need for clearer definition of demonstration projects, \$4,300,000.

My state is not immune either. In fact one EDA grantee in Colorado faced felony embezzlement charges before settling out of court for the money that she owed.

Mr. Chairman, that is over \$14 million of problems discovered by the inspector general. There are hundreds of more grants out there just like these, but they will probably never be discovered or investigated by the Department of Commerce inspector general.

□ 1745

I have not read a report this bad since Price Waterhouse left here a few weeks ago. It is time to put an end to this outrageous abuse of taxpayer dollars, support the Hefley-Solomon-Goss amendment, and let us put an end to the EDA.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment. I hope the House will once again defeat the Hefley proposal to eliminate the Economic Development Administration. If we do not vote this amendment down we will deprive hard-hit communities, all over the country, of the vital assistance provided by the EDA which was created to help our Nation's poorest areas raise their standards of living, or to help communities recover from sudden economic disasters.

I say to the Members, it has worked in my congressional district and virtually every other. EDA provides basic infrastructure in poor counties so they can attract the private investments that lead to long-term jobs. EDA is the cornerstone of our efforts to help local communities rebound from the loss of a military base or defense downsizing. In fact, EDA has helped 151 communities hard hit by base closures over the last 3 years alone. These areas are converting bases to provided long-term jobs to the people that depended on them for decades. Today new communities, facing another round of base closures, need EDA to help their families bounce back, but like other good programs, EDA must be streamlined and reformed and targeted, and this bill does that.

First, we cut EDA dramatically, a 21-percent reduction in grants, a full one-third reduction in staff, almost \$100 million in cuts. Second, we have worked closely with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] of the Committee on Transportation, who are pushing the most significant overhaul of EDA programs in 15 years.

Our reforms provide fewer funds and put them in areas that need help the most. They provide greater local and State control over project decisions.

No longer will Washington pick and choose the projects. Our Governors, our local officials, our communities will decide. If our local factory pulls out, EDA monies will help our town create new opportunities for its workers.

Mr. Chairman, if NAFTA or the GATT treaty pushes our industry to Mexico or overseas, EDA will be there if Members vote down this amendment. If Members have any of the 50,000 defense jobs potentially being eliminated in this year's base closure process, their communities will need this program more than ever.

Let me repeat. In this bill, we cut EDA by 21 percent. We say "No more bloated Washington bureaucracy," and we targeted these very limited dollars to communities and families that simply cannot afford to cope with disasters and job loss. They need our help. Give them our vote. Vote down this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Hefley amendment. No other agency, no other program, Mr. Chairman, in the Federal Government has the flexibility of EDA to respond to unique community needs. EDA programs target funds in areas of need and assistance across the board. For communities who are experiencing structural economic changes, and many across the Nation are, EDA provides flexible assistance to help them design and implement their own local recovery strategies. For communities who are experiencing long-term economic distress, EDA provides funding necessary to repair decaying infrastructure, and it is doing so in virtually every congressional district across the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, defense conversion has been on the lips and minds of every Member of this Congress, and we have had strategies to try to address the massive job losses associated with defense downsizing. It is EDA that has the flexibility to step up and address those concerns. Mr. Chairman, over the last 30 years EDA has invested \$15.6 billion in our Nation's distressed communities. I really urge my colleagues to think strongly about this amendment. Oppose the Hefley amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Representatives HEFLEY and SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, the new Congress was elected with a clear mandate to eliminate any and all wasteful spending and reduce the size and scope of the Federal Government. I applaud the work of Chairmen LIVINGSTON and ROGERS in crafting a Commerce, Justice, State bill that reflects that goal and makes difficult choices in a responsible manner.

Nevertheless, I worry that certain programs that have outlived their usefulness may escape intact, slightly

slenderized but still weighing down the American taxpayer needlessly. It seems to me that we must examine all Federal programs not only as to cost, but also ask ourselves if there is an appropriate Federal role. EDA fails this test on several levels.

EDA purports to assist distressed areas yet its broad eligibility criteria allows areas containing 80 percent of the U.S. population to compete for benefits. EDA's programs are duplicative—four separate departments along with the ARC, TVA, and SBA fund similar development programs. EDA programs are not cost efficient—one analysis on an EDA Emergency Jobs Program suggested each job created ultimately cost the American taxpayer \$307,000, seven times the cost of the private sector.

Again, I commend the committee for the 25 percent cut in EDA funding—it is a step in the right direction. But it is not enough to merely cut back on programs that are no longer appropriate. We must take the next step to rip out the roots altogether. As we are ready to eliminate the Commerce Department in the authorization process, I would suggest it is time to fold the tent at the EDA.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the authorizing committee for EDA.

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

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, but I must say that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] are quite accurate in many things they say about criticizing some of the boondoggles we have seen in EDA and the Federal bureaucracy.

That is the reason, that is the reason why yesterday in our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, we abolished EDA and we put in its place a Federal, State, and local partnership of regional commissions.

The gentleman from Florida is absolutely correct when he says 80 percent of the country is eligible. That is wrong. Yesterday we changed that. We cut it right in half. We not only cut it in half, we also upped the criteria to be eligible in another respect and said for a county to be eligible, they have to be above the unemployment rate by at least 1 percent. Yes, also, this is a partnership program where we also said the Federal share will only be 50 percent. If it is a good program, the States and the localities have to come with the other 50 percent.

Stop and think about it. We have fundamentally changed this program by abolishing the Economic Development Administration itself, putting in its place regional commissions, cutting, as my friend, the gentleman from

Kentucky, has said, cutting \$100 million a year out of the program, reforming the program to the extent that only the truly needy counties are eligible. My good friend, the gentleman from Florida, also talks about an example of the job creation costs on a particular project being several thousands of dollars.

I do not doubt that, but if we look at the overall cost of the program, the cost to create a job, that figure is \$2,500. Compared to many other programs, this is a very efficient program. I would say, particularly to my freshman colleagues, the model that we have adopted in abolishing EDA and putting in its place these regional commissions is the model proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi, ROGER WICKER, the president and leader of the freshman class. He is the one that came to the committee, he is the one that proposed this regional commission approach.

I say vote down this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], the ranking member of the authorizing committee.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] who have done such an able job.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. This bill provides \$348 million for EDA programs. This appropriation is well within the Economic Development Administration authorization which our Subcommittee on Public Building and Grounds and Economic Development unanimously, unanimously, passed yesterday, incidentally, at the same time cutting \$100 million a year out of EDA in the authorization for a savings of \$½ billion over the 5-year period.

EDA is essential to these efforts. In the past 30 years it has created almost 40,000 economic development projects, generated more than almost \$2 billion of private sector capital through revolving loan funds that have supported more than 7,000 businesses, leveraged \$3 for every Federal dollar invested.

To the critics of EDA who want to vote for this amendment because they do not believe the programs have worked as well as they do, I say, "Before you vote, listen to the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], look at the authorization bill that passed yesterday." This is a visionary, responsive, and constructive new version of EDA.

The bipartisan bill creates a national, Federal, State, and local partnership that focuses on the local governments, and particularly on the Governors being directly involved in economic development. It involves regional commissions. It tightens EDA's program eligibility criteria and lowers it significantly from what it was. It requires all applicants to develop an investment strategy.

A recent EDA project in our State generated over 300 jobs. I calculated for what the Federal taxpayers put in, it would be repaid in new taxes coming from those workers alone in less than 4 years. That is an incredible return on the money, and over 300 more people are working that would not have been working elsewhere. I urge Members to vote against this amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I want to put my faith in the marketplace. I have respect for what the gentleman is trying to do. I support what the gentleman is trying to do with his amendment, because the real, the real test of business is when we allow the consumer to go out here and they vote on a daily basis with their dollar bill, paying for those services that they feel like they want and they need.

When we pass out Federal dollars or Government dollars and then businesses go ahead and compete, it becomes a system of grantsmanship: who can write up the best grant, who can plead the hardest for what they need. The best and most humane system we have, and this is what we need to encourage, is a system that says "Individuals can go out there and they make their selection on the services they want to receive." The best thing we can do for hardship cases is to reduce the tax burden, to reduce the regulatory burden, and do away with this process where we have some bureaucrat out here saying, "Okay, you are going to be a winner and you are going to be a loser, and you get this benefit and you do not get that benefit." I think we are much better off to support the Hefley amendment and encourage the free market system.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] who is the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of EDA, the authorizing subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like us to all ponder a question: What is the role of the Federal Government in economic development. What is our role? We hear a lot about the private sector. I think everybody here believes in the private sector. I believe that the role of the Federal Government is to create an environment conducive for economic productivity in the private sector. Once in a while, the Federal Government needs to play that particular role.

The new Republican majority has raised a lot of questions as to what the role is that Government should play in the private sector, and I think we can all agree that in certain circumstances, the Federal Government needs to provide the infrastructure, whether it is

highways, water projects, certain basic needs that the community cannot provide for itself.

I want to make one other point here. This is not a giveaway program. This whole program has been reformed, and to a large extent this program provides grants so communities can make them into loans, and these distressed communities can create much more diversity in their economy.

The EDA reform bill, which our subcommittee recently reported, will make significant changes in the way the agency is structured. The Washington bureaucracy of EDA, and listen to this, the Washington bureaucracy of EDA, is entirely eliminated. It will be replaced by eight regional commissions that will be controlled by the States. I might add that under the reforms we have passed, EDA will no longer be dependent on the Department of Commerce. If the Department of Commerce, if it is the will of the House and the Senate to get rid of it, EDA can continue.

□ 1800

Finally, we will get back to focusing on the mission of EDA, which is creating infrastructure, but I want to make one last important point. The second main mission is one that is gaining in importance with each new round of base closings.

Many communities stand to be devastated by the loss of defense-related jobs. The bill before us directs significant resources into defense conversion. EDA is the largest program aimed at weaning communities off these defense-related agencies.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hefley amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for EDA was to help with infrastructure, to help underdeveloped areas, and to help with jobs. That is the name of the game, Mr. Chairman.

In my area, I can point to a foreign trade zone, I can point to a shrimp boat harbor, I can point to all of the areas where we have developed with the help of EDA in cooperation with the local communities.

I do not know that we need any more than strong oversight by the appropriations subcommittee and by the committee of jurisdiction. I know that there are some practices that need to be changed. Maybe there are some people that need to be replaced. But I can say that my experience with EDA has been very positive and we have worked together.

I would like to mention Joe Bailey Swanner, who was the regional director for EDA when I first came to the Congress. He was a professional amongst the professionals. He did what needed to be done. The jobs are there, the infrastructure is there. I can say,

"Thank you, Joe Bailey Swanner. Thank you, EDA."

All of the other things can be corrected by oversight, yes, maybe they need to change some practices and change some people. Otherwise, I think they do not deserve the fate that is pronounced for them here. EDA has served my area well and I am happy to support them.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Did you hear that?

You will.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hefley amendment. I dropped this on the table here. This is \$850 billion in spending cuts. It balances the budget.

Every single Member of this body that voted for a balanced budget ought to be voting for this amendment, because it is in here, along with \$850 billion of other cuts. This amendment is consistent with our goal of balancing the budget.

Eliminating the Department of Commerce. Are any Members going to vote for that? I am. You said you would. Then come over here and vote for this amendment. This redefines the role of the Federal Government.

To truly understand what we are trying to do, I think it may be insightful for the House to review the history of this 30-year-old program. I say that, and I have probably benefited from this program in my district as much as any other district. But, ladies and gentlemen, we have got to balance the budget, or this country is going to go down the drain.

The EDA was formed under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 as an agency of the Department of Commerce to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments through grants that can be used for public works, technical assistance, defense conversion activities, job programs, and loan guarantees to firms for business development.

Originally created to support the economic growth in some of this country's neediest areas, the EDA through years of bureaucratic growth and political maneuvering has outgrown its purpose and outlived its usefulness, as hundreds of others bureaus and agencies have done.

In our budget, we eliminated them, we restructured the Federal Government.

Over the years, EDA has poured thousands of dollars into politically connected schemes that have invested in shopping centers and hotels in my district, okay? Talk about corporate welfare. Hotels in my district, boating marinas, amusement parks and numerous loans that went, bad, bad, bad, that all of you and your families and I paid for.

The most notorious EDA grant earned the EDA former Wisconsin Senator William Proxmire's Golden Fleece award for spending \$200,000 to build a

limestone replica of the Great Wall of China in, of all places, Bedford, IN. I do not know what it is doing there. I think I will go out and take a look at it. That boondoggle followed a \$500,000 grant to build a 10-story model of the great pyramid of Egypt. Clearly Federal dollars could be better used than on that project.

Mr. Chairman, these are not just random EDA expenditures. According to the Congressional Budget Office, EDA programs have been criticized for substituting Federal credit for private credit.

This is the United States of America. Let us get the Federal Government out of the loan business, and for facilitating the relocation of businesses from one distressed area to another. In other words, you come from a distressed area and your community puts in an application. It scores high. So what it does, it creates a program to take a business out of one distressed area and put it in the other. Does that make any sense? Absolutely not.

The EDA has also been criticized for its broad eligibility criteria which allows areas containing 80 percent of the United States population to compete for benefits and for providing aid with little proven effect compared with other programs having similar goals.

Despite these faults, some in this body may argue that eliminating this funding will unduly harm local communities. However, due to the competitive nature of EDA programs, local governments already do not incorporate this type of aid into their annual budgets, so you are not going to hurt them one dollar.

Therefore, eliminating future EDA funding effective immediately would not impose unexpected hardships on any community in this United States, but instead would foster more local control of developing local solutions to local problems and at the same time save the American taxpayers over \$349 million. While the EDA may have once funded on a greatest needs basis, today the decisions have become in a great many cases highly politicized, with absolute need apparently no longer a priority.

I say all this, ladies and gentlemen, because in my district I have taken advantage of this, but the truth of the matter is this. Like other programs—the Small Business Administration, I came out of the small business area—it just is not right to subsidize one business at the expense of another. Every time we make a Small Business Administration loan to someone who has been turned down from 2 to 3 banks, and the next-door neighbor in competition with him has got to pay the income taxes to pay for the loan guarantee and the interest on that loan, that is wrong.

Ladies and gentlemen, if we are going to restructure this government, if we are going to stop this sea of red ink that is literally ruining this country, so that the annual debt service just to

pay the interest on this loan today is more than the defense budget, that is what it is going to be for 7 years, you are going to be held responsible. Your children are going to regret it. That is why you ought to vote for this amendment.

If you are going to say with all the rhetoric that you support a balanced budget, then you are going to have to cut in your district as well as the other guy's. That is what I am doing in mine. That is why you have got to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

(Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to H.R. 2076 offered by my colleagues, Messrs. HEFLEY and SOLOMON. I support the proposed funding level for the programs and administrative expenses of the Economic Development Administration [EDA]. The EDA has effectively operated the Trade Adjustment Assistance Center and maintaining this mutual relationship is essential to continue to protect American workers and manufacturers nationwide who have been severely impacted by foreign imports.

I have been a strong advocate of retaining adequate funding levels for both the EDA and the Trade Adjustment Assistance [TAA] program. Over 23,000 manufacturing firms in my home State of Pennsylvania rely on TAA. I was pleased to see that in an era of tremendous fiscal constraint, the Committee disagreed with President Clinton's recommendation to eliminate the program and chose to include sufficient resources to provide strategic protection for our domestic workforce in a competitive world economy.

The number of jobs and amount of company sales supported by TAA is impressive, particularly relative to the modest amount of Federal investment. In Pennsylvania, this private/public partnership has resulted in the protection or creation of approximately 6,000 jobs and \$485 million in company sales. Moreover, nationwide TAA has resulted in the reinvestment of \$742 into the economy (including Federal tax revenues) for every Federal dollar appropriated for the program. That's a solid investment by any standard.

I urge my colleagues to protect U.S. manufacturing by continuing TAA funding through the able administration of the EDA. TAA and other services provided by the EDA will allow our companies to compete with imports, and expand into the global marketplace.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Economic Development Administration and against the Hefley amendment.

Why is it that we are against the Federal Government lending a helping hand to economically distressed communities? Were we

sent to Washington to abandon areas of our Nation that require Federal assistance to provide jobs for their citizens? I don't think so.

Now I am not claiming that every EDA loan or grant can be defended. But this amendment throws out the baby with the bathwater. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is in the process of reauthorizing EDA, and I am confident that bill can clean up any problems with the agency. You don't improve a program by eliminating it.

Killing EDA is particularly offensive right now because many communities being aided by the EDA are the victims of Federal policies. Almost \$100 million in this bill would go to assist communities that have been hard-hit by base closures and realignments. Don't we have an obligation to assist communities that have been harmed by sudden reversals of Federal policy? I think we do, and so do those on the Appropriations Committee.

I could provide a list of EDA success stories, but my time is limited, and I'm sure many of you have your own lists from your own districts. The EDA is a successful means to fulfill Federal obligations. The Appropriations Committee—hardly a bunch of big spenders—have recognized this.

This bill cuts funding by 21 percent, but it allows a reformed EDA to continue working to endure that American in all regions of this country can share in our prosperity. That's a worthy and necessary mission. I urge defeat of this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE].

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which would completely eliminate the Economic Development Administration [EDA] and all its programs.

Mr. Chairman, over the years, the EDA has played a pivotal role in helping communities across the country overcome severe economic difficulties. This is an excellent example of a program that truly works.

I have seen the good work of the EDA in action. In particular two communities in my district, Worcester and Attleboro, MA, have receive much-needed assistance from the EDA. These communities were hit particularly hard during the period of economic hardship that swept across the country earlier this decade.

Mr. Chairman, clearly economic development assistance remains an important source of funding for many communities. At the same time, I recognize the need for reform and reductions in Federal spending. As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I fully support the EDA reform bill that was recently reported out of subcommittee.

In closing, I would simply state that this amendment is ill-advised and would destroy a program that has helped and continues to help needy communities around the country. I applaud Chairman ROGERS for his support and interest in the EDA. Reform measures and spending reductions are moving through the committee process which will result in an even stronger, more efficient and responsive economic development program.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Economic Development Administration. With all due respect to my friend the gentleman from New York, I have a completely different view of the EDA.

We are talking about help in distressed areas of this country. I represent a coal mining district that has been closed down by the Federal Clean Air Act. You want to talk about help to our communities? It was the EDA that helped us get a water tower, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], that saved 1,250 jobs in one of those communities that was devastated in a coal mining community.

It was the EDA that helped us put a sewer line into a business park that had been ravaged by another one of our Federal acts. It was the EDA that helped us put in a water line and a sewer line for an industrial park that has created a diverse economic opportunity for hundreds of people in my district.

I have a distressed area. The EDA and the Small Business Administration above all Federal agencies are the two agencies that have helped us forge Federal, State, and local partnerships to save our jobs in this country, and we should not be cutting funding for this agency.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I would just say to my good friend, where the problem is, it is not with keeping the EDA going. We ought to come with the Corrections Calendar and repeal some of those things that have caused all those problems in the gentleman's district. I am on that committee. I will support him if he does.

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

Let me just respond to some of the things that have been said. The budget that we passed here the other day, the balanced budget by 2002, assumed that we would get rid of the EDA. That was a part of the assumption that was built into that budget and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] eloquently made that point. It did not assume, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] said, that we would get rid of the EDA but we would change its name to something else.

What does that do for the \$348 million if you move it from this pocket to that pocket? I guess we can go home and we can brag to our constituents, We got rid of the EDA. You wanted us to get rid of that. We got rid of the EDA, and it's gone. But then it is over here doing something else. That does not save the money. That does not get us down the road to the time when we will have a balanced budget in the year 2002.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. I thank my friend from West Virginia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Economic Development Administration's level of funding contained in this bill. Consequently, I oppose the amendment. I want to congratulate the people that have spoken out. I am going to sound something like a chorus here: The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman; the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER]; and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] as well. We are fighting within a tight budget to reform an administration that might in some ways need some reform but has been incredibly effective in my community there in Alabama.

In the Fifth District of Alabama, EDA has helped leverage non-Federal funds on projects ranging from water treatment facilities to business incubators. I think most of my local officials are clearly endorsing EDA, especially its concept of helping communities that help themselves. EDA is important because it provides seed money that promotes long-term investments that respond to locally defined economic priorities.

I hope the Members will pay attention to this debate. I think we owe as much responsibility to revise and evaluate before we eliminate. We should not make an extreme move and eliminate EDA. I oppose this amendment.

□ 1815

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would associate myself as a very practical matter with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

My district is right across the river from the gentleman's district, and I can say the gentleman knows whereof he speaks and I share his sentiments. I also agree with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] who made an exceedingly fine philosophical statement with which I can also agree.

But the answer, Mr. Chairman, lies somewhere between economic purism and the reality of factors out and around the country that would say from time to time, certainly in some of these small, disadvantaged communities, some help is needed. So I do not think the answer lies all one way or the other.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from New York in his presentation of bouncing books on the table

down here had apparently not heard the statement of the Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, who has assured the House that significant serious reform is in process in the committee, and that significant dollars will be shaved and more appropriately directed than in the past.

I rise in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment and urge Members to take a more balanced view.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this amendment and in support of the successor agency to the Economic Development Administration. First, I want to explain what the EDA does and has done for those who may not be familiar with this issue. The EDA works with many of America's most economically distressed local communities and regions to plan and implement development projects to create jobs, retain jobs, and spur economic growth throughout rural and urban America.

In fact, I can tell you that had it not been for the EDA, several communities in my rural district would not have been able to attract the businesses and jobs that are now located in these areas. Over the years, the EDA has leveraged billions of dollars in local government and private capital for projects and generated billions more in tax revenues. For these reasons, the EDA has enjoyed the bipartisan support of the Congress for 30 years.

This Congress will soon approve or disapprove BRAC's third round of recommendations for base closure and realignments. These recommendations will have a devastating impact on communities and families across the nation. Who do you think will be there to offer help to these cities and towns? The Economic Development Agency or its successor agency will be there only if this amendment fails.

When rivers rise and communities are flooded; when earthquakes strike and all that is left is rubble; when a major plant closes due to foreign trade and leaves behind a virtual ghost town; when a community comes up with a great development plan but can't scrape together all the funding by itself, who steps in to help? The Economic Development Agency will, but only if this amendment fails.

Mr. Chairman, while opponents may question the usefulness of the EDA and exaggerate the past problems associated with the program, I stand and want to reform it, but not abolish it. I want to take a moment to explain that the authorizing committees are working on reforms. Under the able leadership of Chairman SHUSTER and Chairman GILCHREST, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and its Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, EDA reform legislation is coming together.

EDA reform legislation replaces the federal bureaucracy with regional commissioners to make policy and grant decisions. The bill would also reform eligibility criteria to focus funds on truly distressed regions and cuts spending by \$100 million a year. And finally, the EDA reform bill would allow the EDA to continue to do its important work if the Department of Commerce is eliminated. Let me make this point clear. A vote for the EDA is not a vote for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, the EDA is the only place for distressed communities to turn when they are

not able to contribute all of the capital investment needed for legitimate public works and economic development projects. The EDA reform bill will change the way the EDA does business for the better. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI].

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

I have heard all the arguments, and I join my colleague from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON]. I have been to the gentleman's district, I have been to Illinois, I have been to Pennsylvania.

What we are really talking about here, Mr. Chairman, is priorities. We are trying to save about one-fifth of a B-2 bomber, the \$350 million we are talking about here. I cannot talk about the whole country, and I cannot say that there are not those examples of the Golden Fleece Award, as my friend, the gentleman from New York, mentioned, but I can tell you one little story.

Nanticoke, PA, 3 years ago, was able to get an EDA grant that afforded the municipal authority the opportunity to build a \$4 million building downtown. It was the first \$4 million building built from the New York State line to Harrisburg, along the Susquehanna River, that had an elevator that went above two floors. In that building more than 300 people today are employed in data processing for a Fortune 500 insurance company that would never have come to northeastern Pennsylvania or that little town.

Mr. Chairman, 300 people are employed making \$15,000 to \$25,000 a year that otherwise would have been on unemployment compensation, welfare, or unemployed. That is what economic development is all about. That is what our priorities should be all about.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman three decades ago "Night Comes to the Cumberlandlands" described the abject poverty and desperate economic conditions in which people in rural Appalachia lived, and the Nation responded with the Appalachian Regional Commission, an issue we settled on the floor last week.

Similar conditions exist in rural areas and in pockets of poverty in urban areas around this country, and the Congress responded to their needs with the Economic Development Administration. Every year, the jobs created by EDA exceed the total amount of Federal investment by over \$6 billion a year in Federal, State, and taxes paid from the jobs created by EDA.

Mr. Chairman, let us not chop this program from the Federal budget. Let us give hope to the economically depressed areas, the investment-starved areas of this country, so that, for them, "Night Comes to the Cumberlandlands" will become "Morning Comes to America."

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS].

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. At \$348.5 million, the subcommittee has already reduced funding for EDA by 21 percent from its fiscal year 1995 funding level. Totally eliminating funding for this Agency is not justified either from the standpoint of fiscal constraints or economic development policy.

The Economic Development Administration plays a vital role in supporting and enhancing communities around this Nation in a manner that is not carried out by any other agency. EDA grants help localities to build the capacity to plan and implement economic development strategies needed to respond to problems and to restore an employment base.

In areas where there has been a significant loss in the manufacturing sector, EDA has been able to halt further economic deterioration through its revolving loan programs to local businesses. In Buffalo, these efforts resulted in a 61-percent increase in manufacturing employment.

EDA also aids strategic planning and feasibility studies that bolster cooperative efforts for local economic development. For example, EDA efforts in this area helped the State of Maryland and the city of Baltimore to develop a restructuring plan for the promotion of local biomedical research and health facilities.

But Mr. Chairman perhaps the most important aspect of EDA programs are being overlooked here. The Agency's ability to pay for itself. It may be the only Federal program that is actually a net profit maker with a return for the Federal Government. Statistics suggest that approximately \$3 of private investment is spurred by every invested EDA dollar.

As the Secretary indicated in his testimony before Congress, " \* \* \* economic opportunity is not evenly dispersed to all communities \* \* \* " EDA programs strive to equalize the economic playing field for distressed communities. This week the Public Works Committee reported out new strict eligibility standards which will ensure that EDA grants are awarded to our most distressed regions. This action ensures that funds will only go to the neediest communities.

Let us give these new changes an opportunity to work. EDA makes an important contribution to the economic vitality of this country. It is an agency that we need and an agency that deserves our support.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment to eliminate the EDA. The EDA works. We are cutting the EDA by 20 percent in this bill and that is enough.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen it work in my own district in Virginia, where

Henry County used an EDA grant to prepare a site for an industrial park. The EDA grant of \$650,000 was matched by \$740,000 in State and local money and attracted private sector investments of \$68 million, 100 times the investment of EDA.

As a result, 550 people now work at the site in six different businesses. However, the site today would be an empty lot in a high unemployment area, except for the investment of the EDA.

Mr. Chairman, my district is not unique. The EDA is targeted, it is effective and locally driven, and the EDA works in partnership with local leaders in the private sector to foster economic growth for citizens in distressed areas. Clearly, the EDA is an important cost-effective agency; one that we should support, not eliminate.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA], a distinguished minority member of the authorizing committee.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleagues from Colorado, New York, and Florida. However, before I discuss the specific provisions of the amendment, I would like to commend the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. ROGERS, and its ranking member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for their excellent work on this bill.

This bill provides \$348 million for the programs of the Economic Development Administration [EDA]. This appropriation cuts the EDA's current year funding by more than 20 percent. It is \$91 million less than the President's request and well within the economic development authorization which our Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development unanimously passed just yesterday.

Nevertheless, this amendment seeks to eliminate all funding for the Economic Development Administration. At a time when the infrastructure of distressed communities is crumbling, this amendment would eliminate much-needed public works funds. At a time when communities need assistance to determine how to compete in the global market, this amendment would cut off critical planning and technical assistance. At a time when our defense industry is radically downsizing and hundreds of bases are closing, this amendment would cut assistance these communities and the industry need to help them pick themselves up, brush themselves off, and put the pieces of job creation back in place.

For instance, look at EDA's crucial role in defense conversion. Nationwide, more than 250 military bases are currently closing and almost 150 addi-

tional facilities are being realigned. As we all know, the 1995 Base Closure and Realignment Commission proposes closing another 79 based and realigning 26 others. In my home State of California alone, the defense industry has already lost one-quarter of a million jobs. Since 1988, 21 major bases have been slated for closure, with more than 80,000 military and civilian workers losing their jobs.

Through it all, EDA—with infrastructure grants, business development loans, and technical assistance—has helped both communities and industry adjust to the post-cold-war world. Now is not the time to kill this critical program.

To the critics of EDA, let me say: the subcommittee-passed bipartisan authorization bill will launch EDA on a new effort founded on reform, responsibility, efficiency, and accountability. Gone are the programs and approaches of old. Gone are the inefficient bureaucracies; gone are the archaic eligibility requirements; and gone are the time-consuming and cumbersome approval processes. I believe that our bill addresses your concerns about EDA.

Both the Transportation Committee's bipartisan authorization bill and this appropriation bill address the concerns of the past and the challenges of the future. Before we eliminate these programs without due consideration to the effect, let us provide EDA with an opportunity to ensure that our Nation's economic development program is second to none.

I urge Members to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was my hope, that our colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, in dropping all the papers here, would have left them here, because I would have come back to put them back into place.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 11, 1995.

Mr. WILLIAM DAVIDSON,  
Regional Planning Board,  
Lake George, NY.

DEAR WILLIAM: Thank you for contacting me regarding the Economic Development Administration. I most certainly share your concern with this matter. I vigorously support the efforts of the Economic Development Administration to provide much needed capital to businesses.

Although, Congress recently rescinded a total of \$45 million in unspent funds to the Economic Development Administration, these funds represent monies that were authorized years ago and still remain unspent. This reduction does not represent a cut in current funding for the Economic Development Administration.

These rescissions consist of funds appropriated in fiscal year 1992 for emergency relief related to Hurricane Andrew and the Midwest floods. In both cases money for the Economic Development Administration was not requested by the Clinton Administration. Additionally it was generally accepted that these funds had been available for an appropriate length of time to address the effect of economic dislocation resulting from these disasters. The bill also included the re-

scission of \$7.5 million originally provided in 1987 for the Fort Worth Stockyards Project that remained unspent after eight years.

These rescissions and others like them address the long overdue problem of our national debt that now exceeds \$4.5 trillion and threatens the fiscal stability of this nation for future generations. Interest in the deficit will amount to over \$234 billion this year alone. This means that this year's spending by the federal government will be paid for by our children and grandchildren. That's why spending reforms must take place to make this government live within its means and to restore accountability to the budget in Washington. For as long as I have been in Congress, I have supported efforts to reduce government waste and achieve a more efficient use of taxpayers' money. For the sake of future generations the time has come to cut spending. This means reducing, consolidating and eliminating even the most popular programs.

Although, the time has come for all programs to be trimmed or returned to localities, I strongly support helping small business and will do everything possible to ensure that the reforms maintain the Economic Development Administration.

Once again, thank you for contacting me regarding your thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely,

GERALD B. SOLOMON.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say I have offered similar amendments over the years to abolish EDA and in the past it is not the easy thing to do, because it is the kind of amendment that strains friendships. Each of my colleagues has their own experiences about how EDA has helped their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I do not dispute that the EDA has done some good things, but it cannot be disputed that the EDA has had many, many failures as well. To top that off, the financial management of the EDA, according to the Department of Commerce inspector general, is in absolute shambles.

But, Mr. Chairman, the debate is not about whether a particular project is beneficial or not. The debate is whether the EDA is the best use of taxpayers' dollars and it clearly is not. The EDA's influence on the economy is highly overrated. On a good month, the U.S. economy creates more long-term jobs than the EDA has created in its 28-year history.

The best economic performance this country has experienced in the past 28 years was when the EDA's budget was at its lowest. Let us face it, the EDA has been on the chopping block for years. It has survived for the simple reason that it makes Representatives and Senators look good.

Mr. Chairman, I contend that balancing our budget will do more for all of our reputations than all of the successes of the EDA. We need to bring these taxpayers' dollars back to do what they should be doing.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.



Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] with all due respect.

Mr. Chairman, I think that having been at one time an alumnus of the EDA, I would disagree that the Agency has not, in fact, done many good things throughout this country. It has not been a boondoggle. We used to argue this with David Stockman who said it was a zero sum game and it does not create any new jobs.

□ 1830

I think there are Members in this body who can speak from experience who know, in fact, we did create jobs.

I think the important thing to emphasize here is we are now on track to eliminate the Department of Commerce. We are proceeding to do that. My committee is going to be not orchestrating it, but finding out where things fit.

I think it would be premature at this point to eliminate EDA until that process that we have ongoing now through the reconciliation process has been completed.

I think the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], testified we are making dramatic changes in the delivery system. There have been mistakes. Too much of the country qualified for EDA assistance. It clearly should be focused on those areas of greatest need. Give us a chance to make those kinds of reforms. Give us a chance to do reconciliation before we hack the agency to death.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], who, as many know, is president of the freshman class on the Republican side of this body.

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for yielding this time to me.

I certainly rise in opposition to this amendment, and I rise in support of the Economic Development Administration.

I want to associate myself with the remarks made by many of my colleagues here this afternoon.

My colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], spoke eloquently on behalf of the EDA, and I want to take issue with only one thing he said. He said that EDA is the only agency he knows of that actually makes money for the Government at the end of the day by drawing down so much money from other levels of Government and from the private sector. Actually, there are other such agencies, and I would suggest to you that this is the very argument that carried the day on behalf of the Appalachian Regional Commission a couple of weeks ago, when, by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, this House re-

jected an amendment to defeat the Appalachian Regional Commission and rejected an amendment to eliminate the economic development portion of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The same arguments that carried the day 2 weeks ago on TVA and ARC are true today, with the exception of the fact that EDA helps needy counties in every section of the United States of America, not just in a localized area, as the Appalachian Regional Commission and TVA do.

It would be the height of inconsistency for this House of Representatives to save the ARC and TVA while at the same time killing EDA.

Now, there are differences in the programs, but the main factors still remain. I would suggest to you that the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER], was correct when he spoke earlier about the need for changes in the funding formula.

I do have a bill in the subcommittee that has authorizing jurisdiction, and that subcommittee is working on changing the funding formulas. I think, quite frankly, that EDA could have more of a bottom-up approach and more participation by the Governors than they presently have.

But the arguments still basically are the same. We are talking about an agency that provides jobs and an agency that is working. It provides for needy countries, for example, fire protection to attract jobs and industry into a community and create taxpayers out of people. It helps communities build industrial parks. It helps communities build access roads to job locations. This is money well spent.

There is Federal money that basically takes a dollar out of somebody's pocket who is working and gives it to somebody else who is not working. I think Americans have the right to question that type of Federal spending, and we are doing that. We are balancing the budget in this House of Representatives and in this Congress.

But, when we can take Federal dollars and provide the opportunity for private sector employers to create jobs in the private sector and make taxpayers out of individuals in the counties which need it most and the locations which need it most, to me that is so much better than a transfer payment because it creates long-term jobs. EDA, just like TVA and ARC, is a good investment in jobs in the private sector.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment and support for the EDA.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in strong opposition to this short-sighted amendment which would terminate funding for the Economic Development Administration.

As the Representatives whose district is home to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard and has been one of the most heavily affected regions in the base closure process, I know firsthand the remarkable work being done by EDA.

With the expected loss of over 38,000 direct and indirect jobs as a result of the closure of

the Navy Yard, EDA was on the ground working with the community—not as bureaucrats, but as a partner.

In Philadelphia, thanks in large part to this partnership, we are on the brink of creating good jobs and economic opportunity by reviving commercial shipbuilding at the Navy Yard.

EDA provides planning grants to local communities so that they can develop their own economic development plans. EDA provides seed money for community-identified infrastructure investments so that they can recover from an economic loss and rebuild their economic base.

And there are similar success stories throughout the Nation. EDA is assisting big cities hit by defense downsizing, small farming communities stricken by drought and suburban towns hurt by industry cutbacks.

People think of big cities when they talk about the EDA. But these EDA cuts will cut across all geographic lines.

I urge my colleagues to talk to their mayors, county executives and local chambers of commerce to hear these success stories firsthand. Oppose this amendment.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Economic Development Administration has been critical for rural America, and it promotes domestic growth as well as international trade growth.

It truly puzzles me how Members can propose to eliminate the very agencies of Government that have been effective in advancing the fiscal health of America.

The Economic Development Administration has done that.

I wonder if Members are aware of how this agency works.

I am familiar with how it works in the promotion of international trade and exporting of U.S. goods and services.

That is a vital and important function.

Exports from the United States have accounted for more than one-third of the economic growth in America, over the last 7 years.

Over the next 10 years, exports will grow three times as fast as any other component of the U.S. economy.

Export-related jobs have grown faster than domestic employment and export-related jobs pay almost one-fifth more than other domestic jobs.

In 1994 alone, exports supported some 11 million jobs in this Nation, and by the year 2000, exports will support nearly 16 million jobs.

In light of this compelling data, why then, Mr. Chairman, does this House seem to continue to be penny wise and pound foolish?

Why does this House continue to cut the budget without regard to what's in the budget?

Is this House so determined to march recklessly towards a balanced budget that it is willing to sacrifice good, important and valuable programs along the way?

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that by retaining the Economic Development Administration, we are more likely to balance the budget by the year 2002 than if we eliminated it.

The Economic Development Administration does just what its name suggests—it spurs economic development in America—not just domestic development, but global development, where the real future lies.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment. Wake up Congress!

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, Representative HEFLEY, to strike all funds contained in H.R. 2076 for the Economic Development Administration.

Just yesterday, a bill reauthorizing the EDA was reported to the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee by the subcommittee of jurisdiction, and it is a bill that streamlines and tightens eligibility for EDA program assistance so that the funds spent go only to our most distressed regions throughout the Nation.

H.R. 2076, the Commerce/State/Justice appropriations bill, has already cut EDA funding by 21 percent—or \$91 million—below the fiscal year 1995 funding level. Twenty-one percent is a huge cut and I believe it represents EDA's fair share contribution toward reducing the deficit.

The reauthorization bill preserves the basic EDA programs, but has radically altered the program delivery mechanism by adopting an ARC Commission model for future grant-making and policy decisions.

In order to counter criticism of the EDA that it is nothing more than a Federal piggy bank, the new authorizing legislation strengthens the program by tightening the eligibility criteria, so that only truly distressed regions throughout the country will receive economic development assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the new authorizing bill continues the ability of communities to respond to defense cutbacks and base closures while, at the same time, retaining eligibility for local development districts and university centers; the bill also reforms the EDA delivery mechanism basing it on the ARC model of documented success; and it tightens eligibility criteria, while cutting EDA funding by \$91 million—21 percent in fiscal year 1996. This is good reform where needed, and qualifies the EDA for our continued support.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Hefley amendment to abolish the EDA, and urge their strong support for the continued funding for this vital job-creating program.

This is a program that has always helped regions of the country in need of economic development and job-creating assistance—and it should be allowed to continue to provide this assistance to local governments.

Defeat the Hefley amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: First, amendment No. 43 offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD]; second, amendment No. 1 offered

by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ALLARD

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the nose prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 17-minute vote.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the next amendment.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

AYES—197

Allard	Fawell	Luther
Andrews	Fields (TX)	Manzullo
Archer	Foley	Martini
Armey	Fowler	McCollum
Bachus	Fox	McHugh
Baker (CA)	Franks (CT)	McInnis
Baker (LA)	Frelinghuysen	McIntosh
Barcia	Frisa	McKeon
Barr	Funderburk	Metcalf
Barrett (NE)	Galleghy	Meyers
Barrett (WI)	Ganske	Mica
Bartlett	Gekas	Miller (FL)
Barton	Gillmor	Minge
Bass	Goodlatte	Molinari
Bereuter	Goodling	Moorhead
Bilbray	Gordon	Myrick
Billirakis	Goss	Nethercutt
Bliley	Graham	Neumann
Boehner	Gunderson	Ney
Bonilla	Gutknecht	Norwood
Brownback	Hancock	Nussle
Bryant (TN)	Hansen	Oxley
Bunning	Hastert	Packard
Burr	Hastings (WA)	Paxon
Burton	Hayworth	Peterson (MN)
Buyer	Hefley	Petri
Callahan	Heineman	Pombo
Camp	Herger	Porter
Canady	Hillery	Portman
Chabot	Hobson	Pryce
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Quinn
Christensen	Hoke	Radanovich
Chrysler	Horn	Ramstad
Coble	Hostettler	Regula
Coburn	Hunter	Roberts
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Roemer
Combest	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Condit	Istook	Ros-Lehtinen
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Cox	Jones	Royce
Crane	Kasich	Salmon
Crapo	Kim	Sanford
Creameans	Kingston	Scarborough
Cubin	Klecza	Schaefer
Cunningham	Klug	Seastrand
Deal	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
DeLay	LaHood	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart	Largent	Shays
Doolittle	Latham	Shuster
Dornan	LaTourette	Sisisky
Dreier	Lazio	Skeen
Duncan	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Dunn	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Ehrlich	Linder	Smith (TX)
Emerson	Livingston	Smith (WA)
Ensign	LoBiondo	Solomon
Everett	Longley	Souder
Ewing	Lucas	Stearns

Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt

Upton  
Visclosky  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Wamp  
Watt (NC)  
Weldon (PA)

Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

NOES—230

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehkert  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Calvert  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dickey  
Dicks  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Engel  
English  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Forbes  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons

Gilchrest  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gutierrez  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hayes  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchesy  
Holden  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hutchinson  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
King  
Klink  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver

Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Quillen  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Rogers  
Rose  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Walsh  
Ward  
Waters  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bateman  
Chenoweth  
Collins (MI)

Dingell  
Hall (OH)  
Moakley  
Reynolds

□ 1854

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Chenoweth for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Messrs. HOLDEN, DEUTSCH, FORD, and SKELTON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. GALLEGLY, RADANOVICH, BUYER, LAZIO of New York, WICKER, EMERSON, and GORDON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 115, noes 310, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—115

Allard	Gallegly	Paxon
Archer	Goss	Petri
Armey	Gutknecht	Porter
Bachus	Hancock	Pryce
Baker (CA)	Hansen	Radanovich
Barr	Hastert	Ramstad
Barrett (NE)	Hayworth	Rohrabacher
Barton	Hefley	Roth
Bass	Hobson	Royce
Bereuter	Hoekstra	Salmon
Bilirakis	Hoke	Sanford
Bliley	Hostettler	Scarborough
Boehner	Hyde	Schaefer
Brown (OH)	Inglis	Schumer
Brownback	Istook	Seastrand
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Christensen	Kasich	Shaw
Chrysler	Kim	Smith (MI)
Coble	King	Smith (WA)
Condit	Klug	Solomon
Cox	Kolbe	Souder
Crane	LaHood	Stearns
Crapo	Largent	Stockman
Cubin	Linder	Stump
Cunningham	Manzullo	Talent
DeLay	McCollum	Tate
Doolittle	McInnis	Tiahrt
Dornan	McIntosh	Waldholtz
Dreier	McKeon	Walker
Dunn	Miller (FL)	Watt (NC)
Ehrlich	Moorhead	Weldon (PA)
Ensign	Moran	White
Ewing	Myrick	Wolf
Fawell	Nethercutt	Young (FL)
Fields (TX)	Neumann	Zeliff
Foley	Norwood	Zimmer
Forbes	Nussle	
Frisa	Oxley	

NOES—310

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brewster
Ackerman	Berman	Browder
Andrews	Bevill	Brown (CA)
Baesler	Bilbray	Brown (FL)
Baker (LA)	Bishop	Bryant (TN)
Baldacci	Blute	Bryant (TX)
Ballenger	Boehert	Bunn
Barcia	Bonilla	Burr
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Burton
Bartlett	Bono	Buyer
Becerra	Borski	Callahan
Beilenson	Boucher	Calvert

Camp	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Cardin	Hinchev	Payne (VA)
Castle	Holden	Pelosi
Chambliss	Horn	Peterson (FL)
Chapman	Houghton	Peterson (MN)
Clay	Hoyer	Pickett
Clayton	Hunter	Pombo
Clement	Hutchinson	Pomeroy
Clinger	Jackson-Lee	Portman
Clyburn	Jacobs	Poshard
Coburn	Jefferson	Quillen
Coleman	Johnson (SD)	Quinn
Collins (GA)	Johnson, E.B.	Rahall
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Rangel
Combest	Jones	Reed
Conyers	Kanjorski	Regula
Cooley	Kaptur	Richardson
Costello	Kelly	Riggs
Coyne	Kennedy (MA)	Rivers
Cramer	Kennedy (RI)	Roberts
Creameans	Kennelly	Roemer
Danner	Kildee	Rogers
Davis	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza	Klecicka	Rose
Deal	Klink	Roybal-Allard
DeFazio	Knollenberg	Rush
DeLauro	LaFalce	Sabo
Dellums	Lantos	Sanders
Deutsch	Latham	Sawyer
Diaz-Balart	LaTourrette	Saxton
Dickey	Laughlin	Schiff
Dicks	Lazio	Schroeder
Dixon	Leach	Scott
Doggett	Levin	Serrano
Dooley	Lewis (CA)	Shays
Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Shuster
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Sisisky
Durbin	Lightfoot	Skaggs
Edwards	Lincoln	Skeen
Ehlers	Lipinski	Skelton
Emerson	Livingston	Slaughter
Engel	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
English	Lofgren	Smith (TX)
Eshoo	Longley	Spence
Evans	Lowe	Spratt
Everett	Lucas	Stark
Farr	Luther	Stenholm
Fattah	Maloney	Stokes
Fazio	Manton	Studds
Fields (LA)	Markey	Stupak
Filner	Martinez	Tanner
Flake	Martini	Tauzin
Flanagan	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Foglietta	Matsui	Taylor (NC)
Ford	McCarthy	Tejeda
Fowler	McCrery	Thomas
Fox	McDade	Thompson
Frank (MA)	McDermott	Thornberry
Franks (CT)	McHale	Thornton
Franks (NJ)	McHugh	Thurman
Frelinghuysen	McKinney	Torkildsen
Frost	McNulty	Torres
Funderburk	Meehan	Torrice
Furse	Meeke	Towns
Ganske	Menendez	Traficant
Gedjenson	Metcalfe	Tucker
Gekas	Meyers	Upton
Gephardt	Mfume	Velazquez
Geren	Mica	Vento
Gibbons	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Gilchrest	Mineta	Volkmer
Gillmor	Minge	Vucanovich
Gilman	Mink	Walsh
Gonzalez	Molinari	Wamp
Goodlatte	Mollohan	Ward
Goodling	Montgomery	Waters
Gordon	Morella	Watts (OK)
Graham	Murtha	Waxman
Green	Myers	Weldon (FL)
Greenwood	Nadler	Weller
Gunderson	Neal	Whitfield
Gutierrez	Ney	Wicker
Hall (TX)	Oberstar	Williams
Hamilton	Obey	Wilson
Harman	Olver	Wise
Hastings (FL)	Ortiz	Woolsey
Hastings (WA)	Orton	Wyden
Hayes	Owens	Wynn
Hefner	Packard	Yates
Heineman	Pallone	Young (AK)
Herger	Parker	
Hilleary	Pastor	

NOT VOTING—9

Bateman	Collins (MI)	Moakley
Canady	Dingell	Reynolds
Chenoweth	Hall (OH)	Roukema

□ 1902

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 579, I was not recorded. I believe that I registered a "no" vote but it was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following that rollcall vote.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may have the Members' attention on the schedule, I think we have some information that would be helpful to everyone.

Mr. Chairman, we think we have time agreements on all the rest of the amendments that will take significant time, and we think that will take around two hours. We think we should roll all votes on this bill until all debate has ended so that there will only be one other series of votes at the conclusion of debate.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if this is agreeable, there will not be any votes, we estimate, for around two hours.

Members who have amendments should be prepared to offer them because there will not be any intervening votes to kill time.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, we intend to have on the legislative branch appropriations bill a unanimous-consent to appoint conferees after the last vote on the bill. We do not anticipate a vote to be called for on either side. If that is the case, then there would not be a vote, but that is the intent, to ask unanimous consent to appoint conferees, and we intend to go into conference tomorrow, tomorrow evening. We are assuming no one will call for a vote on that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, on today, Wednesday, July 26, during consideration of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996, I missed rollcall vote No. 577. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Are there further amendments to title II?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 43, line 2, strike "": "Provided, That" and all that follows through "grants" on line 10.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on