

Social Security lockbox that they talk about so much. As Democrats, we have said that we would protect Social Security. We have done that in our votes and we have shown that consistently. That is not the case with our friends on the other side of the aisle.

Let us take the case of the \$18 billion; \$18 billion of gimmicks. One of them, almost a third of that is the U.S. census which has been in existence since this Nation started. That is not an emergency. They have said we have \$18 billion in emergencies. These are not emergencies. They are gimmicks.

What we need to do is focus in this body on making sure we do not raid Social Security, we do not rely on gimmicks, and we be truthful with the American people.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 57, answered "present" 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]
YEAS—349

Abercrombie Capuano
Ackerman Cardin
Allen Carson
Andrews Castle
Archer Chabot
Army Chambliss
Bachus Chenoweth-Hage
Baker Clayton
Baldacci Clement
Baldwin Coble
Ballenger Collins
Barcia Combest
Barr Condit
Barrett (NE) Conyers
Barrett (WI) Cook
Bartlett Cooksey
Barton Coyne
Bass Cramer
Becerra Cubin
Bentsen Cummings
Bereuter Cunningham
Berkley Davis (FL)
Berman Davis (VA)
Berry Deal
Biggert DeGette
Bilirakis Delahunt
Bishop DeLauro
Blagojevich DeLay
Bliley DeMint
Blumenauer Deutsch
Blunt Diaz-Balart
Boehlert Dicks
Boehner Dingell
Bonilla Dixon
Bonior Doggett
Bono Dooley
Boswell Doolittle
Boucher Doyle
Boyd Dreier
Brady (TX) Duncan
Brown (FL) Edwards
Brown (OH) Ehlers
Bryant Ehrlich
Burr Emerson
Buyer Engel
Callahan Eshoo
Calvert Etheridge
Campbell Everett
Canady Ewing
Cannon Farr
Capps Fletcher

Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)

Aderholt
Baird
Billbray
Borski
Brady (PA)
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Costello
Crane
Crowley
DeFazio
Dickey
English
Evans
Filner
Ford
Gillmor
Green (TX)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—26

Bateman
Burton
Camp
Cox
Danner
Davis (IL)

Dunn
Fattah
Fossella
Fowler
Gutierrez
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Jefferson
Larson
Lewis (CA)
Oxley
Rush

Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano

NAYS—57
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Klink
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
McDermott
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Pallone
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Ramstad
Riley
Rogan
Sabo
Schaffer
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Udall (NM)
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Weller

Salmon
Sanders
Scarborough

Taylor (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner

Whitfield
Young (AK)

□ 1108

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 335 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 335

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 335 is a typical rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2670, the conference report for the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

House rules provide 1 hour of general debate divided equally between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and one motion to recommit with or without instructions, as is the right of the minority.

I want to discuss briefly the conference report that this rule makes in order. The conference report appropriates a total of \$37.8 billion for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Federal judiciary and 18 related agencies, and focuses on the enhancement of numerous crime enforcement and crime reduction initiatives.

First, I want to say that I am pleased that the bill provides \$3 billion for State and local law enforcement assistance so that local officials can successfully continue their efforts to fight crimes against our citizens. This provision is \$37 million more than last year, including \$287 million for juvenile crime and prevention programs; \$523

million for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program, which was terminated in the President's request; \$250 million for the Juvenile Accountability and Intensive Block Grant, which was also terminated in the President's request; \$686 million for Truth in Sentencing State Prison Grants, which the President also requested we terminate.

Conferees also provided \$552 million for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant program, which was \$92 million more than the President requested.

I am also pleased that the committee has provided \$3 billion in direct funding, a \$460 million increase over FY 1999, to enforce our immigration laws. The conferees have included funding for 1,000 new border patrol agents, increased detention of criminal and illegal aliens, and the continuation of naturalization backlog reduction and interior enforcement initiatives. The conference report also includes \$585 million to reimburse States for the incarceration of illegal aliens.

Finally, I want to point out the good work done by the committee in providing \$1.3 billion for the Drug Enforcement Administration to continue the fight against drugs in our neighborhoods. This \$70 million increase over last year indicates our commitment to win the war on drugs, and I commend the committee for this increase and funding enhancements to bolster this Nation's enforcement strategy and drug intelligence capabilities.

This rule was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules yesterday. I urge my colleagues to support the rule today on the floor so we may proceed with the general debate and consideration of this important conference report.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) for yielding me the time.

This rule waives all points of order against the consideration of the conference report on H.R. 2670. Though better than the original House version, the conference report falls very short. The President has not agreed to sign it. This bill slashes spending in the community-oriented policing program which helps local law enforcement agencies hire more police officers and reduce crime. It drops the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was included in the Senate version of the bill. This provision is aimed at reducing crimes motivated by hatred and bigotry.

Most disappointing to me is the requirement in the bill that United Nations arrearage payments are subject to an authorization. Our country must pay the back dues we owe to the United Nations. This funding is too important to hold it hostage to an authorization bill that might or might not ever pass.

□ 1115

The United Nations is running out of money at a time when demand is great-

er for its peace-keeping activities. We all know about the horrible tragedies in Kosovo and East Timor and Sierra Leone. In all of these cases, the U.N. played a critical role in reducing military conflict and saving lives. Failure to pay our dues will ultimately hamper the U.N.'s ability to maintain its role as a world peacekeeper. Lives are at stake.

I recently met with U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Richard Holbrooke. He has made payment of the U.S. debt to the U.N. one of his top priorities. Mr. Speaker, our integrity is at stake. The United States owes the money to the U.N.

Our ability to influence world decisions is at stake. Unless we pay our back dues, the United States will lose our vote in the General Assembly.

Our honor is at stake. Our position as a world leader will be diminished if we turn our back on the United Nations.

This is not a question of money. The money is already in the bill. The question is whether this Nation is going to stop playing games and pay our debt.

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of both the rule and the conference report, and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Atlanta, Georgia (Mr. LINDER), for yielding me the time.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for the superb job he has done in what is obviously a very difficult and challenging situation.

This bill is a very important measure as we look at a number of critical items that are out there for us to address.

First and foremost for me, as a Californian, I have got to say that the \$585 million that is included in here for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Plan, known as SCAAP, is very, very high on our priority list, because if we look at the problems of illegal immigration, which have been very great, the Federal Government has a responsibility to step up to the plate and meet those obligations. They should not be thrust onto the shoulders of State and local taxpayers.

The other issue that is very key is that of international trade. Also as a Californian, I have got to say that our State is the gateway to the Pacific Rim and Latin America. Within this bill are very important items dealing with the facilitation of international trade, creating new exports for new markets for U.S. products and services.

We have just gotten the report this morning of the strengthening of economies in the Pacific Rim; and through

that, they have been able to purchase more U.S. goods and services. We need to do what we can to facilitate that, and that is done in this bill.

Also, another issue that is of very great importance to me and for us nationally in looking at situations that exist around the world, back in 1985, Ronald Reagan envisioned the establishment of the National Endowment for Democracy. It was to say that simply dealing with weapons systems was not going to bring about freedom and political pluralism. We had to put into place the infrastructure, the institutions that are necessary for political pluralism to succeed. In fact, this bill does just that.

The National Endowment for Democracy has had great success all over the world. One of the countries we spend a great deal of time talking about happens to be the problems that exist in the People's Republic of China.

One of the core groups within the National Endowment for Democracy is the International Republican Institute. Last night, there was a very important freedom dinner that was held. I will say that I serve on the board of that organization, and we have participated in 50 village elections since 1994 in the People's Republic of China. We have been encouraging non-Communist candidates there. We have had success at letting people see for the first time that they can participate in those kinds of political organizations. So this is a very important measure. It deserves our support.

The rule is a very fair and standard rule for consideration of this sort of conference report, and I hope my colleagues will support both.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who is the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the two gentlemen who will handle this bill shortly are both good legislators, and I regard them both as good friends of mine. I think that they are bringing a conference bill back to the House which is a far better bill than the one that left the House. I wish I could vote for it, but I cannot. I would like to explain the five reasons that require me to vote "No."

First of all, there is not nearly enough money in this bill for the President's top anticrime priority, the Cops on the Street bill. I know that the majority will cite various marginally or unrelated programs to try to pump up artificially the impression that they have put a lot of money in this bill for cops, but the hard reality is that, out of \$1.275 billion, that is, 1 billion 275 million dollars, that the President has asked for this program in new money, he is only getting \$325 million. That is not enough. He is also not getting the funds he asked for for community prosecutors.

Second reason, this bill, in a sense, has walked into an accident that started out to happen to somebody else.

This bill tries to fund a lot of worthwhile programs, but it does so with some pretty incredible gimmicks.

Example, we have to do a census under the Constitution every 10 years. This bill avoids counting \$4 billion in spending under the budget ceiling by designating the census funding as being emergency spending. I guess we did not know that the clock was going to tick and that we were going to run into another 10-year census requirement.

There are other gimmicks. We have delayed obligations for the crime victims' fund. We have budget authority which seems to have materialized out of authority. It has really been pulled out from other bills, including Foreign Operations and Labor, Health and Social Services, I suppose, which makes it more difficult to meet those obligations.

Thirdly, this bill waives the Endangered Species Act in the case of the controversy involving Alaska salmon. I find that a quaint provision to be in this bill, and I think persons interested in that issue will be startled to find it here.

Fourth, this bill resurrects an old debate that was on the Treasury, Post Office appropriation bill. It resurrects an old provision that limits the contraceptive services available to Federal employees in order to try to mollify a Member who was unhappy with the result of the conference on the Treasury, Post Office bill. That has no business on this bill, and I think it will cause considerable controversy because it is attached.

Fifth, I would ask my colleagues one question: What do the following six countries have in common, Burundi, Somalia, Iraq, Haiti, Dominica, and the United States of America? The answer is, thanks to this bill, they will all lose their vote in the United Nations.

The other five countries have already lost their vote. The United States will lose its vote because, while it appropriates the funds that are necessary to pay our back-due bills at the United Nations, it does not give the authorization to spend those funds until other legislative decisions are made. As we well know, those decisions have been hung up for 2 years.

So we have the continued spectacle of a majority party which has an obligation to govern in conjunction with the President, instead, throwing roadblocks in his way when it comes to foreign policy. The same party that blew up the Test Ban Treaty last week, the same party whose leader in the other body, or deputy leader, who told the President, standing 6 feet away from him in the White House, that we had no business engaging in military action against Mr. Milosevic. Then after we had a successful conclusion in that operation, he then went to the press and attacked the President for agreeing to a settlement that left Mr. Milosevic in power. Now, that is the fastest U-turn I have seen in my life in this place.

The same party that held up our contributions to the International Mone-

tary Fund at a time we desperately needed to try to stabilize the currency situation in Asia last year in order to protect our own economy. That same party is now saying that we are going to continue to withhold our funds from the United Nations because of an unrelated dispute with the President. That to me is illegitimate, and those are the reasons why this bill is going nowhere. When it leaves here, this bill will be vetoed by the President. When it is vetoed, it will be sustained.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding this time. I want to take a couple of minutes only at this point in the debate. I will reserve my main argument until we get to the bill itself.

But I wanted to correct a couple of statements that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has just made. In the COPS program, one of the sticking points, admittedly, with the administration, the House-passed bill contained \$268 million. We agreed to the Senate version, which is \$325 million. But on top of that, we freed up another \$250 million in carryover funds that were not being spent last year into the COPS program. On top of that, we then added an additional \$150 million which the administration requested in the COPS technology program. We funded that under the COPS program.

So lo and behold, all of a sudden, in the COPS program, there is not the \$325 million the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just said there was. There is \$725 million.

We have gone a long way toward meeting the administration's problem with this bill. We have gone more than halfway. I would hope that the administration and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) would compliment us for that and, in fact, would quit this rampage against this and all other spending bills, and realize there is an effort here to try to meet them halfway and be reasonable.

We are trying to be fair with them. When we offer them fairness, they come back with this tirade. I do not understand that kind of business.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) on the subcommittee, my ranking Democrat, has been perfectly capable in working with us. He has worked in a bipartisan, nonpartisan way, as have we. With reward for that, what we get from the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is a tirade. I do not work that way. We have tried to go more than halfway on the COPS program, and we have.

Now, all the appropriators can do, speaking of U.N. arrears, all we can do is provide money. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) knows that above anybody. He is ranking on the full committee. We have laid the money on the table, every single penny that it would take to pay off our arrears at

the U.N. We all want to do that. We laid the money on the table. We are not the authorizing committee.

What is the Committee on International Relations of the House? It is the authorizing committee. We said, here is the money. Pass an authorization bill, and it will be paid. All we can do is offer the money. We have done that. Every single penny to pay the U.N. arrears is laying on the table. All they have to do is reach down, pick it up and pay that bill, and it is all over with.

In addition, we have provided every single penny for our current dues to the U.N. It is laying there ready to be paid when the President signs the bill.

□ 1130

All he has to do is sign this bill. We will pay the U.N. current assessment, and we will pay the arrears. The President, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) should recommend it to him; he can sign the bill. The money is laying there. All he has to do is reach down and pick it up. No worries about the votes in the U.N., no worries about current assessments. All is at peace with the world. Just pick it up and take it and pay the bills.

So I find it strange, I find it partisanly strange, that the gentleman from Wisconsin takes the floor in a tirade against a bill that we have gone so far in being fair in addressing the concerns of the White House. And if the bill is vetoed, I assure the gentleman this bill will come back in a much different form.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to respond.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply say if the gentleman from Kentucky thinks I launched a tirade against this bill, he has not seen me when I am in a tirade mode.

Let me simply say that what the gentleman has just said is incorrect. He says all we can do is provide the money. It is not the money that is holding this up. The committee has put in the money and then it has refused to waive the requirements for authorization, although it has provided waivers for many other authorization requirements in the bill. That is number one point of inconsistency.

The second point of inconsistency is simply that then, contrary to what the gentleman said, his own committee has gone beyond the authorization and interposed additional conditions of its own which must be met for the release of those funds, conditions which the gentleman well knows cannot be met, in part because Congress was so obstructive on this matter last year and prevented the United Nations from taking the actions necessary to free up the money.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) has 20 minutes remaining,

and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about one very positive element in this underlying bill, and I support the rule and the underlying bill and would like to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from New York for their efforts on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on the night of September 7 in Pasco, Washington, tragedy struck when a Washington State Patrol Officer, James Saunders, was shot and killed in the line of duty while making a routine traffic stop. The suspect in the shooting was an illegal alien who had a history of criminal convictions in this country. In fact, the suspect had been deported three different times by the U.S. Border Patrol and was detained once again this year on a cocaine charge. However, instead of remaining in jail under detention, he was allowed to post bail and was released. This tragic mistake cost Trooper Saunders his life.

How could this criminal be set free? The details of his release are still coming to light; but unfortunately, it appears that the border patrol officer who had detained the suspect in the past was transferred to Arizona and unable to identify the suspect and place him in immigration detention. We must ensure that these ill-conceived transfers of agents that needlessly remove knowledgeable agents from a post for extended periods of time do not continue. It is time to stop robbing Peter to pay Paul in our border enforcement strategy.

Just 1 week before the tragic death of Trooper Saunders, I joined my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), in a letter to INS Commissioner Doris Meissner stating our disappointment that she had reinstated these inappropriate transfers from the northern border to the southern border. As a result of these transfers, our northern border is understaffed, leading to decreased enforcement. I am deeply saddened and outraged that our concerns were proved true by the killing of Trooper Saunders.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in this legislation nor anything that this House considers can bring back Trooper Saunders or help his pregnant wife and 2-year-old daughter come to terms expressing his unnecessary death; but we can ensure that the border patrol is given adequate manpower and resources to keep illegal aliens locked up until deporta-

tion and ensure that, once deported, these illegal aliens do not reenter the United States.

The underlying legislation goes a long way towards ensuring this goal. The fiscal year 2000 conference report contains funding for 1,000 new border patrol agents and increases detention for criminal and illegal aliens. I urge the committee to ensure that this year the INS goes forward with the mandate to strengthen our border patrol by hiring those officers as soon as possible. We must do everything possible to hopefully spare another community the senseless tragedy the family of Trooper Saunders and the local citizens must now endure.

Once again I congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for an excellent piece of legislation and urge support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address an issue of critical importance to our Nation, the upcoming decennial census of the population of the U.S., a constitutionally mandated activity, which will be the largest peace-time mobilization ever undertaken by our Nation.

The administration requested \$4.5 billion this fiscal year in order to count everyone in our country. The conference report before us today contains all but about \$11 million of that request, and I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for their hard work with the other body in providing the necessary funds.

I also commend the chairman in that this bill contains none of the onerous, contentious language prohibiting the use of modern statistical methods which has been in previous CJS conference reports. While this report still designates the funding for the 2000 census as emergency funding, if all the funding was not there, then it truly would be an emergency. So I am glad the funding is there, whatever the designation.

However, a number of important problems remain. First and foremost is the language in the conference report regarding frameworks which would require the Census Bureau to go through a long and complex process before shifting money from one activity in the decennial census to another, for example, for spending money on census takers or additional computers.

Such congressional micromanagement is unprecedented in the decennial census. A programming request could take months. In fact, the most recent request in the Commerce Department took 7 months. But the 2000 census cannot possibly operate under that kind of framework. The census is a massive undertaking which must be completed on an extremely tight time frame. A Con-

gress of 535 Members cannot possibly make the decisions necessary or quickly enough to cover the unpredictable events which might occur.

In conclusion, this restrictive language must be removed, and, hopefully, the President will remove this language when he vetoes this bill. I call upon my colleagues to vote against the bill for the funding for the U.N. and the cops on our streets.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for the purpose of a response.

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

If the gentlewoman would hear me. The gentlewoman is concerned about the earmarked monies by category in the census appropriations. The gentlewoman would understand that is what we do in every agency. That is a routine practice of the Congress, when the gentlewoman was in the majority and as well here. We are an oversight committee. That is done in every single agency that we have.

I talked to the Director of the Census a few days ago about, he was concerned, and I assured him that that is an oversight matter that the Congress does in every agency that we fund, and that if he needed to reprogram monies from one account to the other, we can do it in a matter of hours, really, days at most. It just requires the signature of myself and my counterpart in the Senate.

We want to see a good count. We have not insisted on a banning sampling. All the money is there. We will reprogram the monies as necessary during the year. We do it routinely in other agencies, dozens of requests come to our desk to reprogram funds. That is not a problem, and I think the director understands that.

I would hope the gentlewoman would not vote against the conference report on that account because that is a routine practice of the Congress.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. The Director of the Census, Dr. Prewitt, is very concerned about this restrictive language. The framework language was in report language before; now it has been legislated, which is more restrictive.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker. As I said, I talked to the director a few days ago. I think we resolved that problem. Perhaps the gentlewoman needs to talk to him now.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's attention to this matter. When the President vetoes this bill, I hope the gentleman will accept the language that will remove the framework restrictive language on the census from

the report, but I appreciate the gentleman's other efforts.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time, and I rise to emphasize the point my colleague from New York has just made. I do so in gratitude to the gentleman from Kentucky, whose efforts have been to make sure the census is fully funded in a way that will allow for timely execution on the very tight timetables that remain between now and its conclusion next year. I want to thank him for his concern.

Mr. Speaker, I just simply would like to add to what the gentlewoman from New York said by quoting from a letter from the Director of the Census when he says, "Congressional approval in the form of a reprogramming would be required for any movement of funds between decennial program components. This is a dramatic departure from past practices and takes place at precisely the time when Census 2000 activities peak, when the need for program flexibility is most crucial. If the need to obtain congressional approval significantly delays the transfer of funds, Census 2000 operations could be compromised."

I lived through the 1990 census. We went through a time when the economy was far more fragile than it is today. The difficulty in recruiting and retaining sufficient numbers of adequately prepared workers in differential ways across the country was an enormous problem. At that time it required actual additional enactments of authorizing legislation to permit the Bureau the flexibility in order to respond to that. If they do not have that kind of flexibility, which was initially built into the plans for this census, then I am concerned that the problem that was significant 10 years ago will be multiplied many, many times because of the vast differences in unemployment rates across the United States.

So I would only ask that the gentleman from Kentucky, as we revisit this language in coming weeks, would consider that and find alternative ways to develop more controls.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio would stay at the microphone, I will try to respond.

The frameworks that the gentleman is talking about, where we have placed specific amounts of monies in each framework, one of those frameworks is \$3.5 billion. The Congress, as the gentleman well knows, exercises oversight through the Committee on Appropriations of every agency that we fund, including the Census Bureau. And I think

that is the duty to the taxpayers that we owe to oversee these agencies, particularly one with the leeway to spend \$3.5 billion with no accounting to the Congress. The reason it is in bill language is because in the past, with report language, they simply ignored the Congress. We simply cannot let that happen again.

Now, I will say this to the gentleman. If the Director of the Census Bureau, during the course of the year, needs to reprogram monies from one account to the other through the reprogramming process, it only requires the signature of the chairman of the House subcommittee, myself, and my counterpart in the Senate. I assured the director and I assure the gentleman that if that reprogramming request is in order and is legitimate and needed, he will have the approval within 72 hours, maximum, of the time he requests it.

There will be no huge delays. There will be no harassment. There will be no intimidation or anything of that sort. But there will be some oversight. I think the gentleman, as a Member of this body, would want the Congress to exercise oversight over every agency that we fund of the executive branch, because that is our duty under the Constitution.

□ 1145

I would hope the gentleman would recognize that that is necessary in this respect.

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

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his assurances. I have no reason to doubt his good faith. The way in which he has brought the initial funding for the census to this floor reflects that good faith.

I simply hope that, in coming weeks, we will pay close attention and that they will have the opportunity to go back and forth, as they have, with the census director so that we can make sure we get this language right.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I shall stay in touch with the Census Bureau Director, and we will respond to his legitimate need.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge the bipartisan work of the ranking member and chairman of this committee. I appreciate their attempt to work together.

I am, unfortunately, opposing this bill on several accounts. Because of the brevity of the time, let me just cite the

short funding, if you will, \$300 million plus, to the President's \$1 billion request for "Cops on the Beat."

It is evident that in the last 24 to 48 hours, with the reports coming out on the decrease in crime, that the "Cops on the Beat" had to be a very vital aspect of that even in my own home community. In the Montrose area, the 18th Congressional District, they note that they have been able to have a neighborhood police station because of "Cops on the Beat."

What a tragedy. How long are we going to say to the world, we want to be a player but we refuse to pay our debt and our responsibility in the United Nations?

As much as we may critique the United Nations, it is a world forum for discussions that help to alleviate the various wars and breakouts that we would have if we had not had the United Nations. What a shame on us.

Additionally, the hate crimes bill, I am absolutely shocked that we could not get the hate crimes legislation added. The Senate passed it. It is the right thing to do. It is a statement on behalf of the American public that we abhor hateful acts and violent acts against individuals.

Then I would like to just lastly focus on, as a member of the authorizing committee for the INS, my concern about the distribution of funds in the separate agencies, giving \$900 million to enforcement but yet \$500 million only to the citizen activities.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and myself and others were in Chicago just a few weeks ago hearing the crying of so many individuals who are appalled at the long wait and long lines of getting processed the legal way. If we want to promote legal immigration, then we need to do it the legal way.

A thousand border patrol agents what the INS told us, we cannot recruit. We do not have enough individuals out there. With the thousand border patrol agents, let me say that all of us had pain in our hearts with the Resendez-Ramirez situation. I come from Texas. But the INS has indicated that it is very difficult to recruit at these salary levels.

Although I appreciate the recruitment incentives, the recruitment agency, the bonus incentives, I do question whether or not we could have considered raising the GS level of the hiring individuals and whether or not we should have done it in that way.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) would be happy to hear that we funded every single penny the administration requested for the services in the INS. Every penny they wanted, they got.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it may

be that the administration does not realize the great need out there. I appreciate the funding of what the administration has required.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will continue to yield, I cannot argue with the characterization of the gentlewoman.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, but I am out in the field and I see the pain of the people who are waiting in line.

I would simply say that there are things that we could have done a little better, Mr. Speaker, on the INS funding. I hope we can fix the INS as everyone else can.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and the conference report for the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations.

This bill is a testament to the leadership and the dedication of the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and of the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) of the full Committee on Appropriations. It is a shining example of the commitment and cooperative spirit between the majority and the minority, who worked diligently to bring before us a bill which effectively addresses recent developments and ensuing concerns by providing the necessary funding for three important agencies of our U.S. Government.

This bill provides a total of \$18.4 billion for the Department of Justice. It restores key programs. It funds increases to maintain current operating levels of critical law enforcement agencies and increases funding for State and local law enforcement by actually \$1.4 billion over the President's request. It provides \$3.5 billion more than fiscal year 1999 to the Department of Commerce and to the Census Department.

This bill before us addresses the threats also posed to our overseas facilities and to our brave men and women in diplomatic and counselor corps by including \$568 million for the reconstruction and strengthening of our posts overseas.

These worldwide security improvements and replacements of vulnerable embassies started in fiscal year 1999 with emergency funding and will continue thanks to the foresight and leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the members of that subcommittee.

Lastly, this bill ensures that our concerns worldwide will be met. It is a just and balanced bill which merits our full support. I am proud to be voting in favor of the rule and the conference report this afternoon.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the underlying conference report on the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill.

I oppose this bill because it drastically cuts one of our most important crime prevention programs we have today, the COPS program. Since its creation in 1994, the COPS program has awarded over \$6 billion in grants to law enforcement agencies nationwide. And in May of this year, the program has funded its 100,000th police officer, a year and a half ahead of schedule and \$2.5 billion below the authorized funding.

These officers work with the communities to fight crime in our cities, our suburbs, and even in the vast rural district of my northern Michigan district.

The COPS program not only adds these officers to the front line to fight crime, it funds important community prosecution, crime prevention, and law enforcement technology initiatives. These programs are crucial to ensuring that our families live in a safe community.

Crime rates have been falling over the last several consecutive years, and we cannot now rest on our laurels. We need to build on the success of the COPS program. And it is successful.

Local law enforcement officials from all over the country will tell us that the COPS program is critically important to their ability to reduce crime. The COPS program works well, and that is why it is supported by every major law enforcement organization in the United States, the United States Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Governors' Association.

The President, who recognizes the importance of this community policing program in reducing crime, has requested \$1.3 billion for the COPS program. Instead, unfortunately, the conference committee does not meet the President's request in the need of law enforcement, especially in the COPS in School program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores our communities' urgent call for more police officers in the streets and in our schools to fight crime and violence.

I will vote in favor of safe communities and against the majority's attempt to roll back our successful battle against crime. Vote against the bill and the rule.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) realizes that the bill contains \$725 million for programs which the President has requested in COPS. The authorized level is only \$268 million. We are funding it at \$500 million more than the authorization level.

In fact, the \$325 million that we agreed to with the Senate was the amount that Senator BIDEN had asked for on the Senate side, and the Senate approved that, and we agreed to that.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I may, to answer the question of the gentleman. The President's request was \$1.3 billion. And I agree, they did put in 725. That is about half of it.

The COPS program is more than just police officers. It is COPS in School, it is the Youth Firearms Violence Initiative, community policing to combat domestic violence, anti-gang initiative.

Those programs have not been adequately funded to meet the President's request. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on that issue. I wish we had more funding for it.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of response, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

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

What we did on COPS, if the gentleman would like to hear this, we agreed to the amount that Senator BIDEN on the Senate side, a Democrat, asked for. Plus we added on top of that \$250 million in carry-over funds which were not being spent. On top of that, we also agreed to \$150 million more for the COPS program for the technology portion the Administration requested under the COPS program. For a total of \$725 million.

That is twice what Senator BIDEN on the Senate side asked for, and it is almost \$500 million more than the authorization by law that exists in the Congress.

Now, on top of that, we also provided \$523 million for the local law enforcement block grant, which I am sure the gentleman would want his local police to be able to get at. They do not have to go through a bureaucracy at the State level or the regional level to get those dollars, and they do not have to pay a local match. It is 100 percent money that we will give to their local police.

They can use it for bulletproof vests. They can use it for police radios. They can use it for salaries if they want, firearms, bullets, whatever they want. It is not restricted like the COPS program is.

So what I am saying to the gentleman is, there is \$725 million in the COPS program. There is \$523 million in the local law enforcement block grant program. That brings us to \$1.3 billion, which is what the administration requested.

Mr. Speaker, what is their problem? We have provided tons and tons of money for the COPS and associated programs, not to mention the Byrne Grant program for local law enforcement funded at \$552 million and the State Truth-in-Sentencing Grant funded at \$686 million. There is the Juvenile Justice programs funded at \$28.7 million. There is the School Violence

Program funded at \$225 million. There is Violence Against Women Act monies funded at \$28.4 million. There is \$40 million for the Weed and Seed program. And I could go on.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, those programs that the gentleman mentioned are good programs, and they have been funded in the past. Our quarrel here, our dispute is that we want them all funded to the level requested by the President, not what Senator BIDEN said, but what the President requested.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, do I understand the gentleman to say that we are not spending enough money out of the Social Security Trust Fund?

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, do not use red herring program. We are talking about the COPS program here. Let us stick to the COPS program that we are talking about. To throw in Social Security is disingenuous to their side and to the senior citizens back home.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, does the gentleman realize that the President's request was for zero dollars for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant which funds your local law enforcement agencies, sheriff's offices, and police departments? The President's request was zero.

Now, yes, we did include money there, \$523 million. But I think we could count that toward the COPS total, which would get us up to the total of \$1.3 billion, which was the President's request.

I think the bill is absolutely fair, more than fair, even in getting monies to their local law enforcement agencies. I would argue with anybody who says we were not generous, overly generous, more than the Administration's request, in fact, for their local law enforcement agencies.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I have 15 pages of grants in COPS and equipment that have been given to the First Congressional District in Michigan. And, therefore, whether they are the First Congressional District in Michigan or Kentucky or wherever, under the totality of funding for the COPS program, they would be satisfying their local law enforcement needs.

□ 1200

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do also rise in strong opposition to the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations conference report.

I too believe that the very successful Community Oriented Policing Service program, familiarly known as COPS, which has been reduced has been a program that has allowed for the reduction of crime in this country. And I believe that the President is right to say that this is one of the three main reasons why he will veto the bill.

A second major problem with this bill is the repeated denial by the majority of the United Nations debt which makes us an embarrassing deadbeat country in the international community. The list of nations that have lost their vote in the United Nations General Assembly for failure to pay dues is largely a list of small, war-torn nations such as Sierra Leone, Bosnia and Iraq. It is shameful that the United States would stiff the United Nations. I certainly hope that we do not lose our vote.

Another major flaw of this bill is that it fails to respond adequately to the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes and freezes funding for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The horrendous murders of Mr. James BYRD in Jasper, Texas and Mr. Matthew Shepard in Wyoming are just two instances of crimes for which we should have zero tolerance. The gutting of this portion of this bill is a strong indication of the lack of commitment to move against hate crimes by the majority.

For all of these reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote against H.R. 2670.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill and to express my dismay at the bill that fails to fully fund the COPS program, the community policing program.

Since Congress authorized the COPS program in 1994, the Justice Department has kept its promise by disbursing grants to hire 100,000 community police officers ahead of schedule and under budget. The COPS program has successfully put police officers in over 11,000 police departments and sheriff's offices. Fifty thousand officers are on the street and working in the communities to reduce crime today, and our streets are safer than ever. It is a program that works. It gives communities the ability to employ local solutions to fighting crime.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked to a lot of sheriffs and police chiefs in my district. They tell me this is the one program that has done more than any other program they have received from the Federal Government to deter crime, to work with the community, to have the community involved in helping to reduce crime.

Mr. Speaker, American communities are safer than they have ever been and COPS is one of the reasons why. Last July, 67 of my colleagues signed a letter with me asking the appropriators for full funding of this program. But

most importantly, my local police support COPS, my county officials support COPS, my school districts support COPS, my neighbors support COPS, and so do I.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members to vote against this bill. It is a bill that the President will not sign. It does not address the priorities that the American people care about. And it betrays the words of the Republican leadership last night that they are interested in finding a sensible compromise to the budget mess in which we find ourselves.

There was an important statement made by the President last night, and I believe agreed to by the Republican leadership, and that is that we are not going to approach this budget on a micro basis but we are going to look at it on a macro basis. This concession by the leadership is critical to our ability ultimately to achieve a successful outcome on the budget in the days ahead. We can no longer engage in a process of dealing with the appropriations bills one at a time because there are several other important issues that this Congress wants to address this year, minimum wage, Medicare buybacks, and tax extenders. We have to deal with the remaining bills in this context if we want to reach an agreement on the budget.

The fact that we are voting on the Commerce, Justice, State bill today shows that Republicans are not keeping this agreement. The Republicans cannot see the forest for the trees. And the President has said no more signing of the trees until we see the forest.

Unless we sit down and negotiate the whole picture, we are not going to pass any of these bills. We should not even be voting on this bill if we are serious about looking at the entire picture. Clearly, the Republicans still are not serious about negotiating with the President 3 weeks into fiscal year 2000, and we should not be voting on this bill if Republicans are serious about not dipping into the Social Security surplus. The CBO says that Republicans have already spent \$13 billion of the surplus and are on their way to spending \$24 billion. This bill is just going to make things worse because the spending is not paid for and will come right out of the Social Security surplus.

Apart from the simple futility of even considering this bill, I am compelled to point out how this is a bad bill that shortchanges our priorities. First, the bill fails to build on the success of the last several years in putting additional police on the streets and in our neighborhoods. We have seen a 7-year consecutive decline in violent crime. Why would we want to reverse that now? The Republican plan is a retreat and it is unacceptable.

Second, it is not surprising the bill fails to live up to our obligations to the United Nations. The Republican Party used to be the party of George Bush, willing to make difficult choices to uphold our role in the world. Now, even though Pat Buchanan says he is leaving the Republican Party, Buchananism remains. This is a neo-isolationist view that is hurting our strength and our prestige abroad. They do not care about stopping nuclear proliferation to developing countries. They are willing to put politics above doing the right thing as we saw in the Senate for the test ban vote.

Finally, on hate crimes. We continue to see these horrendous crimes, but for the second year in a row Republican leaders stand in the way of taking strong action to combat this violence. It is an outrage that the hate crimes provision was left out of this bill once again. Republicans continue to listen to the far right on this issue instead of doing what is decent and right.

If we keep rolling out these bills that are dead on arrival before the vote is taken, we will not find any solution to the overall budget problem anytime soon. If we insist on rolling out phony bills filled with gimmicks and waist-deep into Social Security, we will be here at Thanksgiving and maybe even Christmas.

This is another Republican tree. Knock it down. Vote it down. Let us get back to the real negotiations to settle the budget, not phony votes which spend time and accomplish nothing and set us further back from finding the solution to this problem that the American people sent us here to find.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say simply that I will be calling for two votes, on the previous question and on the rule. It is not so much that we are against the rule, but we are against the bill itself and the conference committee for a number of reasons that have been mentioned here, because of the lack of having hate crime legislation, because of not fulfilling what we think is important in the COPS program and mainly in my opinion for not including U.N. arrears. I think for us to lose the chance, to lose our vote in the U.N. would be an absolute embarrassment and it would be a shame. We are coming very close to the edge right now. We are riding that precipice. I think it really fits this tremendous saying that Evanberg said once, "All it takes for evil to prevail is for good people to do nothing." And evil will prevail in this world because this is the kind of world that we live in. And if we do not fund the kinds of programs that are important in the U.N., we allow evil to prevail.

Mr. Speaker I urge that we vote against this conference report. We will be calling for a couple of votes, on the previous question and on the rule.

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

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

At the risk of sounding remedial, I would like to point out to my friend from Ohio that he will have ample opportunity to vote against the bill when the bill comes up. It is not going to be any more defeated by calling for two additional votes.

I encourage my colleagues to come to the floor and vote "yes" on the previous question, "yes" on the rule and then give them the opportunity to debate the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 204, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]
YEAS—221

Aderholt	Cunningham	Herger
Archer	Davis (VA)	Hill (MT)
Armey	Deal	Hilleary
Bachus	DeLay	Hobson
Baker	DeMint	Hoekstra
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Horn
Barr	Dickey	Hostettler
Barrett (NE)	Doolittle	Houghton
Bartlett	Dreier	Hulshof
Barton	Duncan	Hunter
Bass	Dunn	Hutchinson
Bateman	Ehlers	Hyde
Bereuter	Ehrlich	Isakson
Biggett	Emerson	Istook
Biglray	English	Jenkins
Bilirakis	Everett	Johnson (CT)
Bliley	Ewing	Johnson, Sam
Blunt	Fletcher	Jones (NC)
Boehmert	Foley	Kasich
Boehner	Fossella	Kelly
Bonilla	Fowler	King (NY)
Bono	Franks (NJ)	Kingston
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Bryant	Gallegly	Kolbe
Burr	Ganske	Kuykendall
Burton	Gekas	LaHood
Buyer	Gibbons	Largent
Callahan	Gilchrest	Latham
Calvert	Gillmor	LaTourette
Campbell	Gilman	Lazio
Canady	Goode	Leach
Cannon	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goodling	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Goss	Linder
Chambliss	Graham	LoBiondo
Chenoweth-Hage	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Coble	Green (WI)	Manzullo
Coburn	Greenwood	McCollum
Collins	Gutknecht	McCrery
Combest	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Cook	Hansen	McInnis
Cooksey	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Cox	Hayes	McKeon
Crane	Hayworth	Metcalf
Cubin	Hefley	Mica

Miller (FL)	Rogan	Sununu
Miller, Gary	Rogers	Sweeney
Moran (KS)	Rohrabacher	Talent
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Tancredo
Myrick	Roukema	Tauzin
Nethercutt	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Ney	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Northup	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Norwood	Salmon	Thornberry
Nussle	Sanford	Thune
Ose	Saxton	Tiahrt
Oxley	Schaffer	Toomey
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Traficant
Paul	Sessions	Upton
Pease	Shadegg	Vitter
Peterson (PA)	Shaw	Walden
Petri	Shays	Wamp
Pickering	Sherwood	Watkins
Pitts	Shimkus	Watts (OK)
Pombo	Shuster	Weldon (FL)
Porter	Simpson	Weldon (PA)
Portman	Skeen	Weller
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Quinn	Smith (NJ)	Wicker
Radanovich	Smith (TX)	Wilson
Ramstad	Souder	Wolf
Regula	Spence	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Stearns	Young (FL)
Riley	Stump	

NAYS—204

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Murtha
Ackerman	Gordon	Nadler
Allen	Green (TX)	Napolitano
Andrews	Hall (OH)	Neal
Baird	Hastings (FL)	Oberstar
Baldacci	Hill (IN)	Obey
Baldwin	Hilliard	Olver
Barcia	Hinches	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hinojosa	Owens
Becerra	Hoefel	Pallone
Bentsen	Holden	Pascarell
Berkley	Holt	Pastor
Berman	Hoolley	Payne
Berry	Hoyer	Pelosi
Bishop	Insee	Peterson (MN)
Blagojevich	Jackson (IL)	Phelps
Blumenauer	Jackson-Lee	Pickett
Bonior	(TX)	Pomeroy
Borski	John	Price (NC)
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Boucher	Jones (OH)	Rangel
Boyd	Kanjorski	Reyes
Brady (PA)	Kaptur	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Kennedy	Rodriguez
Brown (OH)	Kildee	Roemer
Capps	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Capuano	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Cardin	Kleczka	Sabo
Carson	Klink	Sanchez
Clay	Kucinich	Sanders
Clayton	LaFalce	Sandlin
Clement	Lampson	Sawyer
Clyburn	Lantos	Schakowsky
Condit	Larson	Scott
Conyers	Lee	Serrano
Costello	Levin	Sherman
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Shows
Cramer	Lipinski	Sisisky
Crowley	Loftgren	Skelton
Cummings	Lowe	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lucas (KY)	Smith (WA)
Davis (IL)	Luther	Snyder
DeFazio	Maloney (CT)	Spratt
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Stabenow
Delahunt	Markey	Stark
DeLauro	Martinez	Stenholm
Deutsch	Mascara	Strickland
Dicks	Matsui	Stupak
Dingell	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Dixon	McCarthy (NY)	Tauscher
Doggett	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Dooley	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Doyle	McIntyre	Thompson (MS)
Edwards	McKinney	Thurman
Engel	McNulty	Tierney
Eshoo	Meehan	Towns
Etheridge	Meek (FL)	Turner
Evans	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Farr	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Fattah	Millender	Velazquez
Filner	McDonald	Vento
Forbes	Miller, George	Visclosky
Ford	Minge	Waters
Frank (MA)	Mink	Watt (NC)
Frost	Moakley	Waxman
Gejdenson	Moore	Weiner
Gephardt	Moran (VA)	

Wexler Wise Wu
Weygand Woolsey Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Camp Jefferson Scarborough
Danner Mollohan Walsh
Gutierrez Rush

□ 1232

Messrs. KLECZKA, HINOJOSA, GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. LOWEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BE-REUTER). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 204, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—221

Aderholt Emerson LaHood
Archer English Largent
Army Everett Latham
Bachus Ewing LaTourette
Baker Fletcher Lazio
Ballenger Foley Leach
Barr Fossella Lewis (CA)
Barrett (NE) Fowler Lewis (KY)
Bartlett Franks (NJ) Linder
Barton Frelinghuysen LoBiondo
Bass Gallegly Lucas (OK)
Bateman Ganske Manzullo
Bereuter Gekas McCollum
Biggart Gibbons McCreery
Bilbray Gilchrist McHugh
Bilirakis Gillmor McInnis
Bliley Gilman McIntosh
Blunt Goode McKeon
Boehlert Goodlatte Metcalf
Boehner Goodling Mica
Bonilla Goss Miller (FL)
Bono Graham Miller, Gary
Brady (TX) Granger Moran (KS)
Bryant Green (WI) Morella
Burr Greenwood Myrick
Burton Gutknecht Nethercutt
Buyer Hall (OH) Ney
Callahan Hall (TX) Northup
Calvert Hansen Norwood
Campbell Hastings (WA) Nussle
Canady Hayes Ose
Cannon Hayworth Oxley
Castle Hefley Packard
Chabot Herger Paul
Chambliss Hill (MT) Pease
Chenoweth-Hage Hilleary Peterson (PA)
Coble Hobson Petri
Coburn Hoekstra Pickering
Collins Horn Pitts
Combest Hostettler Pombo
Cook Houghton Porter
Cooksey Hulshof Portman
Cox Hunter Pryce (OH)
Crane Hutchinson Quinn
Cubin Hyde Radanovich
Cunningham Isakson Ramstad
Davis (VA) Istook Regula
Deal Jenkins Reynolds
DeLay Johnson (CT) Riley
DeMint Johnson, Sam Rogan
Diaz-Balart Jones (NC) Rogers
Dickey Kasich Rohrabacher
Doolittle Kelly Ros-Lehtinen
Dreier King (NY) Roukema
Duncan Kingston Royce
Dunn Knollenberg Ryan (WI)
Ehlers Kolbe Ryun (KS)
Ehrlich Kuykendall Salmon

Sanford Souder Traficant
Saxton Spence Upton
Schaffer Stearns Vitter
Sensenbrenner Stump Walden
Sessions Sununu Wamp
Shadegg Sweeney Watts (OK)
Shaw Talent Weldon (FL)
Shays Tancredo Weldon (PA)
Sherwood Tauzin Weller
Shimkus Taylor (NC) Whitfield
Shuster Terry Wicker
Simpson Thomas Wilson
Skeen Thornberry Wolf
Smith (MI) Thune Young (AK)
Smith (NJ) Tiahrt Young (FL)
Smith (TX) Toomey

NOES—204

Abercrombie Gordon Oberstar
Ackerman Green (TX) Obey
Allen Hastings (FL) Olver
Andrews Hill (IN) Ortiz
Baird Hilliard Owens
Baldacci Hinchey Pallone
Baldwin Hinojosa Pascrell
Barcia Hoeffel Pastore
Barrett (WI) Holden Payne
Becerra Holt Pelosi
Bentsen Hooley Peterson (MN)
Berkley Hoyer Phelps
Berman Inslee Pickett
Berry Jackson (IL) Pomeroy
Bishop Jackson-Lee Price (NC)
Blagojevich (TX) Rahall
Blumenauer John Rangel
Bonior Johnson, E. B. Reyes
Borski Jones (OH) Rivers
Boswell Kanjorski Rodriguez
Boucher Kaptur Roemer
Boyd Kennedy Rothman
Brady (PA) Kildee Roybal-Allard
Brown (FL) Kilpatrick Sabo
Brown (OH) Kind (WI) Sanchez
Capps Kleczka Sanders
Capuano Klink Sandlin
Cardin Kucinich Sawyer
Carson LaFalce Schakowsky
Clay Lampson Scott
Clayton Lantos Serrano
Clement Larson Sherman
Clyburn Lee Shows
Condit Levin Sisisky
Conyers Lewis (GA) Skelton
Costello Lipinski Slaughter
Coyne Lofgren Smith (WA)
Cramer Lowey Snyder
Crowley Lucas (KY) Spratt
Cummings Luther Stabenow
Danner Maloney (CT) Stark
Davis (FL) Maloney (NY) Stenholm
Davis (IL) Markey Strickland
DeFazio Martinez Stupak
DeGette Mascara Tanner
DeLauro Matsui Tauscher
Deutsch McCarthy (MO) Taylor (MS)
Dicks McCarthy (NY) Thompson (CA)
Dingell McDermott Thompson (MS)
Dixon McGovern Thurman
Doggett McIntyre Tierney
Dooley McKinney Towns
Doyle McNulty Turner
Edwards Meehan Udall (CO)
Engel MEEKS (FL) Udall (NM)
Eshoo Meeke (NY) Velazquez
Etheridge Menendez Vento
Evans Millender-Visclosky
Farr McDonald Waters
Fattah Miller, George Watt (NC)
Filner Minge Waxman
Forbes Mink Weiner
Ford Moakley Wexler
Frank (MA) Moore Weygand
Frost Moran (VA) Wise
Gejdenson Murtha Woolsey
Gephardt Nadler Wu
Gonzalez Napolitano Wynn
Neal

NOT VOTING—8

Mollohan Walsh
Rush Watkins
Scarborough

□ 1241

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table. Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 335, I call up the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 335, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 19, 1999, at page H10283.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. It is my understanding that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) supports the conference report, and given that case, under clause 8(d) of rule XXII, I ask for one-third of the time on the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York support the conference report?

Mr. SERRANO. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8(d) of rule XXII, the time will be equally divided among the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2670, 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.

□ 1245

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to bring this conference report on the fiscal year 2000 Commerce Justice, State and Judiciary appropriations bill to the floor. We have brought to a successful conclusion the very long, arduous work of reconciling the differences between the very different House-passed and Senate-passed versions of this bill.

This conference report is a sound compromise. It makes a number of significant improvements, I think, over the House-passed version of the bill. We moved forward within the guidelines set for the bill by our leadership, consistent with their plan for meeting the

budget targets and protecting Social Security.

For law enforcement, the Senate came in a billion dollars below the House. We were able to restore those funds, and those funds, of course, will keep intact at their current operating levels, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, the United States Attorneys, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

We provide 1,000 new border patrol agents for the INS. We maintain funding for local law enforcement agencies, local sheriffs, and local police departments—monies direct to them, not going through their State agencies but going directly from here to that local agency—the local law enforcement grants, the juvenile accountability grants, the truth-in-sentencing State prison grant program directly to the States, and the SCAAP program to reimburse States for the costs of incarcerating illegal aliens.

For the COPS program, we provided the Senate level. We went up from the House level of \$268 million, which is the authorized level. We went up to \$325

million, the Senate level that was a result of the amendment offered by Senator BIDEN on the other side of the Capitol.

On top of that, though, we added the unused, unobligated balances that exist in the COPS program of \$250 million. We freed that money up, a quarter of a billion dollars for COPS. On top of that, we gave nearly every penny the administration requested under the COPS program for technology programs. That is added in, for a grand total of \$725 million for the COPS program.

That is for COPS II, which is not authorized. COPS I runs out this year. We gave in this bill the \$268 million in the House version that would have funded the authorized level. We went beyond that to a total of \$725 million, even though it is not authorized, in an attempt to meet the administration's request for more funds.

In Commerce, we fully fund the census. We do not require that there be a ban on sampling. We will let the courts decide that one.

For the rest of Commerce, the Senate was \$850 million above the House level,

much of it in NOAA. We have come up significantly above the House level, \$275 million in NOAA alone above the House, and \$60 million for the Pacific Salmon Recovery program to be of great assistance to the West Coast States of Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska.

For the Judiciary, we provide \$60 million more than the House. We solve the judges' cost-of-living adjustment that is required, and we solve the life insurance problem that had been of such great concern to the Judiciary.

For the Department of State, we fully fund the request for embassy security overseas, every penny. In fact, we made the administration request more money. We have fulfilled that request.

We fully fund and pay for every penny of our current contributions to the U.N. We are paying our dues annually. We provide the money for the arrears, subject to authorization.

Overall, Mr. Speaker, it is a good bill. I would hope our colleagues would support it.

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	79,328	87,534	79,328	82,485	79,328
Joint automated booking system				6,000	1,800	+ 1,800
Narrowband communications		80,000		20,000	10,625	+ 10,625
(By transfer)			(101,434)		(92,545)	(+ 92,545)
Counterterrorism fund	10,000	27,000	10,000	27,000	10,000
1st Responder grants	135,000					-135,000
Telecommunications carrier compliance fund		7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	+ 7,000
Defense function		8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	+ 8,000
Administrative review and appeals:						
Direct appropriation	75,312	89,901	84,200	30,727	98,136	+ 22,824
Crime trust fund	59,251	59,251	50,363	59,251	50,363	- 8,888
Total, Administrative review and appeals	134,563	149,152	134,563	89,978	148,499	+ 13,936
Office of Inspector General	34,175	45,021	42,475	32,049	40,275	+ 6,100
Total, General administration	393,066	403,707	281,366	272,512	305,527	- 87,539
Appropriations	(333,815)	(344,456)	(231,003)	(213,261)	(255,164)	(- 78,651)
Crime trust fund	(59,251)	(59,251)	(50,363)	(59,251)	(50,363)	(- 8,888)
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses	7,380	8,527	7,380	7,176	7,380
Legal Activities						
General legal activities:						
Direct appropriation	466,540	568,316	355,691	299,260	346,381	- 120,159
Crime trust fund	8,160	8,555	147,929	185,740	147,929	+ 139,769
Total, General legal activities	474,700	576,871	503,620	485,000	494,310	+ 19,610
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)	4,028	4,028	3,424	4,028	4,028
Antitrust Division	98,267	114,373	105,167	112,318	110,000	+ 11,733
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,000	-47,799	-47,799		-28,150	+ 1,850
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-68,275	-66,574	-57,368	-112,318	-81,850	- 13,575
Direct appropriation	-8					+ 8
United States Attorneys:						
Direct appropriation	1,009,253	1,217,788	1,161,957	589,478	1,161,957	+ 152,704
Crime trust fund	80,698	57,000		500,000		- 80,698
Total, United States Attorneys	1,089,951	1,274,788	1,161,957	1,089,478	1,161,957	+ 72,006
United States Trustee System Fund:						
Current year fee funding	114,248	129,329	108,248	112,775	106,775	- 7,473
Fees and interest (legislative proposal)		32,000	6,000		6,000	+ 6,000
Total, United States trustee system fund	114,248	161,329	114,248	112,775	112,775	- 1,473
Offsetting fee collections	-114,248	-129,329	-108,248	-112,775	-106,775	+ 7,473
Offsetting fee collections - legislative proposal		-32,000	-6,000		-6,000	- 6,000
Total, US trustee offsetting fee collections	-114,248	-161,329	-114,248	-112,775	-112,775	+ 1,473
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,227	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,175	- 52
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation	476,356	543,380	329,289	409,253	333,745	- 142,611
Crime trust fund	25,553	26,210	209,620	138,000	209,620	+ 184,067
Construction	4,600	8,832	4,600	9,632	6,000	+ 1,400
Justice prisoner and alien transportation system				9,000	
Total, United States Marshals Service	506,509	578,422	543,509	565,885	549,365	+ 42,856
Federal prisoner detention	425,000	550,232	525,000	500,000	525,000	+ 100,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	95,000	110,000	95,000	110,000	95,000
Community Relations Service	7,199	10,344	7,199	7,199	7,199
Assets forfeiture fund	23,000	23,000		23,000	23,000
Total, Legal activities	2,626,606	3,128,860	2,840,884	2,785,765	2,861,034	+ 234,428
Appropriations	(2,512,195)	(3,037,095)	(2,483,335)	(1,962,025)	(2,503,485)	(- 8,710)
Crime trust fund	(114,411)	(91,765)	(357,549)	(823,740)	(357,549)	(+ 243,138)
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund		21,714		20,300	3,200	+ 3,200
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	2,000	23,714	2,000	22,300	5,200	+ 3,200

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement 1/.....	304,014		316,792	304,014	316,792	+ 12,778
High intensity inter-state gang activities.....				20,000		
Total, Interagency Law Enforcement.....	304,014		316,792	324,014	316,792	+ 12,778
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses	2,396,239	2,742,876	2,044,542	2,432,791	2,044,542	-351,697
Counterintelligence and national security	292,473	260,000	292,473	260,000	292,473	
FBI Fingerprint identification	47,800					-47,800
Direct appropriation.....	2,736,512	3,002,876	2,337,015	2,692,791	2,337,015	-399,497
Crime trust fund.....	223,356	280,501	752,853	280,501	752,853	+529,497
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	2,959,868	3,283,377	3,089,868	2,973,292	3,089,868	+ 130,000
Construction	1,287	10,287	1,287	10,287	1,287	
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	2,961,155	3,293,664	3,091,155	2,983,579	3,091,155	+ 130,000
Appropriations	(2,737,799)	(3,013,163)	(2,338,302)	(2,703,078)	(2,338,302)	(-399,497)
Crime trust fund	(223,356)	(280,501)	(752,853)	(280,501)	(752,853)	(+529,497)
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	875,523	1,055,572	1,012,330	878,517	1,013,330	+ 137,807
Diversion control fund	-76,710	-80,330	-80,330	-80,330	-80,330	-3,620
Direct appropriation.....	798,813	975,242	932,000	798,187	933,000	+ 134,187
Crime trust fund.....	405,000	405,000	344,250	419,459	343,250	-61,750
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	1,203,813	1,380,242	1,276,250	1,217,646	1,276,250	+ 72,437
Construction	8,000	8,000	8,000	5,500	5,500	-2,500
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	1,211,813	1,388,242	1,284,250	1,223,146	1,281,750	+ 69,937
Appropriations	(806,813)	(983,242)	(940,000)	(803,687)	(938,500)	(+ 131,687)
Crime trust fund	(405,000)	(405,000)	(344,250)	(419,459)	(343,250)	(-61,750)
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses	1,617,269	2,435,638	1,621,041	1,697,164	1,642,440	+ 25,171
Enforcement and border affairs.....	(1,069,754)	(1,900,627)	(1,086,030)		(1,107,429)	(+ 37,675)
Citizenship and benefits, immigration support and program direction	(547,515)	(535,011)	(535,011)		(535,011)	(-12,504)
Crime trust fund.....	842,490	500,000	1,311,225	873,000	1,267,225	+424,735
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund	2,459,759	2,935,638	2,932,266	2,570,164	2,909,665	+ 449,906
Fee accounts:						
Immigration user fee.....	(486,071)	(517,800)	(446,151)	(446,151)	(446,151)	(-39,920)
Land border inspection fund.....	(3,275)	(6,595)	(6,595)	(1,012)	(1,548)	(-1,727)
Immigration examinations fund	(635,700)	(688,579)	(712,800)	(712,800)	(708,500)	(+ 72,800)
Breached bond fund 2/.....	(176,950)	(116,900)	(117,501)	(127,771)	(110,423)	(-66,527)
Immigration enforcement fines	(4,050)	(3,800)	(1,303)	(1,303)	(1,850)	(-2,200)
H-1b Visa fees.....		(1,125)	(1,125)	(1,125)	(1,125)	(+ 1,125)
Subtotal, Fee accounts.....	(1,306,046)	(1,334,799)	(1,285,475)	(1,290,162)	(1,269,597)	(-36,449)
Construction	90,000	99,684	90,000	138,964	99,664	+9,664
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(3,855,805)	(4,370,101)	(4,307,741)	(3,999,290)	(4,278,926)	(+ 423,121)
Appropriations	(1,707,269)	(2,535,302)	(1,711,041)	(1,836,128)	(1,742,104)	(+ 34,835)
Crime trust fund	(842,490)	(500,000)	(1,311,225)	(873,000)	(1,267,225)	(+ 424,735)
(Fee accounts).....	(1,306,046)	(1,334,799)	(1,285,475)	(1,290,162)	(1,269,597)	(-36,449)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	2,952,154	3,191,928	3,140,004	3,166,774	3,179,110	+226,956
Prior year carryover.....	-90,000	-70,000	-90,000	-50,000	-90,000	
Direct appropriation.....	2,862,154	3,121,928	3,050,004	3,116,774	3,089,110	+226,956
Crime trust fund.....	26,499	26,499	22,524	46,599	22,524	-3,975
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	2,888,653	3,148,427	3,072,528	3,163,373	3,111,634	+222,981
Buildings and facilities.....	410,997	558,791	556,791	549,791	556,791	+ 145,794
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	3,000	3,429	2,490	3,429	3,429	+ 429
Total, Federal Prison System.....	3,302,650	3,710,647	3,631,809	3,716,593	3,671,854	+369,204

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice assistance.....	147,151	338,648	217,436	373,092	307,611	+ 160,460
(By transfer).....		(7,000)	(7,000)		(7,000)	(+7,000)
State and local law enforcement assistance:						
Direct appropriations:						
Byrne grants (discretionary).....	47,000			52,100		-47,000
Byrne grants (formula).....	505,000			500,000		-505,000
Local law enforcement block grant.....			523,000		523,000	+523,000
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark).....			(40,000)		(50,000)	(+50,000)
State prison grants.....			686,500		686,500	+686,500
State criminal alien assistance program.....			420,000		420,000	+420,000
Indian tribal courts program.....					5,000	+5,000
Crime identification technology.....					130,000	+130,000
Safe schools initiative.....					(15,000)	(+15,000)
Upgrade criminal history records.....					(35,000)	(+35,000)
DNA identification/crime lab.....					(30,000)	(+30,000)
Subtotal, Direct appropriations.....	552,000		1,629,500	552,100	1,764,500	+1,212,500
Crime trust fund:						
Byrne grants (formula).....		400,000	505,000		500,000	+500,000
Byrne grants (discretionary).....		59,950	47,000		52,000	+52,000
Local law enforcement block grant.....	523,000			400,000		-523,000
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark).....	(40,000)			(50,000)		(-40,000)
Police corps.....				(30,000)		
Juvenile crime block grant.....	250,000		250,000	100,000	250,000	
Drug testing and intervention program.....		100,000				
Indian tribal courts program.....	5,000	5,000		5,000		-5,000
Drug courts.....	40,000	50,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	
Crime identification technology.....	45,000			260,000		-45,000
Safe schools initiative.....				(15,000)		
Upgrade criminal history records.....				(40,000)		
Global criminal justice information netwrk.....				(12,000)		
State prison grants.....	720,500	75,000		75,000		-720,500
State criminal alien assistance program.....	420,000	500,000		100,000		-420,000
Violence Against Women grants.....	282,750	282,750	282,750	283,750	283,750	+1,000
State prison drug treatment.....	63,000	65,100	63,000	63,000	63,000	
DNA identification grants.....	15,000			30,000		-15,000
Certainty of punishment grants.....		35,000				
Indian country initiatives.....				45,000		
Other crime control programs.....	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	5,700	
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	2,369,950	1,578,500	1,193,450	1,407,450	1,194,450	-1,175,500
Total, State and local law enforcement.....	2,921,950	1,578,500	2,822,950	1,959,550	2,958,950	+37,000
Weed and seed program fund.....	33,500		33,500	40,000	33,500	
Crime trust fund.....		33,500				
Community oriented policing services:						
Direct appropriations:						
Crime analysis technology.....		100,000				
Hiring program.....			150,000	167,675	227,000	+227,000
School violence.....			17,500			
Crime identification technology.....			15,000			
Technology.....			15,500			
Bulletproof vest grants.....			25,000			
Management administration.....				17,325	17,325	+17,325
Methamphetamine.....					35,675	+35,675
Subtotal, Direct appropriations.....		100,000	223,000	185,000	280,000	+280,000
Crime trust fund:						
Hiring program 3/.....	1,400,000	600,000		140,000	45,000	-1,355,000
Police corps 3/.....	30,000					-30,000
Crime identification technology.....		250,000	45,000			
Community prosecutors.....		200,000				
Prevention.....		125,000				
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	1,430,000	1,175,000	45,000	140,000	45,000	-1,385,000
Total, Community oriented policing services.....	1,430,000	1,275,000	268,000	325,000	325,000	-1,105,000
Juvenile justice programs.....	284,597	288,597	286,597	322,597	287,097	+2,500
Safe school initiative.....				(38,000)		

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits.....	31,809	32,541	32,541	32,541	32,541	+732
Disability benefits.....		3,500		3,500		
Total, Public safety officers benefits program.....	31,809	36,041	32,541	36,041	32,541	+732
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	4,849,007	3,550,286	3,661,024	3,056,280	3,944,699	-904,308
Appropriations.....	(1,049,057)	(763,286)	(2,422,574)	(1,508,830)	(2,705,249)	(+1,656,192)
Crime trust fund.....	(3,799,950)	(2,787,000)	(1,238,450)	(1,547,450)	(1,239,450)	(-2,560,500)
General Provisions						
General Pricing level adjustments.....				-2,468		
Total, title I, Department of Justice.....	18,207,450	18,542,949	18,138,926	17,098,025	18,494,720	+287,270
Appropriations.....	(12,736,493)	(14,392,933)	(14,061,712)	(13,048,025)	(14,461,506)	(+1,725,013)
Crime trust fund.....	(5,470,957)	(4,150,016)	(4,077,214)	(4,050,000)	(4,033,214)	(-1,437,743)
(By transfer).....		(7,000)	(108,434)		(99,545)	(+99,545)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT						
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,200	26,501	25,205	26,067	25,635	+1,435
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31).....	1,300					-1,300
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses.....	44,495	47,200	44,495	45,700	44,495	
Total, Related agencies.....	69,995	73,701	69,700	71,767	70,130	+135
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration.....	286,264	308,431	298,236	311,344	311,503	+25,239
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,800	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	-1,400
Direct appropriation.....	284,664	305,431	295,236	308,344	308,503	+23,839
Export Administration						
Operations and administration.....	50,454	58,578	47,650	54,054	52,161	+1,707
CWC enforcement.....	1,877	1,877	1,877	1,877	1,877	
Total, Export Administration.....	52,331	60,455	49,527	55,931	54,038	+1,707
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs.....	368,379	364,379	364,379	203,379	361,879	-6,500
Salaries and expenses.....	24,000	28,971	24,000	24,937	26,500	+2,500
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	392,379	393,350	388,379	228,316	388,379	-4,000
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development.....	27,000	27,627	27,000	27,627	27,314	+314
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development.....	826,369	860,564	829,842	691,985	848,364	+21,995
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE						
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses.....	48,490	55,123	48,490	51,158	49,499	+1,009
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses.....	136,147	156,944	136,147	156,944	140,000	+3,853
Periodic censuses and programs.....	1,186,902	4,637,754	142,320	2,914,754	142,320	-1,044,582
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31).....	44,900					-44,900
Emergency appropriations.....			4,476,253		4,476,253	+4,476,253
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	1,367,949	4,794,698	4,754,720	3,071,698	4,758,573	+3,390,624

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses	10,940	17,212	10,940	11,009	10,975	+35
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	21,000	35,055	18,000	30,000	26,500	+5,500
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2003		299,000				
Information infrastructure grants	18,000	20,102	13,000	18,102	15,500	-2,500
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	49,940	371,369	41,940	59,111	52,975	+3,035
Patent and Trademark Office						
Current year fee funding	643,026	785,976	735,538	785,976	755,000	+111,974
Prior year fee funding	71,000					-71,000
(Prior year carryover)	(40,500)	(115,774)	(116,000)	(115,774)	(116,000)	(+75,500)
Rescission	-71,000					+71,000
Subtotal	(683,526)	(901,750)	(851,538)	(901,750)	(871,000)	(+187,474)
Legislative proposal fees	102,000	20,000				-102,000
Total, Patent and Trademark Office	(785,526)	(921,750)	(851,538)	(901,750)	(871,000)	(+85,474)
Offsetting fee collections	-643,026	-785,976	-785,976	-785,976	-785,976	-142,950
Offsetting fee collections - legislative proposal	-102,000	-20,000				+102,000
Total, PTO offsetting fee collections	-745,026	-805,976	-785,976	-785,976	-785,976	-40,950
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	1,466,379	5,221,190	4,794,712	3,181,967	4,830,071	+3,363,692
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
Technology Administration						
Under Secretary for Technology/ Office of Technology Policy						
Salaries and expenses	9,495	8,972	7,972	7,972	7,972	-1,523
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services	280,136	289,622	280,136	288,128	283,132	+2,996
Industrial technology services	310,300	338,536	99,836	336,336	247,436	-62,864
Construction of research facilities	56,714	106,798	56,714	117,500	108,414	+51,700
NTIS revolving fund		2,000				
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	647,150	736,956	436,686	741,964	638,982	-8,168
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research, and facilities	1,579,844	1,738,911	1,475,128	1,783,118	1,658,189	+78,345
Offsetting collections (fisheries) (proposed)		-20,000				
Offsetting collections (navigation) (proposed)		-14,000				
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	1,880					-1,880
Direct appropriation	1,581,724	1,704,911	1,475,128	1,783,118	1,658,189	+76,465
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(63,381)	(64,926)	(67,226)	(66,426)	(68,000)	(+4,619)
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent)	5,000					-5,000
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund)	-5,000					+5,000
(By transfer from Coastal zone management)		4,000				
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,581,724	1,708,911	1,475,128	1,783,118	1,658,189	+76,465
Procurement, acquisition and construction	584,677	630,578	480,330	670,578	589,067	+4,390
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2018		5,363,345				
Pacific coastal salmon recovery		160,000		100,000	50,000	+50,000
Coastal zone management fund	4,000		4,000	4,000	4,000	
Mandatory offset	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000	
Fishermen's contingency fund	953	953	953	953	953	
Foreign fishing observer fund	189	189	189	189	189	
Fisheries finance program account	338	10,258	238	2,038	338	
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	2,167,881	7,870,234	1,956,838	2,556,876	2,298,736	+130,855
Appropriations	(2,167,881)	(2,506,889)	(1,956,838)	(2,556,876)	(2,298,736)	(+130,855)
Advance appropriations		(5,363,345)				
Total, Science and Technology	2,824,526	8,616,162	2,401,496	3,306,812	2,945,690	+121,164

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	30,000	34,046	30,000	34,046	31,500	+1,500
Office of Inspector General.....	21,000	23,454	22,000	17,900	20,000	-1,000
Total, General administration	51,000	57,500	52,000	51,946	51,500	+500
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Fisheries promotional fund (rescission)		-1,187	-1,187		-1,187	-1,187
Total, Department of Commerce.....	5,098,279	14,680,528	8,007,163	7,160,943	8,604,308	+3,506,029
Appropriations	(5,169,279)	(9,019,370)	(3,532,097)	(7,160,943)	(4,129,242)	(-1,040,037)
Emergency appropriations			(4,476,253)		(4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-71,000)	(-1,187)	(-1,187)		(-1,187)	(+69,813)
Advance appropriations.....		(5,662,345)				
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	5,168,274	14,754,229	8,076,863	7,232,710	8,674,438	+3,506,164
Appropriations	(5,239,274)	(9,093,071)	(3,601,797)	(7,232,710)	(4,199,372)	(-1,039,902)
Emergency appropriations			(4,476,253)		(4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-71,000)	(-1,187)	(-1,187)		(-1,187)	(+69,813)
Advance appropriations.....		(5,662,345)				
(By transfer)	(63,381)	(64,926)	(67,226)	(66,426)	(68,000)	(+4,619)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,690	1,698	1,698	1,698	1,698	+8
Other salaries and expenses	29,369	34,241	33,343	34,205	33,794	+4,425
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	921					-921
Total, Salaries and expenses	31,980	35,939	35,041	35,903	35,492	+3,512
Care of the building and grounds.....	5,400	22,658	6,872	9,652	8,002	+2,602
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	37,380	58,597	41,913	45,555	43,494	+6,114
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,943	1,945	1,945	1,945	1,945	+2
Other salaries and expenses	14,158	15,691	14,156	14,966	14,852	+694
Total, Salaries and expenses	16,101	17,636	16,101	16,911	16,797	+696
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,506	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525	+19
Other salaries and expenses	10,298	10,621	10,279	10,432	10,432	+134
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,804	12,146	11,804	11,957	11,957	+153
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges.....	238,329	240,375	240,375	240,375	240,375	+2,046
Other salaries and expenses	2,583,492	2,979,551	2,669,763	2,651,890	2,717,763	+134,271
Direct appropriation.....	2,821,821	3,219,926	2,910,138	2,892,265	2,958,138	+136,317
Crime trust fund	10,164	29,395	156,539	100,000	156,539	+146,375
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,831,985	3,249,321	3,066,677	2,992,265	3,114,677	+282,692
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.....	2,515	2,581	2,138	2,581	2,515	
Defender services	360,952	374,839	361,548	353,888	358,848	-2,104
Crime trust fund	30,879	38,605	26,247		26,247	-4,632
Fees of jurors and commissioners	66,861	69,510	63,400	60,918	60,918	-5,943
Court security.....	174,569	206,012	190,029	196,026	193,028	+18,459
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	3,467,761	3,938,868	3,710,039	3,805,678	3,756,233	+288,472
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salaries and expenses	54,500	58,428	54,500	56,054	55,000	+500
Federal Judicial Center						
Salaries and expenses	17,716	18,997	17,716	18,476	18,000	+284

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds.....	37,300	39,700	39,700	39,700	39,700	+2,400
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salaries and expenses	9,487	10,600	8,500	9,743	8,500	-987
General Provisions						
Judges pay raise (sec. 304).....		9,000		9,611	9,611	+9,611
Total, title III, the Judiciary.....	3,652,049	4,163,972	3,900,273	3,813,685	3,959,292	+307,243
Appropriations.....	(3,611,006)	(4,097,972)	(3,717,487)	(3,713,685)	(3,776,506)	(+165,500)
Crime trust fund	(41,043)	(66,000)	(182,786)	(100,000)	(182,786)	(+141,743)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs 4/	1,644,300	2,838,934	2,472,825	2,671,429	2,522,825	+878,525
Worldwide security upgrade.....			254,000		254,000	+254,000
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs.....	1,644,300	2,838,934	2,726,825	2,671,429	2,776,825	+1,132,525
Salaries and expenses	355,000					-355,000
Capital investment fund.....	80,000	90,000	80,000	50,000	80,000	
Office of Inspector General.....	27,495	30,054	28,495	26,495	27,495	
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....		210,329	175,000	216,478	205,000	+205,000
Representation allowances	4,350	5,850	4,350	5,850	5,850	+1,500
Protection of foreign missions and officials	8,100	9,490	8,100	8,100	8,100	
Security and maintenance of United States missions	403,561	747,683	403,561	583,496	428,561	+25,000
Worldwide security upgrade.....			313,617		313,617	+313,617
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2005.....		3,600,000				
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	5,500	17,000	5,500	7,000	5,500	
(By transfer)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	
Commission on Holocaust Assets in U.S. (by transfer)	(2,000)	(1,162)	(1,162)		(1,162)	(-838)
Repatriation Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	593	593	593	593	593	
Administrative expenses.....	607	607	607	607	607	
(By transfer)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	
Total, Repatriation loans program account.....	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	14,750	15,760	14,750	16,000	15,375	+625
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	132,500	128,541	128,541	128,541	128,541	-3,959
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	2,676,756	7,694,841	3,889,939	3,714,587	3,996,064	+1,319,308
Appropriations.....	(2,676,756)	(4,094,841)	(3,889,939)	(3,714,587)	(3,996,064)	(+1,319,308)
Advance appropriations.....		(3,600,000)				
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	922,000	963,308	842,937	943,308	885,203	-36,797
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	231,000	235,000	200,000	387,925	200,000	-31,000
Arrearage payments	475,000	446,000	351,000		351,000	-124,000
International conferences and contingencies (by transfer)	(16,223)					(-16,223)
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	1,628,000	1,644,308	1,393,937	1,331,233	1,436,203	-191,797
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	19,551	20,413	19,551	19,551	19,551	
Construction	5,939	8,435	5,750	5,939	5,939	
American sections, international commissions.....	5,733	6,493	5,733	5,733	5,733	
International fisheries commissions.....	14,549	16,702	14,549	15,549	15,549	+1,000
Total, International commissions	45,772	52,043	45,583	46,772	46,772	+1,000
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	8,250	15,000	8,000		8,250	
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund		525	525	465	465	+465
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....		350	350	340	340	+340
East-West Center		12,500		12,500	12,500	+12,500
North/South Center.....		2,500			1,750	+1,750
National Endowment for Democracy		32,000	31,000	30,000	31,000	+31,000
Total, Department of State.....	4,358,778	9,454,067	5,369,334	5,135,897	5,533,344	+1,174,566
Appropriations.....	(4,358,778)	(5,854,067)	(5,369,334)	(5,135,897)	(5,533,344)	(+1,174,566)
Advance appropriations.....		(3,600,000)				

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670) — continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RELATED AGENCIES						
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities	41,500					-41,500
United States Information Agency						
International information programs.....	455,246					-455,246
Technology fund (by transfer)	(2,000)					(-2,000)
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....	202,500					-202,500
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	525					-525
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....	350					-350
International Broadcasting Operations	362,365					-362,365
Broadcasting to Cuba (direct)	22,095					-22,095
Radio construction	13,245					-13,245
East-West Center	12,500					-12,500
North/South Center.....	1,750					-1,750
National Endowment for Democracy	31,000					-31,000
Total, United States Information Agency.....	1,101,576					-1,101,576
Broadcasting Board of Governors						
International Broadcasting Operations		431,722	410,404	362,365	388,421	+388,421
Broadcasting to Cuba.....				23,664	22,095	+22,095
Broadcasting capital improvements.....		20,868	11,258	13,245	11,258	+11,258
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors.....		452,590	421,662	399,274	421,774	+421,774
Total, related agencies	1,143,076	452,590	421,662	399,274	421,774	-721,302
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,501,854	9,906,657	5,790,996	5,535,171	5,955,118	+453,264
Appropriations	(5,501,854)	(6,306,657)	(5,790,996)	(5,535,171)	(5,955,118)	(+453,264)
Advance appropriations.....		(3,600,000)				
(By transfer)	(25,223)	(6,162)	(6,162)	(5,000)	(6,162)	(-19,061)
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Maritime Security Program	89,650	98,700	98,700	98,700	96,200	+6,550
Operations and training.....	69,303	72,164	71,303	72,664	72,073	+2,770
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	6,000	6,000	5,400	11,000	6,000	
Administrative expenses.....	3,725	3,893	3,725	3,893	3,809	+84
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	9,725	9,893	9,125	14,893	9,809	+84
Total, Maritime Administration.....	168,678	180,757	179,128	186,257	178,082	+8,404
Census Monitoring Board						
Salaries and expenses		4,000		4,000		
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salaries and expenses	265	265	265	490	490	+225
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salaries and expenses	8,900	11,000	8,900	8,900	8,900	
Commission on Electronic Commerce						
Salaries and expenses					1,400	+1,400
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salaries and expenses	1,170	1,250	1,170	1,250	1,182	+12
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses	279,000	312,000	279,000	279,000	279,000	
Federal Communications Commission						
Salaries and expenses	192,000	230,887	192,000	232,805	210,000	+18,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-172,523	-185,754	-185,754	-185,754	-185,754	-13,231
Direct appropriation	19,477	45,133	6,246	47,051	24,246	+4,769
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses	14,150	15,300	14,150	14,150	14,150	

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	116,679	133,368	116,679	133,368	125,024	+8,345
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,000	-39,472	-39,472	-19,309	-21,000	+9,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-76,500	-93,896	-77,207	-114,059	-104,024	-27,524
Direct appropriation	10,179					-10,179
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	300,000	340,000	250,000	300,000	300,000	
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses	1,240	1,300	1,240	1,300	1,270	+30
Ocean Policy Commission						
Salaries and expenses	3,500					-3,500
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses	23,000					-23,000
Current year fees	214,000	230,000	193,200	240,000	173,800	-40,200
1998 fees	87,000	130,800	130,800	130,800	194,000	+107,000
Direct appropriation	324,000	360,800	324,000	370,800	367,800	+43,800
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses	288,300	263,000	245,500	246,300	276,300	-12,000
Office of Inspector General	10,800	11,000	10,800	13,250	11,000	+200
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	2,200	4,000	762	4,000		-2,200
Guaranteed loans subsidy	128,030	144,368	128,030	164,368	131,800	+3,770
Administrative expenses	94,000	131,000	94,000	129,000	129,000	+35,000
Total, Business loans program account	224,230	279,368	222,792	297,368	260,800	+36,570
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	76,329	39,400	139,400	77,700	119,400	+43,071
Contingent emergency appropriations		158,000				
Administrative expenses	116,000	86,000	116,000	86,000	136,000	+20,000
Contingent emergency appropriations		75,000				
Total, Disaster loans program account	192,329	358,400	255,400	163,700	255,400	+63,071
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	3,300					-3,300
Total, Small Business Administration	718,959	911,768	734,492	720,618	803,500	+84,541
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 5/	6,850	15,000		6,850	6,850	
Total, title V, Related agencies	1,856,368	2,198,573	1,798,591	1,940,666	1,986,870	+130,502
Appropriations	(1,856,368)	(1,965,573)	(1,798,591)	(1,940,666)	(1,986,870)	(+130,502)
Contingent emergency appropriations		(233,000)				
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Working capital fund (rescission)	-99,000			-22,577		+99,000
Legal Activities						
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)	-2,000			-5,500		+2,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
FY 1998 FBI construction (rescission)	-4,000					+4,000
No Year FBI salaries and expenses (rescission)	-6,400					+6,400
FY 1996 VCRP (rescission)	-2,000					+2,000
FY 1997 VCRP (rescission)	-300					+300
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	-12,700					+12,700
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Drug diversion fund (rescission)				-35,000	-35,000	-35,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Immigration emergency fund (rescission)	-5,000		-1,137		-1,137	+3,863

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)— continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
FY 1998 Commerce (rescission)	-2,090					+2,090
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Industrial technology services (rescission).....	-6,000					+6,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities (rescission of emergency appropriations).....		-3,400		-3,400		
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Security and maintenance of United States Missions (rescission).....				-58,436		
United States Information Agency						
Buying power maintenance (rescission).....	-20,000					+20,000
Broadcasting Board of Governors						
International broadcasting operations (rescission).....			-14,829	-18,780	-15,516	-15,516
RELATED AGENCY						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Ship construction fund (rescission).....	-17,000					+17,000
Small Business Administration						
Business Loans Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission).....			-12,400		-13,100	-13,100
General reduction.....				-92,000		
Total, title VII, Rescissions	-163,790	-3,400	-28,366	-235,683	-64,753	+99,037
Appropriations				(-92,000)		
Rescissions	(-163,790)		(-28,366)	(-140,293)	(-64,753)	(+99,037)
Rescission of emergency appropriations.....		(-3,400)		(-3,400)		
TITLE VIII - OTHER APPROPRIATIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses	21,680					-21,680
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	10,200					-10,200
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses	10,000					-10,000
Border affairs	80,000					-80,000
Department of Justice (Y2K conversion).....	84,396					-84,396
Total, Department of Justice	206,276					-206,276
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research, and facilities.....	5,000					-5,000
Department of Commerce (Y2K conversion)	57,920					-57,920
Total, Department of Commerce.....	62,920					-62,920
THE JUDICIARY						
Judicial information technology fund (Y2K conversion).....	13,044					-13,044
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	790,771					-790,771
Salaries and expenses	12,000					-12,000
Office of Inspector General.....	1,000					-1,000
Security and maintenance of United States missions	677,500					-677,500
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	12,929					-12,929
Department of State (Y2K conversion).....	64,918					-64,918
Total, Department of State.....	1,559,118					-1,559,118

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670) — continued
 (Amounts in thousands)**

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
RELATED AGENCIES						
Small Business Administration						
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	71,000					-71,000
Administrative expenses	30,000					-30,000
Total, Disaster loans program account	101,000					-101,000
Small Business Administration (Y2K conversion)	4,840					-4,840
Total, Small Business Administration	105,840					-105,840
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration (Y2K conversion)	530					-530
Federal Communications Commission (Y2K conversion)	8,516					-8,516
Federal Trade Commission (Y2K conversion)	550					-550
Marine Mammal Commission (Y2K conversion)	38					-38
Office of the US Trade Representative (Y2K conversion)	498					-498
Securities and Exchange Commission (Y2K conversion)	8,175					-8,175
United States Information Agency (Y2K conversion)	9,562					-9,562
Total, title VIII, emergency appropriations	1,975,067					-1,975,067
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	36,197,272	49,562,980	37,677,283	35,384,564	39,005,685	+2,808,413
Appropriations	(28,944,995)	(35,856,206)	(28,970,583)	(31,378,257)	(30,379,372)	(+1,434,377)
Emergency appropriations	(1,975,067)		(4,476,253)		(4,476,253)	(+2,501,186)
Contingent emergency appropriations		(233,000)				
Advance appropriations		(9,262,345)				
Rescissions	(-234,790)	(-1,187)	(-29,553)	(-140,293)	(-65,940)	(+168,850)
Rescission of emergency appropriations		(-3,400)		(-3,400)		
Crime trust fund	(5,512,000)	(4,216,016)	(4,260,000)	(4,150,000)	(4,216,000)	(-1,296,000)
(By transfer)	(88,604)	(78,088)	(181,822)	(71,426)	(173,707)	(+85,103)

1/ The Administration's request proposes to eliminate this account and distribute the funding to GLA, US Attorneys, US Marshals, FBI, DEA and INS.

2/ The Administration's June 8, 1999 budget amendment proposes to reinstate the 245(f) adjustment of status fee, which would increase receipts in the Breached Bond Fund by \$110 million.

3/ The President's request includes \$30 million for the Police Corps within the hiring program.

4/ As a result of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 and other changes, the amounts requested and recommended in FY 2000 include amounts appropriated separately in previous fiscal years for State Department, USIA and ACDA salaries and expenses.

5/ The President's budget proposed \$5 million for State Justice Institute.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we take up the conference report of H.R. 2670, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and several related agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this year I jumped from not being a member of the subcommittee at all to the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee. Learning this large and challenging bill practically from scratch has made this an interesting and educational year, but it has been made much easier by our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), who has graciously shared his considerable expertise and made necessary allowances for the new guy on the block. Working with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has been a great personal pleasure for me, and I thank him for his support and understanding.

I must also mention our very professional and able staff, some of whom we always see on the floor during the debate and others who are back in our offices. They have worked long and hard, including just about every night and weekend since conferees were appointed, to bring this conference report to the floor.

The chairman has explained the conference report so I will just add a few words. First, while there are still problems and concerns with certain provisions, the conference report is much better than the bill that passed the House in August. I think that is an important thing to note. So I repeat it. There are still concerns with the content of this bill, but this is a much better bill than the one that passed the House in August. If what I hear on radio this morning is correct and the President and the leadership of this House will take care of this problem this weekend, then this bill, I suspect, will get much better way before the Yankees win the World Series.

Additional resources were provided to the conferees and the result is much closer to the President's request in many areas. The conference agreement provides \$1.5 billion over the House-passed level and \$3.6 billion over the Senate-passed level. Like the House-passed bill, the conference report provides the Census Bureau with the resources it needs to do both the 2000 census and the necessary quality checks on it. This, Mr. Speaker, is a tremendous accomplishment and probably at the center of my support for this bill.

Like the House-passed bill, the conference report includes funding for U.N. arrears, but unfortunately it continues to restrict the State Department's ability to actually pay the U.N. dues, and I am very concerned that this will cost us our vote in the General Assembly. Along with the vote, we may lose any leverage we would hope to exercise over U.N. management and budget reforms.

The conference agreement, like the Senate-passed bill, provides resources to begin implementation of the Pacific Salmon Treaty, but one troubling provision waives the Endangered Species Act for the State of Alaska. This is an issue on which I have had many visits from Members and they should know the efforts that have been made on this issue.

The House-passed cut to SBA's salaries and expenses is largely restored, although partially subject to reprogramming procedures.

If I may depart from my text, if I could get the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman, to answer a question, and I am departing from my text just to ask the chairman, I understand that he might be willing to entertain reprogramming requests from SBA, something which is of great interest to me, to the agency obviously, and to our side of the aisle.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, we have worked with the gentleman to significantly increase funding for the SBA's operations in this conference report, and that is due solely to the pleas and arguments and very persuasive arguments for SBA, of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO). So we are \$45 million over what we passed in the House thanks to the gentleman, plus the SBA has the ability, as he suggested, to transfer additional funds if they are needed.

So we reserve that possibility as we go along during the year. I am very happy to continue to work with the gentleman on any further concerns he may have during the course of the year.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for his response.

We still have to look, of course, at the losses associated with Hurricanes Floyd and Irene. I, unfortunately, note that there is a new hurricane, Jose. He is not on the floor today, but he would be creating problems that we will have to deal with.

Now, one area where we have improved dramatically and which I am very proud of is the Legal Services Corporation. It was initially underfunded at only \$141 million, and as in past years the House amendment raised that to \$250 million, and the conferees agreed to set it at the higher \$300 million level, which is equal to the fiscal year 1999 level.

I would have preferred to provide more, such as the President's request, which was \$340 million; but this is an improvement, a significant one, over the House-passed bill.

The conference agreement continues to underfund the COPS program and therein lies perhaps the most difficult part of this bill. This is a program that is a good program. This is a program that needs to be improved and to grow,

and I think it is important that especially in the area of universal hiring that this bill be improved. Perhaps we will have that opportunity, as I said, before the Yankees win the World Series.

NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, while slated to receive more than \$340 million above the House-passed level, is still \$200 million below the President's request for important initiatives to protect our ocean resources and to help us better understand and predict weather and climate changes.

The State Department numbers have been increased over the House-passed level; and I think that this is, while still below some of the levels that were presented before, it is still something to note and something that we can be supportive of.

There are, unfortunately, some troubling issues that still remain and issues that could have been dealt with and were not, specifically the issue of hate crimes. We believe that on this bill we could have easily included the language that dealt with the issue of hate crimes legislation. We should not waste time trying to figure out the intricacies of where this language belongs. We should only deal with the fact that this is one of the most pressing issues in our country and that we have to address it properly.

I really think we missed our opportunity on this bill and hopefully this House will somehow deal with this.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, there are problems with the bill but I did rise today and will continue to rise in favor of this conference report. One of the reasons, as I said before, is my relationship to the chairman, his support of many of the requests that I made and the hope that as this process keeps going along we can, in fact, take care of those items that we did not take care of. So with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a positive, a yes vote, on this bill.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in debate on the rule, this bill is a lot better than it was when it left the House. Frankly, that is damning with thin praise but it certainly is.

There are five basic reasons why this bill is going to be vetoed by the President of the United States. The first is that no matter what accounting schemes are cited by the committee, the fact is that the new funding, new dollars for the President's Cops on the Beat program, and its successor program are only \$325 million out of the over \$1 billion the President has requested.

The universal hiring program, which is the program that all communities will be eligible to try to receive funds from, is funded at a level of only \$92 million as opposed to the \$600 million that the President is asking for.

□ 1300

Secondly, this bill resurrects an old argument left over from another bill on the Treasury, Post Office appropriations, and it renews legislative attempts to place limitations on the kinds of contraceptive services that will be available to Federal employees in their own insurance program. That should not be in this bill.

Thirdly, this bill contains an exemption from the Endangered Species Act for the Alaska salmon controversy. That should not be in this bill.

Fourth, this bill is part of a huge charade, which is pretending that the Congress is spending billions of dollars less than it is actually spending. Under our budget rules, if we call something an emergency, it then is not counted under budget spending ceilings.

We are told that the majority party does not want to sit down in the same room with the President and his negotiators and negotiate an omnibus budget arrangement because they say, when we did it last year, that resulted in \$20 billion of emergency spending being jammed into last year's omnibus appropriation bill, in fact, \$21 billion, as this bar graph shows. This represents last year's problems which our Republican friends say they want to avoid.

But the fact is that, without sitting down for that kind of a meeting, the majority has already produced bills which contain \$25 billion in emergency spending, thereby exempted from the budget caps.

This bill contains over \$4 billion of those phony emergencies, because it claims that the census, which, by constitutional edict, we must conduct every 10 years, this bill claims that the funding for that is an emergency. The budget act says that something is an emergency if it was unforeseen. Well, I did not know many people in this place did not know that the end of the millennium was coming and we would need another census. That is simply a \$4 billion device to hide spending and to pretend that we are not over the budget caps.

But most seriously of all, this bill is part of a continued onslaught on the part of the majority party in this House, on the President's ability to defend our national interest abroad diplomatically.

The Senate last week turned down the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Now this bill provides the money for us to contribute to the United Nations what we are obligated to contribute, but it does not give the authorization authority to actually provide that money to the United Nations. So it is a let-us-pretend appropriation.

What does that mean? It means that, because we cannot actually cut the check to the United Nations under this proposal, we will lose our vote in the United Nations. We will thus be joining Burundi, Djibouti, Dominica, Equatorial Guinea, Gambia, Haiti, Iraq, and Somalia as the countries in the United Nations who lose our votes because we did not pay our bills.

What a wonderful performance on the part of this Congress. My colleagues really ought to be thrilled by putting the United States in this disgraceful condition.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a very hardworking member of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky very much for yielding me this time.

First of all, I just want to give my most sincere thanks to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member, for a tremendous job, and compliment, I think, the best staff in Washington on this subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very unfortunate that people try to politicize this bill because it is so important what this bill accomplishes as far as I am going to focus mostly on law enforcement. But when we look at the Commerce, Justice, Justice Department, the State Department, the Supreme Court, Judiciary, it is an extraordinarily important and wide-ranging bill. I would hope that we would not politicize this bill.

I want to particularly point out the funding in Iowa in my district for the Meth Training Center in Sioux City that has been such a tremendous success to fight this major problem that we have in the upper Midwest, funding in this bill for video conferencing so that local communities can contact directly with the INS to get verification of identification of people they may suspect of being illegal, funding for the tri-State drug task force for local law enforcement for all the overtime hours that they put in in this great war we have on drugs today.

I want to stand in strong support of the local law enforcement block grants, the \$523 million which is included in this bill. This allows my communities, my small communities, to get the resources they so desperately need for equipment, for computers, for radios, for bulletproof vests. This is the only way for these small communities, and I come from a town of 153 people. We need this kind of help in the local law enforcement battle that we are fighting with the drug problem and with criminals throughout the country. This is essential. I compliment the committee.

Also, the truth in sentencing block grants for the State are extremely important.

Again, I want to compliment the chairman, the ranking member, and the great staff.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), a great member of the committee.

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report, but I certainly have some reservations that I had when I voted "no" on the floor when the bill was originally here.

I cannot quarrel with those that say that this conference report should not be on the floor, but the fact of the matter is it is on the floor. Certainly I would like to have seen more money for COPS, but the truth is that there is a substantial amount of money for COPS. I would like to have seen the fully funded request for the Justice Department Civil Rights Division, but that was not to be in this conference.

But important, it does have significant money for juvenile justice and crime prevention for juveniles. It has \$287 million. As both the chairman and the ranking member have pointed out, it has \$585 million for the Criminal Alien Assistance Program, a very important program to border States.

It also contains full funding for the census. Yes, it is contained under a gimmick, but the important thing is that the money is there to have an accurate and a full count in the census.

I certainly agree that it could be a better bill, but it is here, and the issue is whether the glass is half full or half empty. We can certainly make a case on either side. As a member of the committee, I see that the chairman and the ranking member have been exceptionally fair, and I prefer to see this glass as half full.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I rise in opposition to this conference report, with great respect to the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Unfortunately, I have to stand here again, as I have before, embarrassed and ashamed that the United States is the United Nation's number one deadbeat. If my colleagues want to help restore our good name and regain our influence in the UN, they will oppose this conference report and join me in demanding today that we pay immediate and full payment of our over \$1 billion in UN arrears.

This conference report provides only \$351 million to pay off our arrears, only after separate authorization, and only after onerous and impractical conditions have been met.

We have gone through this before. We voiced our concerns, and the UN has responded, maintaining a no-growth budget from 1994 to 1998, creating an Office of the Inspector General, eliminating over 1,000 positions, implementing other cost saving measures.

Withholding our arrears is irresponsible and short-sighted. We have already begun to feel the effects of our diminishing influence, and this is just the beginning.

How can we expect the United Nations to continue to take our interest into account around the world? How can we expect them to fund the projects we support and to send peace-keeping troops to areas where we want to see more stability when we do not contribute? How do we expect to help continue to reform the United Nations in a meaningful way to cut down on its bureaucracy and decrease our annual dues if we do not pay our debt?

This funding is critical to United States foreign policy. It shows the international community that a commitment made by the United States means something, and it is a cost effective way for us to leverage U.S. funding with that of the other members of the United Nations to make a difference around the world.

Our continued participation in the UN is critical to United States global leadership, which in turn is the cornerstone of our national security.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not also express my outrage about a trick played on us in this bill. The majority has violated the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government appropriation by modifying the newly signed fiscal year 2000 Treasury, Postal law in the Commerce, Justice, State bill.

It goes without saying that the Commerce, Justice bill has no jurisdiction over the programs in the Treasury, Postal bill. This conference report passed the House 292 to 126, a broad bipartisan margin, and was signed by the President on September 29. Not even 3 weeks later, the Republicans undo the bipartisan agreement, one of the few bipartisan bills that this ridiculous process has produced.

I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report. Let us get serious about the budget process. Let us make the modifications to what is a good bill and reject this proposal.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), one of the more valued members in our subcommittee. He is also, incidentally, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies. I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking minority member and the outstanding work in crafting a very important legislative product.

With regard to our UN arrearages, this measure contains full funding for the payment of our UN arrearages over a

3-year period. I fully support that provision. It is our hope that this will soon be followed by an authorization measure for the so-called Helms-Biden UN arrears payments which our Committee on International Relations is working on rapidly.

I also commend the committee for providing substantial funding for the security of our embassies abroad, something that is sorely needed.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to support this conference report on H.R. 2670, and I urge the President to sign this measure.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly urge my colleagues to support this bill. We cover a diverse number of functions such as Federal law enforcement, trade negotiations, diplomatic functions, and Federal courts.

A couple of things I would highlight. First of all, we have increased funding for the United States Trade Representative. I think our Trade Ambassador Mrs. Barshefsky has done an excellent job and along with the Commerce Department and Secretary Daley. They have a big challenge ahead to represent the United States interest at the WTO meeting in Seattle in about 6 weeks. It is important that we have trade opening initiatives to get more exports of American products, and they are working hard at that.

Secondly, embassy safety, there was no money requested in the original budget from the administration. It is a very important function because of the proliferation of terrorists. We recognize this fact and put substantial amounts in this bill to upgrade the safety programs at our embassies around the world.

Thirdly, the bill continues funding for the manufacturing extension program in small business development, again programs that are very important to our economy because probably 70 percent or more of the jobs in our economy are from small business development. We need to encourage and enhance the opportunities in small business.

□ 1315

Fourthly, the JASON program is a very innovative program that is funded in this bill. It basically is the electronic school bus. This is a program whereby students can go, as they have, to the rain forest, they can go to the bottom of Monterey Bay, they can go to the National Park at Yellowstone, and next year I think they will go into space all by the electronic bus.

Under the JASON program, for the schools that are wired properly, they can have two-way conversations between the students and the people and the locations I have mentioned. Very innovative. It is the future in education, and I am pleased that we could do that. It is long-distance learning at its best.

I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 2000 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations conference report. This is a good and balanced

bill that was put together under tight funding restraints.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill which contains many diverse functions from federal law enforcement programs, to trade negotiation and enforcement programs, to diplomatic functions, to the funding of our federal courts.

I will highlight just three areas that are of importance to the people of Ohio.

This bill provides funding levels that are necessary to continue the important work of opening new markets for U.S. goods and of protecting our domestic industries against unfair foreign trading practices.

The United States Trade Representative's Office received a much-needed increase of over \$1 million to continue the work of that our trading partners reciprocate and opening their markets in the same manner as the U.S., which remains the most open market of the world.

The important trade functions that reside in the Commerce Department to promote our exports abroad and to protect domestic industries are also provided adequate funding levels.

The bill continues funding for the Manufacturing Extension Program and the Small Business Development Centers, both programs which are critical to small businesses as they modernize and prepare to compete in the global marketplace.

Finally, the bill funds two innovative programs. The first provides an additional \$2 million to the JASON Program which makes available to over 3 million students the good work that is occurring in the Commerce Department with regard to oceans and ocean research. The JASON Program is an exciting interactive education program which I call the "electronic school bus" because after a year of studying a science curriculum, students participate in an expedition via interactive telecommunications means. This program represents the future of our education system.

The bill also funds the National Inventors Hall of Fame at \$3.6 million to continue the partnership with the U.S. Patent and Trade Office to highlight to the public the importance of our national patent system. This system is critical for the U.S. in maintaining its preeminent position with the world with regard to development of technology.

This is a fair bill that funds many critical federal functions and I urge your support for it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to pick up on something the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON) said in support of the conference report. He did say he was unhappy and perhaps questioned the way that the census was being funded, but he emphasized the fact that the important aspect was that the census was being fully funded. And I have to tell my colleagues that for the many people that I deal with on the House floor on a daily basis, that is a very important issue.

I personally have a great deal to look forward to in this census. I represent the most undercounted district in the Nation. My district was undercounted by a very large number of people in terms of what we thought we should have, not to mention what I consider

the hidden undercount, which is people that have a difficult time just coming forward and allowing themselves to be counted. So I have the undercount, and then there is that other problem.

To me, the census is crucial. And to the city and the county that I represent, the Bronx, New York, a census count is perhaps at the center of how we look at our future and what we can do to better our condition. Of particular importance for me is the idea of being able to spend dollars on a census that will go beyond certain limits imposed in the past to reach out to people, such as advertising in languages other than English. This is very important to me, to be able to reach people and to send a message out that not only is it a constitutional mandate for us to conduct it, but perhaps it is a constitutional responsibility for them to participate in it.

So I cannot emphasize enough the importance to me of the fact that after a very difficult time in the past, we were able to reach agreement in a proper way on the census issue. So I cannot say enough as to how important that is and how important that is, in my opinion, for my community, for my State, and for the future of this country.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), who is the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Census of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and it is a pleasure to serve my first year on this particular subcommittee. I get to wear two hats with respect to the census, and that is as a member of the subcommittee that funds it, but also as the chairman of the authorizing committee.

This is a good bill that has lots of really great programs in it, from the JASON project, to the law enforcement and embassy security issues. But with respect to the census, there have been a couple of questions raised.

First of all, is it an emergency. I think we would all have preferred it not to have been classified as an emergency. But, unfortunately, it was not included in the original budget agreement in 1997, and this was the only way to really include it without taking it from somewhere else and to provide the full \$4.5 billion, which is a very large amount, obviously. Now, this is for this one year.

Next year there will be a cost to the census, but it will not be anything near what we are spending this time around. And this Congress and previous Congresses have always fully funded the census. In fact, we have gone beyond the President's request. We have put in emergency spending bills, and the money has always been there.

The question has been raised about this issue of frameworks. And the frameworks idea is that of the \$4.5 billion there are classifications. These are

the exact classifications as requested by the Census Bureau. So it is their numbers. It has nothing to do with a sampling fight or anything else; it is just their numbers that are put in these classifications. The question is how to shift it back and forth.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has given us his assurances that he will act within 72 hours. I will do everything I can to help support and provide for that type of ability to move around the money. Most of the money is in one program, which is \$3.5 billion alone. Where we got into this problem is, and we have had it in report language in the past, but the Census Bureau's management finance people have ignored that, and we have an oversight responsibility. We do have a responsibility to make sure this \$4.5 billion is spent according to the law.

So I think this is very reasonable, to say we want to know how money is being shifted around. That is common sense. This is amazing. When they sent us the request for the \$4.5 billion, we got 10 pages of information to document that. Ten pages. Normally we get thousands of pages of documentation to show why we need to spend that money. So I think we have gone beyond what would be good common sense because of the fact that we have that.

GAO is also raising questions, so I think it is important we stick with this. This is not an unreasonable request. It is common in other departments of the Government, and I am really pleased that the census is fully funded, and I fully support this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on all three sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has 9 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has 8½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I find this a very strange debate. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and I, for instance, agree on about 90 percent of the issues before this place, and yet today we find ourselves on the opposite side of this bill, and I think we need to ask why. The reason is very simple, in my view.

The Republican majority in this House decided that they were going to spend \$7 billion to \$10 billion more on the Pentagon budget than the President and the Pentagon had asked for. The Republican majority has decided now, in the Labor, Health, and Education budget, to fund a program level which is \$2.2 billion above the President. They did that at the same time managing not to fund his education and health and job training priorities. The VA-HUD bill wound up being several billion dollars above the President. The agriculture bill wound up

being about \$8 billion above the President. The military construction bill wound up being a good amount of money above the President.

So the issue today is not whether we on the Democratic side want to spend more money. The issue is simply whether we are going to agree to the labeling of different kinds and categories of spending that the majority party would like so that we can fit it all into the TV ads of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY). That is what the issue is.

Now, the Committee on Appropriations, if left to its own devices, could come up with compromises on all of these bills by next Tuesday. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) knows that, I know that, and I think the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) knows that. We have always been able to resolve appropriations differences between us. But the problem is that we are also now being asked to do something very different. We are being asked to invent a new system of accounting in order to fit into the TV ads of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

So I would simply say this, our Republican friends cannot seem to take back even one dime of the spending that they have already voted for. Example: NIH. I happen to be a strong supporter of NIH. But the House bill for NIH contained \$1.4 billion. The Senate bill contained \$1.7 billion. We are supposed to resolve those differences by coming in somewhere in the middle. The conference at this point is now at \$2 billion for NIH.

I would submit if our Republican friends cannot compromise on money which they have already spent, if they cannot, for instance, agree to give back the billion dollars that the Pentagon did not want, that they put in the military budget anyway for the ship that the Senate majority leader wanted, if they cannot give back some of that money, then we are going to have to put some additional money into the remaining bills. But we will agree to pay for it, just as the administration found the offsets to pay for the increases that they wanted in the VA-HUD bill.

So the question today is not whether we are talking about the Democrats' demand to spend more money. And the question today is not whether or not Democrats are going to be spending Social Security money. The question is how much of Social Security money has the Republican majority in this Congress already committed us to spend.

And the question is how do we deal with those issues in an honest way, rather than conducting what Time magazine referred to as "A \$150 billion shell game" where they said "This debate over Social Security surplus is more about politics than it is money."

To me, it comes down to a simple question of honesty. And when we get enough of it, we will get an agreement between both sides; and until we do, we will not.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, and also a very hard working member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I do rise in strong support of this conference report. I want to commend both the chairman and the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), for the work that they have done. I think they bent over backwards to provide fairness and equity for the competing interests that we find in this bill.

Obviously, not everything that I would like is in here. Some things that are in here I would perhaps prefer not be in here. But it is a good bill, and I think it is a good balance. And I think it does a good job of providing funding for the diverse range of programs that we find in this bill.

Now, I am a representative of a border State, so I care a lot about border problems and funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This bill provides \$3 billion for direct funding of the INS. That is \$460 million more than last year. Very importantly, it provides full funding so that we can add another 1,000 agents. That is a commitment that we made as part of the immigration legislation that we passed a few years ago. It is very important if we are going to get a handle on the problem of illegal immigration along our border.

We also have funding in there for increased detention of criminal and illegal aliens, and adequate funding to reduce the naturalization backlog. These are issues that those of us who live along the border deal with every single day, and that is why they are so important.

I also want to congratulate the subcommittee for making other parts of law enforcement a priority; the flexibility that this bill gives to law enforcement at the local level. It restores the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant; the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant; the Truth-in-Sentencing State Prison Grants; the Byrne Law Enforcement Grants. It fully funds the FBI and Violence Against Women Act. Overall, for local law enforcement, there is \$1.4 billion more in this bill than we have had before.

Much was made on the floor about the census. That issue, too, is important to us. We have heard about the U.N. arrearages, but the money is in here to fully fund the U.N. arrearages, subject to an authorization bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is one that is carefully balanced, not perfect, but carefully balanced, does what it is supposed to do in terms of meeting our priorities; and I urge support for this legislation.

□ 1330

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the very distinguished and very able chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I think we are in the middle of a very interesting discussion. We all agree that we need better law enforcement and we think the practice of community policing is a very effective way to fight crime.

Well, what we are arguing about is the subject of flexibility and the efficiency, the efficacy of the 100,000 cops promised. That has a nice ring to it. Those are nice round figures. But the fact is, with less than a year to go in the existing program, less than half of the 100,000 cops we were promised have been hired and some of them are not engaged in active police work but only in ancillary administrative tasks.

We think an appropriate way to do this is not to cut the money but to provide flexibility, some ability to go elsewhere than simply hiring cops. A community may have adequate policemen but may lack radio equipment, squad cars, other law enforcement equipment that helps them do the job.

We are simply trying to provide adequate funding to hire the cops where they are needed and when necessary but also to have flexibility for other programs that help law enforcement.

This is not a policemen's benefit bill. This is law enforcement, safe streets, safer communities. And that means some flexibility in where this money can go. That is an intelligent, useful way to handle this appropriation.

There is new spending for COPS, \$325 million in new spending, which is \$57 million dollars more than the amount that the Democratically controlled Congress authorized for this program when it was put into law. So there are unused monies. There is \$250 million unused from prior years which is available only for the COPS program.

No, this is intelligent. This will help the big problem of law enforcement. I urge its support.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime.

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman for the product he has brought out here today overall in the crime area. I think it is a good piece of legislation and it appropriates money in the right way.

The debate today, in large measure, is over flexibility, that is, over who gets to make the decisions on where to fight crime. Most of us on this side of the aisle believe that those who are on the beat, the cops on the street, the local county police, the local county

commissioners, the city commissioners, are the ones that ought to be making these decisions. We have for years supported law enforcement block grant programs that sends the money back to the local communities to make those decisions on how to best fight crime.

The President, in his request, never has requested in this cycle funding for this program that has been very effective over the last few years. And so, I think that putting all of this in context it is important to see how this legislation proceeds.

There is \$1.25 billion, a little over that, that was asked by the President for his COPS program. There is over \$1.25 billion going to local law enforcement in this bill. It is just that about half of that is going to this program we have always thought was a great program to have, and that is a program of law enforcement block grants to let the cities and the counties and the local police decide exactly how they are going to spend this money in fighting crime, whether that is for a new jail facility, or whether that is for more cops, or whether that is for more technical equipment, or whether that is for more training, or whatever it might be. It is very important to know that that is the case.

With regard to the COPS program, the issue there is that there is actual money in here for the COPS program, \$325 million in new spending in the COPS program in this bill. I think that is really significant in addition to the \$250 million already there that has not been spent in the past.

And then there is a problem in the COPS program of it not being distributed in the right way. A lot of it has not gone to the localities that really need it. Many of the localities are telling us, and we are going to have an oversight hearing in our Subcommittee on Crime this next week, that they are not getting these COPS monies and they are in need of some of it.

Others are saying we can apply for this but then we do not have any funding that goes on beyond the couple of years and we cannot afford it.

So the COPS program has its problems this bill balances, and I think it is a very important approach that the chairman has drafted here.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I think this is probably a good conference report, but I really want to take issue with my colleagues on the block granting to local law enforcement.

I was in local law enforcement, local board of supervisors, when we had the revenue sharing program. I will tell my colleagues that a lot of these cities and counties just misuse these funds. They did not put them into the programs that are really trying to fight crimes.

I think it is unfortunate that the demand out there is in issues like drug

courts. And this was level funded for drug courts. That is where we need these monies. Just to go out and buy more equipment, more fancy stuff to spruce up, that ought to be the object of local government. The big salary costs are where we can really help.

I think that the grants program is not the way to end crime in America. The way to do it is to pour more people, more personnel where the problem is. I wish the committee would put more into that effort and certainly more into the drug courts program.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say to my colleagues here today, if they feel good about the fact that, under this bill, the United States, the greatest Nation in the world, will lose the right to cast a vote in the United Nations, then, by all means, vote for this bill. If they feel good about denying women who work for the Federal Government access to a full range of contraceptive services, then, by all means, vote for this bill. If they feel good about providing an exemption to the Endangered Species Act for the State of Alaska, then, by all means, vote for this bill. If they feel good about slashing the President's Cops on the Beat program, then, by all means, vote for this bill.

I know that the other side will bring in all kinds of whistles and bells and try to suggest that they have funded the President's program adequately. The President does not believe that, which is why, among other reasons, he is going to veto this bill.

And most of all I would say, if they believe the fantasy of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) about Social Security, then, by all means, vote for this bill. But keep in mind, when they do that, they will make it more difficult, not easier, for us to resolve the remaining differences between us and they will simply extend the fantasy debate which has plagued Washington for the past 3 years on budgeting.

We have seen all kinds of arguments made for all kinds of appropriation bills that have come through this House so far, most of which I have voted against. I would simply say, if they feel good about voting for a bill which will contribute to the ability of this Congress to hide almost \$40 billion in spending that it is actually making through gimmicks such as so-called advance appropriations or mislabeled emergencies and the like, then, by all means, vote for the bill.

I have come quite accustomed to hearing fantasy spoken on the House floor. I guess one day more will not surprise me. We will hear a lot of fantasy expressed when I sit down; and, under the rules of the House, I will not be able to answer because the other side has the right to close.

Just because they have the right to repeat fallacious arguments one more time unanswered does not mean those arguments are true. I think a lot of Members understand that, which is why this bill is going to be vetoed by the President and that veto will be sustained.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has 7½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, as my ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, I find myself in a unique and somewhat, if not very much, uncomfortable situation in that I support this conference report and my ranking member, who I respect very much, does not.

I suspect when the vote is taken, it will get pretty lonely in this seat right here, as most Members of my party will probably not support this conference report. But I would like to take a few minutes to explain a couple of reasons why I do that.

First of all, I do it honestly and sincerely because I believe that the negotiations that I was involved in and my staff were involved in made this bill a much better bill than the bill that left the House. I do it with the full understanding, as I said before, that there are still problems with the bill and some are very serious.

But I also do it for another reason and a reason that very few people, if ever, mention on the House floor when it comes to discussing a bill; and that is my desire to continue to create a working atmosphere both for myself, for the subcommittee that I participate in, and perhaps for this House that goes back to a time when the bitterness was not here the way it is these days and when people could work together.

We live in a society where sometimes people from different parts of this country and from different backgrounds find it very hard to get along with each other. Perhaps if they were to be a reporter writing about the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from the Bronx, New York (Mr. SERRANO), previously from Puerto Rico, one could say there is a fine example of two people that would have a hard time working together.

It turns out to be just the opposite, that we have worked together to try to make a better bill is a fact. That we have accomplished some things is a fact. That we still disagree on some very serious points is a fact. That I believe that the philosophy between his party and mine are totally different and that I believe ours is correct and his is not, that is a fact. But to me the idea of establishing this relationship and working to make life for people in this country better on a daily basis is

important for me enough to stand here in support of a conference report today that may not be supported by many on my side. But I do it, and I repeat it again, with the hope and thought that it is part of a larger picture.

But I know some will say, oh, what a naive ranking member to think that if we are nice to people and work with them they will respond. Well, sometimes it works. Sometimes if we respond properly, people respond to us.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is important to me to say this at this moment. I want to say how much I admire and respect the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) for taking the position that he is taking.

□ 1345

It is not easy, I know, the position that he is taking. It takes a lot of courage. It takes a lot of determination, it takes lot of perseverance and it takes a lot of plain old guts. That is what I like about the gentleman. I also like the fact that he is so easy to work with and he is also very effective.

We have mentioned some of the things in this conference report that the gentleman has been responsible for getting included since the bill passed the House and it is substantial, matters of great import not only to him but to the country. I mention briefly the SBA increases which is due solely to the gentleman's insistence, but there are many others. And so this political odd couple that he has alluded to, the gentleman from New York, this gentleman from Kentucky, sometimes we have difficulty understanding what each other is saying, but that is beside the point. I wish we had a major league baseball team in Kentucky so that I could be on an equal footing with the gentleman. He has been a model to work with. I would only say this: If others on that side of the aisle would have the good sense and the wisdom that the gentleman has exhibited during this process, we would have much better bills across the board and we would not be at standoffs. The gentleman has been a wonderful example of being the creative minority leader. I appreciate him very much.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman. Just to cover my tracks, let me say that if other Members on his side were as courteous as he is, we could have a better working relationship, also, as parties.

Let me just close, Mr. Speaker, by saying from everything I am reading in today's papers and hearing on radio, the leaders in this House will get together with the White House this weekend, and as I said and I will say it for the third time, before the Yankees win the World Series, this will be in place.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that they listen to the fact that we tried to give them

a better bill than left this House and when they make it better, they at least turn to the gentleman from Kentucky and say, "Well, it wasn't all in vain."

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

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

I wanted just to say a word of thanks not only to the gentleman from New York and the members of the subcommittee who have worked so hard on this but most importantly I think our staffs. They are here in the room at this time and we would not be here without them. They do the work, they stay up all night, they read these bills by the thousands of pages, and we get up and take credit for it. It is really the staff that did the work. We say thank you to our staff. And, of course, to our distinguished chairman the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for his great work in helping us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. I think fighting crime is serious business and this legislation works to make America safer. I want to commend the two gentlemen, the ranking member and the chairman, for working together in the manner that the process is supposed to work, in working together, fashioning a bill and bringing it down without any politics involved.

Among many other provisions in this bill, there are very strong commitments to local law enforcement, juvenile crime prevention, the Drug Enforcement Agency and truth-in-sentencing programs. Important priorities are funded and the entire package keeps the budget in balance and does not spend a dime of the Social Security surplus.

This is a good bill. But it does not silence the critics of common sense who want to increase spending on everything. No matter how much funding we provide in this bill, there are always screams from the left that too much is not enough. This sophistry coming from the other side of the aisle must come to an end. The Democrats go on and on with a line of reasoning and they do not stop for anything except the truth as revealed by the facts and the bills that we are actually passing. They refer to press reports as if press are the gospel, as if you read something in the press and it is true. I have found the Washington press have yet to get it right. They use assumptions on spending that we are not doing and claim that we are spending the Social Security surplus. They say that they want more spending and they are willing to pay for it by making the tough choices. Well, that is the old shell game of tax and spend. When they say tough choices, that means increased

taxes and they want more spending and they will pay for it with increased taxes.

When the Democrats were in control, they spent every dime of the Social Security surplus on government programs for over 40 years. When the Democrats were in control of this place, they never passed a balanced budget. Yet we are to believe all their Washington press reports and their specious figures.

This is not a fantasy debate. A balanced budget for 2 years in a row is not a fantasy. Paying down the debt now for 3 years in a row is not a fantasy. Locking up the Social Security surplus for 2 years in a row is not a fantasy. It is very real. The problem is their arguments are all wrong despite the evidence to the contrary.

They maintain that the Republican budget plan is irresponsible. Actually the opposite is true. I think it is very responsible to balance the budget without raiding Social Security and increasing taxes. The Democrats cannot make such claims, so they attack the budget with specious arguments. The trend is clear. We pass bills and the President vetoes them because he wants more spending. But there are only three ways to maintain a balanced budget and pay for the President's big spending programs. We are not going to raid Social Security, we are not going to raise taxes, so he will have to find cuts in the budget to spend more money. That is what we are doing.

Vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on H.R. 2670, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Act of 1999 conference report. This bill contains funding for the Department of Commerce's (DOC) Science and Technology programs.

In May of this year, the Committee on Science passed H.R. 1552, the Marine Research and Related Environmental Research and Development Programs Authorization Act of 1999, and H.R. 1553, the National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999. H.R. 1553 subsequently passed the House on May 19th and awaits Senate action.

In H.R. 2670, NOAA is funded at \$2.3 billion. Within this amount, the National Weather Service (NWS) is funded at \$604 million, which is a \$43 million increase over the FY 1999 enacted level. This level is \$13 million below the authorization in H.R. 1553 of \$617.9 million, however, I believe it will provide adequate resources for the NWS. It is NOAA's highest duty to protect our citizens' life and property from severe weather and this amount is sufficient for NWS to finish its modernization and deploy critical weather observation systems. I also am pleased that the appropriators kept the Award Weather Interactive Processing Systems (AWIPS) cost-cap of 1996. This cap will protect taxpayers from unnecessary cost overruns.

This bill funds the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at NOAA at a level of \$300.2 million which is \$18 million over the President's request. This amount is also \$16 million over the total authorizations in H.R. 1552 and H.R. 1553.

The National Sea Grant College Program is funded at \$59.2 million. This is \$7.7 million above the President's request. I am pleased that this total includes money for zebra mussel research. Sea Grant's cost-sharing approach with states provides a good bang for the research buck and is a good way to stretch scarce research dollars.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the conferees decided to include funding for a new Fisheries Research Vessel. The Commerce Inspector General and the Government Accounting Office have pointed out time and time again the need for outsourcing NOAA fleet operations. While NOAA is making some progress in the oceanographic and hydrographic outsourcing areas, there is little to no progress in the fisheries research area. In H.R. 1552, the Marine Research and Related Environmental Research and Development Programs Authorization Act of 1999, the Committee on Science directed NOAA to transfer resources to NSF to avoid having the taxpayer foot the bill for a new NOAA vessel. I urge NOAA to follow the recommendations of the Commerce I.G. and GAO and contract for vessel time instead of building new ships.

H.R. 2670 also funds the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) at \$639 million for FY 2000. This amount is \$99 million below the President's request and \$8 million below the FY 1999 enacted amount.

First, I want to remind my colleagues that last year we appropriated \$197.5 million for the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) program. We were recently informed by the Commerce Department that the ATP program would carryover \$69 million of this total. Once carryover from previous years is considered, ATP spent less than \$190 million in FY 1999. This bill includes \$142 million in new appropriations for ATP. With the 1999 carryover, ATP will have \$211 million for FY 2000. I see no reason to increase the money available for ATP when the program could not efficiently and effectively use its FY 1999 appropriation.

The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) at NIST is funded at a level of \$104.8 million or \$5 million over the President's request.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the construction account at NIST is funded at \$108.4 million for FY 2000. After deducting a modest amount to maintain NIST facilities in Colorado and Maryland, I am optimistic that enough funds will remain to start construction of the Advanced Measurements Laboratory (AML). AML is necessary due to the precise measurements required for establishing standards associated with today's increasingly complex technologies. It is my hope that the additional funding that has resulted from this conference will enable NIST to begin construction of AML in FY 2000.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2670. It includes sufficiency language removing the taking of listed salmon in Alaska from the Endangered Species Act (ESA). A wholesale waiver from ESA is unacceptable for any state because it undermines the purpose of the Act and for this reason alone it will probably draw a Presidential veto.

This bill is also inadequate in its funding of our nation's ocean research, fisheries and conservation needs. The observers' program received no increase in funding; marine sanctuaries are funded \$10 million below the President's request; fisheries habitat restoration

was zeroed out—that's \$23 million below the President's budget. Now is not the time to be neglecting the oceans or reducing our commitment to understanding their processes. Not now, when we have disasters occurring around the country and we do not understand the causes nor can we suggest solutions.

In Alaska, Stellar Sea Lions continue to decline despite decreased interference with the pollack fishery and we don't know why. The Bering Sea ecosystem has changed in some way resulting in the deaths of 10 percent of the Gray Whale population, but we don't understand what the changes in the ecosystem are that have led to this.

On Long Island Sound, lobster men and women began reporting dead lobsters last month. From 8 percent to 13 percent of the lobsters caught in traps are dead or dying, and a total of as many as a million lobsters may have died. Although die-offs have occurred in other years, this appears to be the worst in nearly a decade. Why are the lobster dying? No one knows.

Runoff from Hurricane Floyd has resulted in a 350 square mile dead zone off of Pamlico Sound, North Carolina and no one has any idea what the lasting effects will be. In the Gulf of Mexico, we have a dead zone the size of the state of New Jersey. Some say this is the result of nutrient runoff, but no one really knows. We have insufficient funds to study this disaster.

In the Northeast, the groundfish population declines while the Canadian seal herd population climbs. Is there a relationship? We don't know because there are no funds to study the factors decimating the groundfish population in New England. In my own district the Pacific Fishery Management Council is about to reduce the catch for my fishermen by 75 percent because of overfishing. However, there is a dispute between the fishermen and scientists on whether or not management decisions are based on data collected from the right fish populations. No one really knows for sure because fishery management studies are underfunded.

In Florida we have 3 toxic, deadly, and unexplainable red tides. Red tides have become much more common in the last decade, but we do not know what causes them.

Mr. Speaker, we do know that the sea drives climate and weather, regulates and stabilizes the planet's temperature, generates more than 70 percent of the oxygen in the atmosphere, absorbs much of the carbon dioxide that is generated, and otherwise shapes planetary chemistry. We also know that ocean community is in crisis. Therefore, I must oppose this bill that places our oceans as such a low priority.

Equally as troubling as the shortfall in funding for our oceans, is lack of adequate funding for the COPS program. It is unconscionable that this year's federal budget contains only \$325 million for the COPS program.

COPS has awarded state and local law enforcement agencies with nearly \$6 billion to fund hiring and redeployment of more than 100,000 officers. I have heard repeatedly from local law enforcement officials on the Central Coast that the need for continued robust federal funding for the COPS program is critical to help them continue highly successful crime-fighting initiatives. But providing Central Coast residents with safe communities requires resources beyond local capabilities.

Several of my communities have been awarded special COPS grants including the Youth Firearms Violence Initiative and the Community Policing to Combating Domestic Violence. These programs have helped local law enforcement officials implement highly effective community policing strategies to target specific problems, neighborhoods and crimes. If all politics is local, certainly all crime is local.

Crime doesn't wear a political button identifying party affiliation. Republican conferees shouldn't be playing politics with highly effective anti-crime programs.

Furthermore, conferees shouldn't be playing politics with arreage funds. The United States currently owes more than \$1 billion in unpaid dues to the United Nations—giving our country the dubious distinction of being the single largest debtor nation to the U.N. Tying those funds to an authorization bill that hasn't been signed into law since 1994 is a sham.

The United Nations provides educational and economic assistance to people around the world, working to reduce hunger and malnutrition, improve education, and provide assistance to refugees. In short, the role of the U.N. in world affairs is critical and invaluable, and our unwillingness to contribute our fair share to the U.N. threatens the health, welfare, and security of our country and others.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill and demand that conferees address these issues that affect our national security, safety and environmental health.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the conference report on H.R. 2670, the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act of 1999. The funding cuts for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), fund usage restriction on the U.S. Census Bureau, and failure to include the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, make this bill unacceptable.

COPS has helped make America safe. Crime rates have dropped dramatically since the program's inception. Texas alone has received funding totaling more than \$300 million, placing almost 5,000 additional law enforcement officers on our streets to protect neighborhoods, schools and businesses. My district has received more than \$15 million in COPS funding, allowing local police and sheriff's departments to add 238 officers. I am a strong believer in this hallmark program which has been a substantial investment in the security of schools, cities, counties and states across the country.

After more than two years of negotiations, a Supreme Court decision, and a final budget agreement on the 2000 census, I was disappointed to hear of the undue "frameworks" restriction on census funding. Congress should not continue to micro-manage an institution that has historically remained independent in discharging its constitutional duty. I cannot support this language and believe the Census Bureau's objections to it are well-founded.

Finally, as a co-sponsor of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, I am disappointed that the conference report does not include this language. In light of recent incidents involving hate motivated killings across America, we in Congress need to send a strong signal that federal law will add a level of protection to currently unprotected classes while posing a deterrent to those who would use physical violence to further their prejudiced passions.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation and work with the Administration in fashioning acceptable levels of funding for COPS, removing restrictive language on the Census, and including language which would further punish those who commit crimes of hate.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill before us today. I wish to express my appreciation for the efforts of the Ranking Member, Mr. SERRANO, and Chairman ROGERS in working with members thus far. I want to stress that this is not a perfect bill. There is still much work to be done. However, I will be voting for the bill to express my optimism that those concerns will be addressed, as many others have been throughout this process. It is my hope that the final version of this bill will illustrate the bi-partisan manner that the Chairman and Ranking Member have stressed all along.

I am particularly pleased that \$1.5 million is allocated for construction of a plant studies research laboratory at the New York Botanical Garden. The Garden is recognized as the premier institution in botanical research in the United States. Funding this new facility ensures that the Garden will enhance its pre-eminent status and continue to attract scientists and scholars from around the world. It is my sincere hope that continued research at the Garden will improve public health, generate economic growth, and secure our place as the world leader in plant research.

Mr. Speaker, as I vote in favor of the CJS Appropriations bill today, I am confident that the continued efforts of the Chairman and the Ranking Member will result in overwhelming support for this legislation.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to the FY 2000 Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Conference Report. I opposed H.R. 2670 because it lacked sufficient funding for several essential federal programs, and I once again must oppose the conference report because it fails to address the vital funding shortfalls identified in the House bill.

More than 200 years ago our founding fathers provided within the Constitution a framework for a national census to be conducted every ten years. Unfortunately, language contained in the conference report places unnecessary restrictions that will ultimately obstruct the Census Bureau's ability to conduct a complete and accurate census. While the conference report provides \$4.47 billion for the Census Bureau, it contains language that restricts the Bureau's management of these funds. This language would require congressional approval in the form of a reprogramming for any movement of funds between decennial program components. Counting every man, woman, and child within the United States requires a tremendous amount of effort, support, and resources. This represents a dramatic departure from past practices and takes place at precisely the time when Census 2000 activities peak and when the need for program flexibility is most crucial to ensure a successful count.

With respect to the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), the conference report provides \$3 billion, \$26 million below the Administration's request. INS must receive adequate funding if it is to be successful in providing enhanced border patrols, reducing its enormous backlog and maintaining its current

applications. The \$26 million shortfall will hurt the INS in its efforts to become more effective and efficient.

Another area of insufficient funding can be found within the Advanced Technology Program (ATP) conducted by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). The ATP was established in 1988 to encourage companies to take greater risks in new and innovative basic research technologies. Successfully partnering public and private businesses working together to develop technology in all areas, over 700 organizations in 40 states including 104 joint ventures have a role in ATP projects. Last year's appropriation levels provided \$197.5 million for ATP. This year the Administration requested \$238.7 million, of which \$137.6 million would continue to fund existing projects. However, the conference report provides only \$142 million, barely enough to keep existing programs alive. The ATP is a catalyst for industries to develop and invest in high-risk technologies. Without this important program, individual companies will be less inclined to pursue these technological developments.

Additionally, international programs within the State Department are abhorrently underfunded. Only \$885.2 million is provided for contributions to international organizations. Not only is this funding level \$78 million below the President's request, but it is also \$37 million below last year's appropriation levels. Due to the unforeseen breakout of conflicts in Kosovo, and more recently in East Timor, the United States directed large amounts of federal funds toward restoring and maintaining peace in these regions. In order to continue our efforts to preserve peace and promote human rights and democratic principles throughout the world, we must sufficiently support our men and women who are acting as peacekeepers. Much to my dismay, this report provides only \$200 million for contributions to international peacekeeping efforts, nearly \$35 million below the Administration's request and \$31 million less than FY99.

Adding insult to injury, this report fails to adequately address U.S. payments to the United Nations (UN). Currently, the United States owes over \$1 billion in back dues to the UN. In recent years, \$508 million has been provided to address this issue, but these funds have not gone to the UN because the funds are connected to controversial family planning legislation. According to Article 19 of the UN Charter, if we fail to pay at least \$153 million, we will automatically lose our vote in the UN General Assembly. Unfortunately, the \$351 million for UN arrearage payments provided in this report is contingent upon passage of possibly contentious legislation. By holding these funds hostage, we are playing a dangerous game with a highly respected international organization, and we are losing face, force, and credibility within the international community.

I also have deep reservations regarding the funding that is contained in the conference report for programs under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. The conference report significantly limits the ability of law enforcement officials to enforce and maintain a safe and secure environment. I am disappointed by the drastic reduction in funding for the Community Oriented Policing Initiative (COPS), in which only \$325 million of the \$1.275 billion that the President requested was provided for the program. These funds were to have been

used to extend the COPS Initiative and allow local police departments to hire up to an additional 50,000 police officers over the next few years. Such a significant reduction in funding threatens to undermine the efficacy of the COPS Initiative, which has been a major contributor to the dramatic drop in the crime rate since 1994 and has resulted in the hiring of an additional 100,000 police officers nationwide.

Lastly, the conference report fails to include the Hate Crimes Prevention Act, a measure of which I am a cosponsor. Though included in the Senate-passed version of the bill, this language is not contained in the conference report. The Hate Crimes legislation strengthens the current federal hate crimes statute by making it easier to prosecute crimes based on race, color, religion, and national origin. The measure also expands coverage to include hate crimes based on sexual orientation, gender and disability. By failing to include this legislation, I believe Congress is missing an opportunity to strengthen the current hate crime statute.

Mr. Speaker, I am frustrated and disappointed that many of these valuable and essential programs were not adequately funded in this conference report and urge my colleagues to oppose final passage. If this report passes, I urge the President to veto this legislation so that we may have another opportunity to correct this seriously flawed bill.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Conference Report for FY 2000. I continue to have reservations about this legislation some of which led me to oppose the initial bill presented to the House. I understand the strong opposition the bill may encounter, as well as the President's anticipated veto of the conference report in its current form. However, the legislation before us is greatly improved and Chairman ROGERS, under very difficult conditions, has made his best efforts to accommodate the needs of the minority on the subcommittee.

I want to thank Chairman ROGERS; our ranking member, Mr. SERRANO; and their capable staffs for their hard work in bringing this conference report to the floor. This is a bill that is problematic in the best of circumstances; the current circumstances—where spending constraints, budget gamesmanship and gimmickry, and political posturing have hampered the Appropriations Committee's ability to do its job—have made it much more contentious.

Let me highlight a few important provisions and positive additions to the legislation contained in this conference report.

I agree that the emergency designation for census funding is inappropriate. But I am relieved that we have fully funded the 2000 census and hope we can now all concentrate our efforts on obtaining the most accurate count possible.

The legislation provides \$585 million in funding for State criminal alien assistance—the same level as last year and \$85 million above the budget request. While we need to keep in mind that this level provides reimbursement for less than half of the costs that incarceration of criminal illegal aliens imposes on States and localities, the conference level is substantially above the \$100 million approved by the Senate.

The conference report includes \$287 million in funding for juvenile crime and delinquency prevention programs. These important pro-

grams help deter young people from becoming involved in criminal activity.

The conference report continues an important initiative to fight methamphetamine which is the fastest growing abused drug in our Nation. The legislation provides \$36 million in grants to States for this purpose, including \$18 million for the California Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement. Unfortunately, labs in my State continue to be major suppliers of this lethal drug.

The funding level for the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) has been greatly improved in conference, increasing from \$250 million in the House passed bill to \$300 million in the legislation before us. This will enable LSC to continue its support to local legal aid agencies which provide vital civil legal services for the poor—ensuring access to legal redress for all Americans.

Funding for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) has been increased to \$1.66 billion from the inadequate House passed level of \$1.475 billion—which was nearly \$300 million below the budget request. The extreme weather this Nation has experienced from the El Nino and La Nina events of recent years to this year's hurricanes underscores the importance of NOAA's work. In California, the agency's climate observation programs and coastal and marine stewardship are essential to our environment and economy.

The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice was underfunded in the House bill. The division's work is vital to safeguarding the interests of the American consumer and the fair operation of the market in our economy. The conference committee provides the division with \$110 million, a needed increase over the \$105 million passed by the House.

Some of my colleagues will raise serious, legitimate concerns about this conference report—many of which I share. I too am unsatisfied with several funding levels in this bill, as well as certain legislative provisions that were added in conference.

The conference report provides only \$325 million for the Cops on the Beat Program, \$950 million below the President's request. While this level is an improvement from the House bill, it is woefully inadequate. This program has enabled communities all across this Nation, including Los Angeles, to hire additional police officers which has contributed to the significant reduction in crime we now enjoy—seven consecutive years of reductions in crime, and the lowest murder rate since 1967. We should continue to build on this success by funding this program and providing more police officers, better policing technology, and hiring community prosecutors.

I also am disturbed by the funding levels in this conference report for the enforcement of our civil rights laws—particularly in light of many recent events.

This conference report reduces the funding passed by the House for the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department to \$72 million, \$10 million below the President's request. At a time when many of our communities are experiencing serious crises of confidence in law enforcement agencies, we should be fully funding an agency that can help restore that confidence. Recent police shootings in my congressional district, as well as in the ranking member's district, have undermined community trust in law enforcement. By providing

independent investigation into the pattern or practice of discrimination by law enforcement, the Civil Rights Division helps restore trust in communities like Los Angeles.

The conference report provides no increase for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which protects our civil rights in the workplace. The agency continues to reduce its backlog of cases, but needs and deserves Congressional support to enhance those efforts.

While funding levels for the programs of the Small Business Administration are increased, I continue to be concerned about the adequacy of the "salaries and expenses" account. We need to take care that the SBA's efforts to expand Small Business opportunities are not undermined by inadequate staffing levels.

Clearly, I wish that the bill before you addressed these and other unmet needs. I regret that the House and Senate could not reach out in a bipartisan fashion and embrace the hate crimes legislation contained in the Senate bill. I also regret the addition of a provision waiving the Endangered Species Act with respect to Alaskan salmon; the majority continues to use appropriations bills to thwart important environmental protections.

Notwithstanding these concerns, the conference report before you is a significant improvement over the version the House adopted in August. Based on those improvements and the importance of many of these programs to my community, my State, and the Nation, I choose to give it my support today.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my objections to the FY 2000 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Conference Report. The Conference Report before us today is deficient in two key areas: it lacks the Hate Crimes legislation that was included by the Senate version and it withholds payment of our financial obligations to the United Nations unless the State Department Authorization bill is first signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 is cosponsored by myself and 184 of my colleagues and has passed the Senate. It is disappointing that the Conferees receded to the House on this measure, when it enjoys such broad support and is so sorely needed.

Just a few weeks ago, our Country was shocked when a gunman entered a Jewish Community Center in Los Angeles shooting at innocent children. His intent "sending a message by killing Jews."

One year ago, in Laramie, Wyoming, a young man named Matthew Shepard was killed. The reason, because he was gay. Now, with the removal of the Hate Crimes provision by the Conferees on the anniversary of his brutal murder, it is a double tragedy for his family.

In Jasper, Texas, a man was murdered and dragged through the streets because he was African-American.

All of these incidents are Hate Crimes, and they do not just affect the group that was killed, they affect all Americans.

This is especially troubling to me because of the rash of anti-immigrant billboards and posters in my district, which falsely blame immigrants for societies problems. Having spent my entire life in Queens, I recognize the problems faced daily by minorities and strive to eliminate any form of discrimination still present in our society.

I believe the "Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999" is a constructive and measured re-

sponse to a problem that continues to plague our nation—violence motivated by prejudice. This legislation is also needed because many States lack comprehensive hate crimes laws.

Now, I know some people believe that hate is not an issue when prosecuting a crime. They say our laws already punish the criminal act and that our laws are strong enough.

I answer with the most recent figures from 1997, when 8,049 hate crimes were reported in the United States. And, according to the FBI, hate crimes are under reported, so the actual figure is much higher.

And I say to my colleagues, penalties for committing a murder are increased if the murder happens during the commission of a crime. Murdering a police officer is considered first degree murder, even if there was no premeditation. Committing armed robbery carries a higher punishment than petty larceny.

There are degrees to crime. And committing a crime against someone because of their race, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, ethnicity or other group should warrant a different penalty. These crimes are designed to send a message. We don't like your kind and here is what we are going to do about it.

So why can't we punish crimes motivated by hate differently than other crimes?

Mr. Speaker, this legislation does not punish free speech as some have contended. Nowhere does it say, you can't hold a certain political view or believe in a particular philosophy. What it does say, is that if you commit a violent act because of those beliefs, you will be punished.

Hate crimes laws are also constitutional. The U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in *Wisconsin v. Mitchell* unanimously upheld a Wisconsin statute which gave enhanced sentences to a defendant who intentionally selects a victim because of the person's race, religion, color, disability, sexual orientation, or nation of origin. Once again, I would like to express my disappointment and frustration at the actions of the Conferees for failing to include this provision.

Mr. Speaker, the second area of deficiency in this legislation is the provision withholding the U.S. payment of our financial obligations to the United Nations until the State Department Authorization bill is signed into law. I am both saddened and troubled by this provision because in all likelihood, this legislation will not be signed into law because of the continuing fight over linking the unrelated issue of family planning to our U.N. arrears payment.

For several years, critical funds earmarked for payment of America's debt to the U.N. have been linked to the unrelated issue of U.S. bilateral family planning programs.

These issues deserve to be considered on their own individual merits and should not be linked. Withholding money from the United Nations damages the financial viability of this essential institution. In addition, it jeopardizes our relations with even our closest allies, who are owed millions in peacekeeping reimbursements that have gone unpaid due to the financial shortfall at the U.N. created by the more than \$1 billion in U.S. debt. Our credibility has been damaged. We must stand by our legal responsibility and moral obligation to pay our outstanding debts to the U.N.

The U.N. plays an important role in the world today. Efforts to reduce infant mortality, immunize children, eradicate deadly diseases, protect innocent civilians in war torn nations,

and feed starving families serve to clearly demonstrate that supporting the United Nations saves lives.

I believe we should do everything we can to prevent and reduce the number of abortions. That is why I am committed to de-linking the Smith amendment policy from UN arrears. U.S. law already states that no money can be spent on abortions; this includes our overseas funding. And, neither the United Nations nor United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA, which provides voluntary family planning services to poor countries) provide abortion services of any kind, nor do they promote abortion as a method of family planning. UNFPA actually reduces the number of abortions by teaching women how to practice safe and effective birth control.

The Smith amendment policy is a prohibition on activities supported by USAID, not the United Nations. Put another way, the Smith amendment language relates to US-supported family planning activities in other countries, not the activities of the United Nations. There is no link whatsoever between the Smith amendment and the United Nations. This policy doesn't apply to the United Nations because, as I said, the UN does not promote or perform abortions. Nonetheless, some Members of the House have consistently linked it to the UN, creating the US debt to the UN of more than \$1 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of our UN arrears is a serious one. The United States has been quick to criticize the UN for a host of perceived failures. The slow response to the needs of refugees from Kosova, the failure to stop Slobodan Milosevic and paramilitaries in East Timor, and the list goes on. But what many fail to realize, is that for the UN to succeed in its endeavors, it takes the necessary resources.

By failing to pay our obligations, we limit the UN's ability to prevent the spread of violence. And in the end, this costs the U.S. more money. How much would we have saved if we didn't need to fight an air war in the Balkans? How much would we have saved if the UN had the resources to prevent the crisis in Bosnia? And how much money would we save if the UN had the resources to prevent future crises before they start? By not paying our obligation, we are costing the American taxpayer more in the long run.

Mr. Speaker, when we fail to pay our financial obligation to the United Nations, we are also hurting America's credibility. Many have made this statement, but what does it mean? It means that the US's ability to effectively influence international treaties and conferences is being negatively impacted. It means countries want us off the UN Budget Committee, where many of the US's criticisms about the UN are debated. And, even worse, it means the US is in danger of losing its vote in the General Assembly. There will be no vote on this, no one to sway or cajole, the UN charter is clear, members who do not meet their financial obligations for two years lose their vote. How can the US promote its agenda when we can't even vote on the outcome? Who will listen to us on such vital issues as gaining Israel admittance to the Western Europe and Other Group at the UN? Who will take our reform efforts seriously?

How would my colleagues feel if a deadbeat dad said our system of child support payments needed to be reformed? Well, that is how our

allies feel about us. We are the deadbeat dad at the UN. We helped create this organization. We helped instill it with democratic principles. We ensured our place on the Security Council where the most important UN decisions are made. And we have shut off our support. This must stop.

Mr. Speaker, I do not speak for myself alone on this, I speak for a vast majority of the American people. According to our best polling data, Americans support the United Nations. In fact, 73 percent of Americans support paying our UN dues and believe UN membership is beneficial to the US. This issue is too important to ignore and hope it will go away. As we debate this issue, UN employees are being killed, UN resources are dwindling and US credibility is melting away. It must stop and I am casting my vote against this Conference, like many of my colleagues, because it fails to live up to our international commitments.

Mr. Speaker, while the failure to include Hate Crimes legislation and the provision preventing US payment of our financial obligations are two key issues for my opposition to this Conference Report, I am also concerned about two other important provisions. First, the Conference Report under funds the COPS Initiative. The President had requested \$1.275 billion to extend the COPS program and effectively put 50,000 more police officers on the street. This Conference Report only includes \$325 million of that request.

Second, I am concerned about the provision limiting the ability of the Census to move funds around from one activity to another when they have problems during the Census. Such a provision is unprecedented and places in danger an accurate census count of every American. A number of my colleagues and I have been working very closely with Census Bureau Director D. Kenneth Prewitt to make the 2000 Census the most accurate one in history. To include language preventing an accurate Census breaks the pact the US Government has with the American people to ensure they receive the services and representation they are Constitutionally entitled to through an accurate census.

Mr. Speaker, the President has already indicated his intention to veto this legislation. I hope that when negotiations take place on this measure these important issues will be resolved favorably.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 213, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Biggart	Burr
Archer	Bilbray	Burton
Army	Bilirakis	Buyer
Bachus	Biley	Callahan
Baker	Blunt	Calvert
Ballenger	Boehlert	Campbell
Barrett (NE)	Boehner	Canady
Bartlett	Bonilla	Cannon
Barton	Bono	Castle
Bass	Boucher	Chambliss
Bateman	Brady (TX)	Coble
Bereuter	Bryant	Coburn

Collins	Hunter	Ramstad
Combest	Hutchinson	Regula
Cook	Hyde	Reynolds
Cooksey	Isakson	Riley
Cramer	Istook	Rogan
Crane	Jenkins	Rogers
Cubin	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Danner	Jones (NC)	Roukema
Davis (VA)	Kasich	Roybal-Allard
Deal	Kelly	Royce
DeLay	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
DeMint	Kingston	Ryun (KS)
Diaz-Balart	Knollenberg	Salmon
Dickey	Kolbe	Saxton
Dixon	Kuykendall	Serrano
Doolittle	LaHood	Sessions
Dreier	Largent	Shadegg
Duncan	Latham	Shaw
Dunn	LaTourette	Sherwood
Ehrlich	Lazio	Shimkus
Emerson	Leach	Shuster
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Skeen
Ewing	Linder	Smith (MI)
Fletcher	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Foley	Lucas (KY)	Smith (TX)
Fossella	Lucas (OK)	Souder
Fowler	Manzullo	Spence
Franks (NJ)	McCollum	Stearns
Frelinghuysen	McCrery	Stump
Galleghy	McInnis	Sununu
Ganske	McKeon	Sweeney
Gekas	Metcalf	Talent
Gibbons	Mica	Tancredo
Gilchrist	Miller (FL)	Tauzin
Gillmor	Miller, Gary	Taylor (NC)
Gilman	Mollohan	Terry
Goode	Moran (KS)	Thomas
Goodlatte	Morella	Thornberry
Goodling	Murtha	Thune
Goss	Myrick	Tiahrt
Graham	Nethercutt	Toomey
Granger	Ney	Trafficant
Green (WI)	Northup	Vitter
Greenwood	Norwood	Walden
Gutknecht	Nussle	Walsh
Hall (TX)	Ose	Wamp
Hansen	Oxley	Watkins
Hastert	Packard	Watts (OK)
Hastings (WA)	Pease	Weldon (FL)
Hayes	Peterson (PA)	Weldon (PA)
Hayworth	Petri	Weller
Herger	Pickering	Whitfield
Hilleary	Pitts	Wicker
Hobson	Pombo	Wilson
Hoekstra	Porter	Wolf
Horn	Portman	Young (AK)
Houghton	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)
Hulshof	Radanovich	

NAYS—213

Abercrombie	Costello	Hill (IN)
Ackerman	Coyne	Hill (MT)
Allen	Crowley	Hilliard
Andrews	Cummings	Hinchey
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hinojosa
Baldacci	Davis (IL)	Hoeffel
Baldwin	DeFazio	Holden
Barcia	DeGette	Holt
Barr	Delahunt	Hooley
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Hostettler
Becerra	Deutsch	Hoyer
Bentsen	Dicks	Inslee
Berkley	Dingell	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Berry	Dooley	(TX)
Bishop	Doyle	John
Blagojevich	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Jones (OH)
Bonior	English	Kanjorski
Borski	Eshoo	Kaptur
Boswell	Etheridge	Kennedy
Boyd	Evans	Kildee
Brady (PA)	Farr	Kilpatrick
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Kind (WI)
Brown (OH)	Filner	Kleccka
Capps	Forbes	Klink
Capuano	Ford	Kucinich
Carnahan	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Carson	Frost	Lampson
Chabot	Gejdenson	Lantos
Chenoweth-Hage	Gephardt	Larson
Clay	Gonzalez	Lee
Clayton	Gordon	Levin
Clement	Green (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Clyburn	Hall (OH)	Lipinski
Condit	Hastings (FL)	Lofgren
Conyers	Hefley	Lowey

Luther	Owens	Slaughter
Maloney (CT)	Pallone	Smith (WA)
Maloney (NY)	Pascrell	Snyder
Markey	Pastor	Spratt
Martinez	Paul	Stabenow
Mascara	Payne	Stark
Matsui	Pelosi	Stenholm
McCarthy (MO)	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
McCarthy (NY)	Phelps	Stupak
McDermott	Pickett	Tanner
McGovern	Pomeroy	Tauscher
McHugh	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
McIntosh	Quinn	Thompson (CA)
McIntyre	Rahall	Thompson (MS)
McKinney	Rangel	Thurman
McNulty	Reyes	Tierney
Meehan	Rivers	Towns
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Turner
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Udall (CO)
Menendez	Rothman	Udall (NM)
Millender-	Sabo	Upton
McDonald	Sanchez	Velazquez
Miller, George	Sanders	Vento
Minge	Sandlin	Visclosky
Mink	Sanford	Waters
Moakley	Sawyer	Watt (NC)
Moore	Schaffer	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Schakowsky	Weiner
Nadler	Scott	Wexler
Napolitano	Sensenbrenner	Weygand
Neal	Shays	Wise
Oberstar	Sherman	Woolsey
Obey	Shows	Wu
Olver	Sisisky	Wynn
Ortiz	Skelton	

NOT VOTING—6

Camp	Gutierrez	Rush
Cox	Jefferson	Scarborough

□ 1418

Messrs. BLUMENAUER, WATT of North Carolina, and PASTOR, and Ms. WOOLSEY and Ms. MCKINNEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. JONES of North Carolina and Mr. COBURN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BEREUTER changed his vote from "present" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDENT RESULTS ACT OF 1999

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Madam Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 336 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 336

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to send more dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed 90 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule for a period not to exceed six hours. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute