As required by law, I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of Romania. You will find that the report indicates continued Romanian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration policy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 3, 1996.*

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO LIBYA (H. DOC. NO. 104–157)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1662(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Libyan emergency is to continue in effect beyond January 7, 1996, to the *Federal Register* for publication.

The crisis between the United States and Libya that led to the declaration of a national emergency on January 7, 1986, has not been resolved. The Government of Libya has continued its actions and policies in support of terrorism, despite the calls by the United Nations Security Council, in Resolutions 731 (1992), 748 (1992), and 883 (1993) that it demonstrate by concrete actions its renunciation of such terrorism. Such Libyan actions and policies pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and vital foreign policy interests of the United States. For these reasons, the national emergency declared on January 7, 1986, and the measures adopted on January 7 and January 8, 1986, to deal with that emergency, must continue in effect beyond January 7, 1996. I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of Libya to reduce its ability to support international terrorism.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 3, 1996.*

PROVIDING U.S. MILITARY PERSONNEL WITH FULL COST OF LIVING INCREASE

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1514) to authorize the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds for a 2.4-percent increase for basic allowance for quarters for the members of the uniformed services, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VOLKMER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, because of the din on the floor, I was unable to hear the Speaker's ruling on the request of the gentleman from California. Would the Speaker be so kind as to repeat the ruling?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair declined recognition as the Chair has in previous cases.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, the House is not in order, and the gentleman is entitled to be heard. We cannot hear the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will be in order.

The Chair will repeat his denial of recognition. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. DELLUMS. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, is the reason that this gentleman cannot be recognized to offer this unanimous-consent request because of the minority status of this gentleman and the fact that the majority has not agreed to bring up this legislation which is needed, as this gentleman understands, by 5 p.m. this afternoon?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would say to the gentleman, it has absolutely nothing to do with the gentleman's minority status; it has to do with the clearances that have to be obtained for a measure to be brought to the floor by unanimous consent by majority or minority Members.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry.

Does that mean, as I understand the language of the Chair, that that bipartisan agreement has not been achieved as of this moment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair knows of no understanding between the bipartisan leaderships, committee leadership, or by the floor leaderships for bringing the gentleman's measure to the floor by a unanimous-consent request.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I had trouble hearing during the prior parliamentary inquiry. In order to bring the needed pay-raise bill to the floor, which is needed by 5 o'clock tonight, we are to go get bipartisan support. The question we have is, Where do we go to get that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. We do not know where that room is. No one has been able to find that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee leadership, I would say to the gentlewoman and the floor leadership.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rogers moves to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto message on the bill, H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill was referred back to the Committee on Appropriations when the veto message was received from the President. Consequently, any effort to override the veto must await a discharge of the bill from the committee back to the floor, and consequently, that is the purpose of my motion.

I think the parties are prepared to yield back the time which otherwise would be allocated to us on the motion to discharge, so that we can get directly to the main motion. So if there is no request for time on the other side, I am prepared to yield back the time on this side on the motion.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. No objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–149)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago, the President took to the airwaves to say that we have workers in the Justice Department that are not able to go to work; we have workers in the Commerce Department that have been laid off; we have workers in the Federal Judiciary and the State Department around the world unable to go to work. He says it is because the Congress shut down the Government.

I am going to make the President a real deal here today. We are going to give the President a chance to put these workers back to work.

We have heard speakers in the well of this House, for the last several weeks now, saying we need to put these workers back to work. I am going to make you a real deal today. We are going to give you a chance to vote to put these workers back to work, because today we are going to give you a chance to vote to override the President's veto of this bill and put the workers back to work.

Make no mistake, the reason the workers in these departments are not working today is not because the Congress did not pass a bill. We sent the President this appropriations bill for these departments several weeks ago. The President chose to lay them off. The President chose to close the Government for these agencies. The President chose to say to the American people, I am going to shut these agencies down because I do not like the bill the Congress gave to me.

Well, I am saying to Members of this body today, here is your chance. You have been telling the folks back home, if I had a chance, I would put the workers back to work. If I had a vote, I would vote to require the workers to go back to work and to reinstate their pay.

Here is your chance. Here it is, right square before you. The vote on the bill to override this veto by the President of the spending bill for these agencies is square before you. A ''yes'' vote will send these workers back to work.

A ''yes'' vote to override the veto will mean that the guards in the prisons will also receive their pay, even today, as the prisoners are receiving their benefit checks. It is true. Today, prisoners are receiving money and the guards in the Federal prisons are not. Is that not something, Mr. President?

Well, today you have a chance. Let us pay the guards in the prisons as well as the prisoners, Mr. Speaker. Let us put them all back to work. Vote ''yes'' to override the President's veto.

Some of the most important agencies of the Government are shut down because of the President's veto. The Justice Department, the FBI, the Drug Enforcement Administration, U.S. Attorneys, the Federal prisons, all law enforcement agencies in the Justice Department are laid off or working without pay because the President chose to thumb his nose at the bill we sent to him.

We bring to the floor the President's veto of the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill. You get a chance today to put more than 200,000 employees back to work and to end the crisis of the government to these major parts of our Government.

□ 1600

The bill we sent to the President is a good bill. It is tough on crime and even tougher on spending. The bill provides the largest amount of funding ever provided in the Nation's history for the number one domestic priority, and that is fighting crime. But even more important at this moment, it represents our best opportunity to put over 200,000 Federal employees back to work, with pay, not just for a day, not just for a week, but for the rest of the fiscal year.

This is what Members of this body can do, while the negotiators are down at the White House trying to work out a deal on a continuing resolution for a few days, here is the chance to short-circuit all of that. Here is the chance to override all of that.

Our immigration patrol, the Border Patrol, fighting illegal immigration, laid off. Drug Enforcement Administration, fighting the Nation's scourge of drugs, laid off. State Department personnel around the world issuing passports, visas and the like, guarding America's diplomacy efforts around the world, laid off. Prosecuting criminals in the Federal courts, laid off. Here is the chance. Members have been saying in the well of this House in speech after speech, day after day, week after week, ''Give me a chance to vote and I'll put these workers back to work.'' Here it is, square before you.

Vote ''no'' and you continue this shutdown. Vote ''yes,'' and you put our workers back to work. New Border Patrol agents, new FBI employees, new Drug Enforcement agents will be hired and put to work in addition to the ones already hired.

The fundamental question, Mr. Speaker, is whether the President's objections to this bill outweigh the harm caused by the shutdown of these departments and agencies, harm to Federal employees and their families and to the American people that has resulted from the President's veto of this bill.

In my view, there is no reason, no valid reason, to support the veto and vote against this effort to override the veto. Of course we have differences with the President. But they relate to just a handful of programs in this bill, and certainly do not justify shutting down these agencies.

The President vetoed the bill, with one exception, because it does not provide enough money for several programs funded in the bill. And what compelling need caused him to prevent the Nation's war against crime from being funded and put 200,000 Federal paychecks in jeopardy? Listen to this. This is why: No funding for corporate welfare, he says. The Advanced Technology Program, he vetoed the bill because of that. That is corporate welfare. I thought we were out to eliminate it. Certainly the bill did. The President says, ''No, I don't like that.''

Another reason why he vetoed the bill, Mr. Speaker, listen to this one. There is no funding for the Ounce of Prevention Council, $2 million, an extension of the Vice President's office.

Another reason he vetoed the bill was lack of funding for international organizations, like the International Office of Epizootics, Mr. Speaker.

Is that enough to shut down the Government? Well, the President said so when he vetoed our bill. He would like to put more money in the United Nations and international organizations, and that is why he vetoed the bill.

There may not be as much funding as he or even some of us wanted for individual programs. But we have set priorities, we had to, priorities we thought were the President's as well, the war on crime and drugs and the fight against illegal immigration. On no scale of right and wrong can you justify shutting down 3 departments, the Federal courts, 20 independent agencies, and depriving more than 200,000 Federal employees of paychecks because a handful of programs are not funded at a high enough level to merit

the President's signature. Any yet that is exactly what happened.

Look at the harm being done by the President's veto and the shutting down of these departments. Two-thirds of the funding in the bill, nearly $18 billion, is aimed at putting criminals behind bars. The bill contains $14.6 billion for law enforcement programs at the Department of Justice, a 19-percent increase over 1995 funding, including $3.6 billion for State and local law enforcement to give them the resources to fight crime where it counts, on our streets back home. That is a 57-percent increase over last year.

It contains $2.5 billion, an $895 million increase, to combat illegal immigration and secure our Nation's borders, $146 million more than the President requested, including 3,000 more INS personnel, 1,000 more Border Patrol agents on the border.

The bill includes $500 million for California, Texas, Florida, New York, and other States most impacted by criminal aliens, a $370 million increase, and the President's veto is telling those States, tough luck.

It includes $175 million for violence against women programs, 7 times more than provided in 1995, the full amount of the President's request, one of the major initiatives of the bill, and now because of this veto those programs are sitting at zero.

This is the largest crime-fighting budget in the Nation's history which the President vetoed.

If you cannot justify shutting down these agencies because of funding levels for a handful of programs and you cannot justify the veto because of the harm it does to the Nation's fight against crime, what does it come down to, Mr. Speaker? It comes down to one policy difference. Instead of funding the President's COPS Program, the bill provides a $1.9 billion grant, full funding, to provide local communities the resources to hire every single policeman on the beat that he has proposed, and then some. It comes down to this, Mr. Speaker: The issue of who controls the program to help local communities fight crime—the President's Washington-based one-size-fits-all program which half the communities cannot afford, or the block grant approach in this bill to empower local communities to decide what they need most to fight crime in their judgment, tailor made to their community.

This bill provides a better way. The President was willing to block the largest crime-fighting bill in the Nation's history and shut down 3 departments, the Federal courts, 20 independent agencies and more than 200,000 employees because he did not get his way on the COPS Program.

Now the House has the opportunity to overturn that decision, to put 200,000 employees back to work for the rest of the fiscal year, to reopen Justice, State, the Federal judiciary, to put the war against crime back on track to fight illegal immigration, drug abuse and violence against women.

I urge my colleagues to weigh the balance. The choice is to reopen the business in the Departments of Justice, State and Commerce, the Federal courts and 20 agencies, provide paychecks and jobs to 200,000 employees, fund the largest anticrime bill in history, or to shut them down, over a handful of funding issues and a matter of who gets credit for hiring police on the beat. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the choice is plain. Let us put them back to work. Vote ''yes'' to put America's workers back to work.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today we find ourselves once again spending time on the floor of the House taking on an action which will not advance the process of completing the fiscal year 1996 appropriation bills. We are way behind in them. They are way past due. They should have been passed in the first session, and here we are at the beginning of the second session of the 104th Congress and we do not have our appropriation bills done.

The Commerce-State-Justice bill was vetoed by the President and received by the House on December 19. It was referred to committee at that time, and today, rather than presenting to the House a bill that could be signed into law and one that ends the shutdown of all the agencies funded in this bill, now in the 19th day, we are debating a veto override.

Well, I will vote to sustain the President's veto today, Mr. Speaker. At the time the conference report was passed, I indicated that if a vote to override occurred, that I would support the President. My position is based on the belief that the most constructive thing to be doing now is working out our differences on this bill in a rational way, without the Government shutdown being used by the majority in the House of Representatives as leverage in these policy debates. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I think there is a pretty clear analogy between just good old hostage-taking and the strategy being pursued by the majority.

The similarity is that both in the conventional hostage-taking situation and in the situation where we allow Federal workers to be laid off and not employed and do not pass a continuing resolution, there is an irrationality that is common on both situations. That irrationality is this: In this case by the majority here in the House it is the presumption that by holding these hostages, by keeping these Federal workers unemployed, keeping them out, that that is going to affect the policy debate; that the President of the United States is going to be brought to heel on these issues because these Federal employees and all of the Americans they serve are being held hostage in the debate.

That is an irrationality, Mr. Speaker. It is an irrationality in the conventional hostage situation; it is an irrationality here. There is no relationship between these Federal workers going back to work and solving these policy questions.

We could pass a continuing resolution here today in a shorter period of time than we take to debate this veto override, get the workers back to work and then sit down in a rational way and solve these policy issues.

The Government shutdown in its 19th day is furloughing some 280,000 Federal Government workers, holding them hostage, and keeping 480,000 excepted workers on the job without pay.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Senate did a sensible thing, a rational thing. It passed a clean continuing resolution lasting until January 12, giving us some time to work on these issues. I believe the quote is ''enough is enough,'' were the words of the Senate majority leader. In fact, he used the word ''pawns'' to describe those employees caught in the middle of this fight that they have nothing to do with and no reason to be involved in.

These people want to go back to work, and we should be addressing that situation today with a simple continuing resolution. Various Republican Members have been quoted as indicating that the current shutdown was having no significant effects across the country and should perhaps be extended. I think the statement, the whole idea is irresponsible and I patently disagree, Mr. Speaker.

At the Justice Department, most of the law enforcement personnel have been declared essential, but as of this week they will only receive half a paycheck. What a way to ring in the new year. All FBI training, all Federal Bureau of Investigation training of State and local law enforcement has stopped.

My good friend and chairman of the committee alluded to the COPS Program, Mr. Speaker, a wonderfully successful program. I know there are some other speakers that are going to be speaking in greater detail about the success of the COPS Program, a program to get community police, federally assisted community police, out on the beat.

□ 1615

To date, there are 31,000 cops out on the beat as a result of this program, doing good work, good reviews, real results in reducing crime in the neighborhoods in which they are working.

Mr. Speaker, 7,688 more policemen could be added right now to the beat in communities all across this country if the money were available, if we would simply pass a continuing resolution. That's 7,688 more policemen out there fighting crime.

Mr. Speaker, also vendors who are supplying food to prisons are continuing to deliver that food, but they are not being paid. How long can that continue before vendors either refuse to deliver more food or go bankrupt? What a reputation for the Federal Government to get, reneging on its obligations, not paying small businessmen,

small business women out there trying to make it work for their services. What would this mean to the prisons if that would happen? No food, riots. Mr. Speaker, it is not a pretty picture.

More than 200,000 Americans, Mr. Speaker, are now waiting for passports. That is not in effect. Our friends suggest that these workers are unessential? This affects students trying to begin school overseas, individuals who have job offers, and many people who have nonrefundable tickets for overseas travel. The inconveniences are tremendous.

Local employers who process visa applications are required to come to work but cannot do their jobs once they get there.

Funds to pay for the massive State Department-run worldwide communication system will run out of funding the end of this week. That is the heart of our ability to communicate with our posts around the world. Activities to facilitate American businesses around the world are being hampered with the nongranting of more than 30 export licenses a day worth over $30 million to U.S. businesses, blocking more than $92 million a day in export licenses for defense articles and dual-use technology items.

The release of government-generated statistics is being held up that is affecting business decisions, and more than 260 small businesses which receive an average of $40 million in financing guarantees from the SBA are not receiving those guarantees, Mr. Speaker.

The impact is real. It is affecting the ability of the Federal Government to provide essential services. Keeping Federal employees off the job is just not being mean-spirited to Federal employees, reducing and eliminating their paychecks, it is meaning that we are not delivering services to the American people across a broad sector, and it is patently irresponsible. These are the impacts of the shutdown, Mr. Speaker.

Clearly, we ought to be working today to get the Government open. It is simple to do it, pass the CR and not wasting time on a veto override motion.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full committee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky. This is, indeed, an opportunity for a real deal.

Today we can vote to override the President. We can solve many of the problems we heard the President complain about just a little while ago on television. He said the Congress is keeping many Federal employees out of work.

Well, the fact is that 620,000 Federal employees have not returned to work, because the three appropriations bills that provide the funding for those 620,000 employees were vetoed by the President of the United States, the same gentleman who was on television just a little while ago complaining about the lack of appropriations bills.

The Congress did its job in those three bills. We sent the President the Commerce, Justice, State, and judiciary bill, on which we are considering the veto here today; the Interior bill; and the VA–HUD bill. The President chose to veto them and put those 620,000 Federal employees on the street without paychecks for the Christmas holidays. In fact, he vetoed the bills just about a week before Christmas.

The American people can thank the President for the closure of the national parks and museums. They can thank the President for delaying Government services. The Federal employees can thank the President for reductions in paychecks, and while they are thanking people, they might also consider the Labor, Health and Human Services bill which has passed the House of Representatives, went over to the other body, the U.S. Senate, and it got lost there. There are 143,000 people employed with the funding in the Labor-HHS bill that is being filibustered by the Democrats in the Senate. It cannot move, because every time they bring the bill up, the Democrats in the Senate filibuster it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman is reminded that he is not to characterize the actions of the Senate.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I did not characterize it. I just simply pointed out they filibustered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not allowed to characterize the actions or inaction of the Senate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I stand corrected, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for pointing that out.

Mr. Speaker, I might add that on this bill alone, which is the real crime bill, if the President had not vetoed it, if he were sincere in his concerns that he expressed on television a little while ago, $14.6 billion would have been spent to fight crime, an increase of 20 percent over last year. Mr. Speaker, 25 percent more would have been spent on immigration initiatives, 57 percent more would have been spent on State and local law enforcement, 285 percent more than last year would have been spent on State criminal alien assistance, and 573 percent more would have been spent for violence against women programs.

So let us not hear that the Congress is responsible for the shutdown. When the President chose to veto these bills, he knew it was going to hang us up over the Christmas holidays, and he know these 620,000 people would hit the bricks for the Christmas holidays. Our hearts go out to these people sincerely. We are sorry. We do not want to hold them hostage. But the President committed that he was going to meet our demands to balance the budget and save our children and our grandchildren from total economic catastrophe. He has reneged on that promise. He has not met us halfway.

We need to override this bill so that we can put these people back to work. This is our opportunity. If you do not take advantage of this opportunity, then, in fact, do not talk about how people are being hurt.

The fact is we have a real chance to put all of those people back to work by overriding this veto, and by overriding the veto on the Interior bill, and by overriding the veto on the VA–HUD bill, and, for that matter, we can put the people to work who are funded in the Labor, Health and Human Services bill by getting the other body to do what they are supposed to do.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of this bill is hardly new news to people. The President made clear his intentions to veto this bill in July if it passed without continuing the President's program under which 31,000 cops on the beat positions were filled in communities all throughout the country because of action of the Congress in the previous year.

So there is no reason to be suddenly shocked or chagrined by the President's simply doing what he told us many months ago he would do if this bill did not pass in its present form.

I think we need to really be frank about what is happening here today. What is happening here today is that we are going through a series of meaningless exercises, pretending to have an effort to override the previous veto that was considered by the House. Now we are going through the charade of pretending that we are going to try to override the President's veto on this bill because the House does not have any other legislative business to perform. That is what is going on, and that is what the taxpayers ought to know.

What ought to be on the floor today is the motion to continue the bipartisan action that was taken in the Senate yesterday by Mr. DOLE and Mr. DASCHLE, when, on a bipartisan basis, they passed a resolution to open up the entire Government. That is the motion that should be before us today. Instead, we face the ridiculous spectacle of first seeing Government workers paid for work that they were not allowed to do, then we see Government workers being forced to do work for which they are not yet being paid, and the Congress sits here and allows that to continue.

Do not kid anybody. The President did not shut down the Government. The President exercised his constitutional right to veto a bill which he thought was haywire, and the President has asked on every occasion that the Congress pass legislation to keep the Government open while differences are being resolved.

The Congress has shut down the Government because the Speaker and the Republican majority have made a conscious decision that they want to gain leverage over the President of the United States to force him to make cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and education that he simply is not willing to do, and that is why the Government is shut down.

What I really believe ought to happen—instead of this meaningless consumption of time here today on this veto override that is going nowhere—what ought to happen is we ought to take note of the quote in the newspaper this morning by the Senate majority leader, who said, ''I can't see any sense in what we have been doing. I would hope we would have quick action in the House. People have been gone from their jobs long enough. Enough is enough.''

I want to say to my moderate friends on the Republican side of the aisle, sooner or later you are going to have to decide whether you are Gingrich Republicans or Dole Republicans, and that time might as well be today. Because what ought to happen here today is that you ought to bring on to this floor—and only you can do it, only you have the votes—you ought to bring onto the floor a resolution which will open up all of the Government so that Government can stay open while we continue to work on the other differences between us.

After that resolution is passed, then what ought to happen it that appropriation bills ought to be separated from the other debate going on about long-term budget policy. We ought to reach a bipartisan, reasonable consensus on the dollar levels in those appropriation bills. Those bills should be stripped of extraneous language, and then we should try to pass those compromise appropriation measures.

We are supposed to be public servants. We are supposed to be looking for ways to provide service to the public, not to deny that service, and yet by your refusal to follow the Senate lead, to follow Senator DOLE's lead in opening up the Government, you are insisting upon denying to the public services for which they have already paid.

What you have here, in my view, is an incredible display of arrogance.

We are being told that the majority in this House believes that their political ideology is more important to them than providing the services to the taxpayers who we are all supposed to serve.

What we ought to do is, on a bipartisan basis, the same as the Senate did: pass the Dole motion and get on with the business of opening up the Government. Open up the Government, that is what we are paid to do, and we should not be paid until we do it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], a member of the subcommittee.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, very simply, today's Post carries a story about 40,000 people being laid off by AT&T. The other day it was reported 3 million jobs have been lost through downsizing.

That is the reason this bill is extremely important. We need to expand our exports, open up the markets so that there will be new jobs for the 3 million people that have been downsized in the name of efficiency.

What is in this bill that would affect that? No. 1, this cripples the embassies if we do not override this veto. It cripples our security. It cripples our communications. It makes them difficult to represent the United States around the world and to encourage the growth in exports.

Second, the International Trade Agency is crippled, and it is the protector of our industries against unfair dumping, against unfair practices that make it difficult for them to compete.

Third, it cripples the manufacturing extension assistance, which helps small and medium businesses to be competitive in the marketplace.

□ 1630

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the subcommittee, the ranking chairman, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, may I again wish my friend, the subcommittee chairman with the least meritorious appropriation bills, a warm and happy new year. The time that he had off for Christmas has left him confused and not as prepared as he normally is, because he said the Congress has an opportunity to bring people back to work.

Dear Mr. Subcommittee Chairman of Appropriations, a Congressman rose on the floor in April and said, ''I will shut down the government if the President does not agree to my budget, and when that happens, watch and see what he will do then.''

That was the Time Man of the Year that uttered those now famous remarks. So why does the gentleman not admit that a continuing resolution would not free your appropriation, which was wisely vetoed by the President, but that a continuing resolution would open up the entire Government? Let us get real around here.

We could not work during Christmas because there was not anything to do. We come back now, there still is not anything to do. So we start bringing up these lemons, trying to see if we can override them.

Please, the President's veto did not shut down the Government. So my dear friend, recognize that we are the ones that could operate. Tell me what is the problem with your Presidential candidate, the majority leader, who is trying to organize the Republicans to make a face-saving device after Christmas.

Now, in Detroit, the eighth largest police force in the country, we strongly support the President's Cops on the Beat Program. We have already received the first round funding. In Dearborn Heights, Mayor Ruth Canfield has said this is excellent. We are on the way. In Highland Park, MI, another part of my district, the mayor, Lindsey Porter, has praised the half dozen. They only got six cops, but six makes a difference in a small town. Ruth Canfield, the mayor of Dearborn Heights, the Detroit police chief, Isaiah McKinnon, all say the same thing. Do not kill this program.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise only to respond to the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations's remarks about our obligation to provide services that have already been paid for. That is the point of this debate.

For 26 years we have been providing services that have not been paid for. We have passed the bill on to future generations. That is why we are here and having trouble. But we insist on a balanced budget so we stop passing the bill on. That is why we are here.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, at the conclusion of this debate we will have the opportunity to reopen three executive branch departments and all of their agencies and to fund the judicial branch of the U.S. Government.

The President's veto of this appropriations bill has had the effect of keeping no less than 43,200 employees of the United States furloughed. It did not have to be this way.

The President vetoed this conference report because of an alternative method of funding the 1994 crime bill's COPS Program. The fact is under this bill, the one the President vetoed, there is more funding provided for more local governments with more flexibility to hire cops or to hire technology or get

equipment, but it lets the decision be made locally, not ''Father Knows Best'' in Washington. I guess it is hard to break the habit of assuming that all wisdom and judgment is here in Washington, and not out where the people are.

Prison building grants are contained in this bill that the President vetoed. This bill provides $500 million to fund our Truth in Sentencing Program: This conference report deals directly with what our criminal justice system needs most, holding violent criminals accountable for the pain they have caused. It contains needed legislation to prevent activist Federal judges from taking over and running State prison systems. Count these casualties of the President's veto pen.

It is clear keeping criminals behind bars will reduce crime. This bill does it. Prison construction is worthwhile in a proven prevention program. There are so many other things. Few problems have contributed more to the revolving door of justice than Federal court-imposed prison population caps. This bill removes them.

Cities across the United States are being forced to put up with predators on their streets because of this judicial activism. In dozens of States and hundreds of communities, Federal judges have imposed prison population caps. So vicious criminals are released simply because we cannot accommodate the caps.

In short, the President's veto of the Commerce, State, judiciary and Justice conference report does real harm.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 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 would like to clear the air, because we are talking about the present status of the Government. We simply need to pass and consider the Dole legislation, which allows us to open this Government and to keep it running.

While we have some major philosophical differences, those that would impact in a dastardly way my 18th congressional district, just recently we cited statistics in Houston that showed crime was going down. Partly crime was going down because we happened to be the beneficiary of some $3 million over the last month to help us ensure that we had 52 or more police out in our neighborhoods, the kind of coverage by law enforcement that our citizens applauded, participated in, and wanted.

Yet this bill that is before us that has now been vetoed, of which we should sustain the President's veto, denies America's cities the opportunity to have the continuation of the Cops on the Beat Program, eliminating over 100,000 police. Why our Republican colleagues would think that their contract on America can deny the basic rights of Americans to have safe streets with police officers patrolling the neighborhoods is beyond me. It is a philosophical difference that is impacting citizens in the 18th congressional district in the worse way.

I do not think it is any news to anyone that drugs kill. They simply kill. In this legislation, we have our Republican colleagues killing the drug courts, courts that have been noted in Harris County to be of great consequence and have been able to isolate those in drug trafficking, managed to move those people quickly through the system, and have them incarcerated, where they belong.

But what have our Republican colleagues done? The very vital drug courts that have helped us stem the tide of drugs, have been eliminated under this bill, along with dollars for DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, when we have already stated that it is of great need for us to make sure that we have drug violation enforcement and stop the tide of drugs coming across our borders.

Likewise, let me say that rather than provide for jobs, we are eliminating jobs by eliminating the Advanced Technology Program, which stimulates much needed technical research which creates jobs.

This bill also devastates our Legal Services Corporation severely limiting the access of poor people to the justice system.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice and State Appropriations, Mr. ROGERS, for his leadership in seeking to override the President's veto and put the employees of several important Federal agencies back to work. Time is of the essence for them to return back to work and to get their salaries restored. Vital services need to be resumed.

This motion to override the President's veto is the right thing to do. As the chairman of our Committee on International Relations, I am concerned about the impact that the continued shutdown of the State Department is having on American citizens, both here and abroad.

One key activity of the State Department affected is the operation of our domestic passport offices located in our major cities. Our colleagues have heard from constituents who have been unable to obtain their passports, causing hardship to U.S. businesses, to students, and others who need to travel overseas.

Our embassies and consulates overseas are not providing any visa services to foreigners seeking to come to our country, including au pairs, who must obtain a J–1 visa to enter our country. Our passport offices and visa services should be resumed as quickly as possible. Commerce and tourism are vital to our Nation's economy. These vital services should be restored immediately.

These are just a few of the serious consequences of the President's veto of this bill, in addition to the impact on law enforcement and international trade. As a world leader, Mr. Speaker, we must resume our international services to the fullest. We must pay the bills we have incurred overseas and end the fiscal limbo into which this veto has plunged our foreign service employees. Credibility and reliability are hard to gain, but much too easy to lose.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion to override the President's veto to get these agencies running again and putting our Federal workers back to work.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

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

Mr. Speaker, listening to this debate, a lot of attention has been paid to the crime-fighting elements contained in this bill, I think the biggest crime being committed here is on this floor here today by trying to blame the President of the United States for vetoing this bill, which somehow shuts down Government.

If we wanted to put Government back to work and all of our employees, we would have voted earlier today on a resolution to put them all back to work, the so-called Dole legislation. So let us quit talking about crime in this crime bill and how great it is and somehow it shuts down Government. We really should be talking about fighting crime.

Being an ex-police officer, I want to devote my attention to the crime portion of this legislation.

Back in 1994, when we passed a real crime bill, we promised, all of us, in a bipartisan manner, to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. Unlike my friend from Illinois, who said Father Washington knows all, we have put 31,000 more police officers on the street.

Who applied for those 31,000 police officers? No one in this room. No one in this room. It was the local mayors, the local county boards of commissioners, the state police. They asked, and they applied on a one page application, and it worked extremely well.

The American public wants more police officers on the street. That is what this program is delivering. American people feel safe and secure in their homes and communities. Putting more police officers in their communities will make them safer and make America more secure.

But in this bill that you are presenting today, not one single police officer is guaranteed. We asked you back on December 6, our motion to recommit, to take $1.9 billion to fund the COPS Program out of your $14.6 billion.

My friends on that side of the aisle said no, they could not allow us to do that. So the President vetoed the bill, amongst others reasons, but mostly the COPS reason. December 19, the COPS More Program was announced. Many of you got police officers. But you got more than police officers, because the COPS Program is more than just cops. It is equipment, it is civilian employees, it is technology. It is what you need, it is what the local people are telling us they need to fight crime in their communities.

So if you take a look at it, COPS has the support of virtually every major law enforcement agency in the United States, the cops, the sheriffs, the chief of police, the beat cops in every town and city across this country.

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

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, this vote presents us with an immediate opportunity to reopen a large and important part of our Government. If the House and the Senate votes to override the President's veto, we can have our embassies and our passport offices and our freedom broadcasting operations back at full strength tomorrow morning.

In all of the publicity about the Government shutdown, what gets lost is that many of the most essential Government services, the ones that Americans miss the most, like national parks, museums, passports, VA mortgages, are suspended, even though the Republican Congress has passed various appropriation bills to keep them open. President Clinton vetoed each and every one of these bills, complaining that the multi-billion-dollar spending levels were too low.

In the CJS bill, provisions covering the State Department and related agencies, only two major items, international organizations and peacekeeping, are substantially lower than the 1995 figures. The House, I might add, supported higher numbers both in the authorization bill which went through my subcommittee, and we met the President and gave him exactly what he asked for on that.

□ 1645

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill and I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto of this legislation.

With two-thirds of the Cabinet agencies closed, paychecks stopped for 760,000 Federal workers, and 260,000 Government employees furloughed, this body should be taking up legislation to immediately reopen the Government and put Federal employees back to work.

What we are engaged in this afternoon is filler, trying to put something on the floor because there is no legislative business to conduct, so we have this veto override. We know what the outcome will be on this, but let us take up the time because the Speaker of the House, and the House Republican majority do not want to do what they were sent here to do and that is to reopen this Government and put those Federal employees back to work again.

That is wrong to keep them out of work and not being paid. The House should follow the actions of the other body and correct this injustice. Failure to reopen the Government represents a dereliction of our constitutional duty.

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

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override President Clinton's veto, and I ask my colleagues who did not support the original conference report to consider the program being held hostage by President Clinton's veto pen.

In America, during the next 5 minutes, one woman will be raped and more than a dozen will be beaten, but the President's veto pen ended the Federal Government's commitment to protecting these women. This bill included full funding for the Violence Against Women Act, $175 million to protect women and children from abuse. That, Mr. Speaker, is a 573-percent increase from last year.

No, this is not filler. A continuing resolution will provide funding for these very important programs at the 1995 level of $26 million. How many of my colleagues would argue it is filler to increase $175 million for programs to protect women and children compared to this year's $26 million, and how many of my colleagues are willing to bridge this gap at the expense of abused and battered women and children?

It was a long fight to authorize the Violence Against Women Act. Now let us fund it. I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the ranking member on the Committee on Science.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's veto of H.R. 2076. Although there are many sections of this bill which I find troubling, I will limit my remarks to the funding of the ATP and MEP programs at the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

Mr. Speaker, before speaking in defense of these, I want to pay tribute to the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee dealing with these subjects, who has done a valiant job throughout the year, including today, in trying to educate the Congress to the importance of these various programs. Funding levels for the MEP and the ATP were not the result of any objective analysis of the merits of these programs, but were based solely on political considerations.

From the beginning days of the 104th Congress, both MEP and ATP programs were targeted as corporate welfare by many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, before I list my specific objections to the bill, I want to express my disgust with the process this House is following at the beginning of the second session of the 104th Congress. We are in the midst of the longest Government shutdown in the history of the United States. As a result, vital services are being denied to Americans. In addition, the other body has passed legislation which would put the Government back to work as the budget negotiations progress.

However, rather than taking up legislation which would put the government back to work, the leadership of this House is simply marking time by bringing up this veto override. Congress did not pass H.R. 2076 with the necessary margin to override a veto, so why do we think we will have the necessary margin today—we do not. This is a feeble pretense by the leadership that the House is doing something, anything rather than proceeding with the substantive business pending before Congress.

H.R. 2076 provides adequate funding for the NIST laboratories and provides subsistence funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership [MEP] but it completely eliminates funding for the Advanced Technology Program [ATP]. Funding levels for the MEP and the ATP were not the result of any objective analysis of the merits of these programs, but were based solely on political considerations. From the beginning days of the 104th Congress both the MEP and ATP programs were targeted as corporate welfare by many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The only reason there is any funding for the MEP is due to the educational efforts of the small and medium-sized business community about the importance of this program. The ATP, which up to now has funded only 276 grants, could not muster the widespread support to withstand a political vendetta. Indeed, H.R. 2076 not only eliminates funding for new projects, it eliminates funding for projects currently underway. Current ATP recipients which provide 50 percent of a project's cost, will suddenly find themselves short. This bill forces the Government to simply walk away from commitments it has made to business. Is this the signal that we want to send our business community?

Why do I believe that the termination of these programs was based in politics rather than any rational evaluation of the programs? In hearings before the Committee on Science this year, the only witnesses who spoke

against ATP and MEP were individuals with no technical or business background.

Every other private sector witness supported these programs and programs like them—regardless of whether their company received an ATP award. According to a Congressional Budget Office [CBO] report, Federal Financial Support of Business, the ATP and MEP represent less than 4 percent of the $12 billion the Federal Government will spend on programs that support industrial technology commercialization.

If Republicans were interested in rooting out so-called corporate welfare, why are they silent regarding the other 96 percent of the programs such as the almost $1 billion Small Business Innovation Research Program [SBIR] or $3.7 billion at the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for applied biomedical research? In fact, the chairman of the Science Committee is a cosponsor of legislation, which has passed the House, which strengthens government/industry partnerships at Federal labs. If opponents of industrial welfare were serious, we would be debating the entire range of Government-funded technology commercialization programs. The Science Committee has not done this and this House has not done this.

Eliminating the ATP is nothing more than a banner for Members who pretend we are eliminating Government corporate welfare. The CBO number show that we are not. Let us be frank, ATP was targeted by this Republican Congress, despite its initiation by a Republican administration, because it was enthusiastically endorsed by Bill Clinton—both as a candidate and as President. Eliminating ATP funding does not say we are willing to make hard choices—it says we are making simple ones. Eliminating ATP is easy because it is a small program with a small constituency. Spouting platitudes, opponents of ATP have tried to kill it for purely political reasons.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, to quote a Member of the other body: ''Enough is enough.''

It is time for the President to do for the American Government and the taxpayer's employees what he did for the government and people of Mexico.

Last year, President Clinton provided $20 billion United States taxpayer dollars to Mexico so they could pay their bills and employees.

But President Clinton vetoed the appropriations bills that would have paid the bills for the Commerce, Justice, and State Departments and their employees.

Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. It is time to override the irresponsibility of the President. Vote yes to override President Clinton's veto of the Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, It is time for Congress to do for America what the President did for Mexico.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I come here this afternoon to express my outrage. My colleagues talk about opening the Government when they have closed it down. Some of them say they are revolutionaries. I think the question is whether they are becoming anarchists or nihilists.

I have heard some say their hearts go out to the those whose services are being cut, but their fists are on their neck.

Look, I like the COPS Program. It is working in the 12th District. It is working in nine different police departments and they fashion their own. Some of my colleagues may not like it, but they should not shut down the Government to carry out their point of view; they should do it through normal legislative processes.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the individuals who has had the privilege of living along the Mexican border, I need to highlight that a continuing resolution will not address the outrageous situation along our border. Actually, this bill does include $500 million of reimbursement to State and local government for the cost of incarceration of criminal illegal aliens, Mr. Speaker. Also, there are 1,000 new Border Patrol agents to be put at the border and also 1,500 additional INS individuals to be put at the border.

Mr. Speaker, if Members had seen the rape, the main, the loss of life along our frontiers, they would never want to support the status quo. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, do they really want to serve the status quo, even at the cost of the type of anarchy we are confronting on our border?

We keep hearing about the need to fight for crime. Let me tell my colleagues that the fight against drugs, the fight against crime, and the fight against the injustices of illegal immigration starts at our borders, and it is time we have the guts to either admit that we do not want to control the border, or we start voting for the funding so we do our job at the border.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, for those of my colleagues who may have missed it, New York City is experiencing the steepest decline in violent crime since 1972. No one thought we could do it, but we did. With the help of the President's COPS Program, we have added well over 2,000 new police officers to the New York City Police Department. Those police are dedicated to new policing strategies; targeting hot spots, walking neighborhood beats, working with the community to prevent crime. That is what community policing is all about.

Mr. Speaker, this trend is not just confined to New York City. Other cities, like Houston and San Diego, are experiencing a similar decline. It makes no sense to eliminate a successful program such as this, as this bill does.

This is not a debate about balancing the budget, a goal many of us support, this is about the priorities of our country. To me and my constituents, ridding our streets of crime is a priority worth fighting for. Sustain safe communities. Sustain the President's veto.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speakers, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

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

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to put many Government employees back to work—by overriding the President's ill-conceived veto of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, State and Justice appropriations bill.

H.R. 2076 is a fiscally responsible bill which reflects the priorities of the American people. The bill provides $1.8 billion—a 20-percent increase over fiscal year 1995—to help I.N.S. stem the tide of illegal immigration.

H.R. 2076 provides $3.4 billion to aid States and localities in their fight against crime. That includes money for Byrne grants, Weed and seed, and the local law enforcement block grant.

It also provides $2.9 billion for prison construction so that States can keep violent criminals behind bars.

When the House passed this appropriation earlier, 256 Members—including 35 Democrats—voted for it. It is not radical. It is not extreme. In fact, H.R. 2076 is a responsible approach to balancing fiscal constraints with the need to provide real tools to fight crime at the local level.

With just a few more votes, we can override the President's veto. A yes vote on H.R. 2076 would mean that the hard working employees at the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the U.S. Marshal's Service can go to work and get paid. It would also mean that our constituents will be able to get passports in a timely manner.

If we want to get our Nation on the path to a balanced budget, preserve our commitment to fighting crime, and get the Government back to work again, we must support the motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, as Senator DOLE said, as the Member of the other body said, enough is enough. The majority leader the other day said it. The American people are saying it. All of the House Republicans, who are becoming extremists, ''Shut the government down unless you do it exactly my way,'' they can blame this on the

President, but everyone knows that is not the case. He has exercised his veto power because he wants to see the COPS Program continue, the cops on the beat which are helping our neighborhood.

Look at the choice we are putting law enforcement in. We are saying either knock out the COPS Program, which every major police group in America supports, or all our brave Federal law enforcement people get half pay. Shame on us. FBI agents, half pay? DEA agents, risking their lives, half pay? And now we are telling them that they may not get health benefits next week? Young Federal law enforcement people who go out and risk their lives?

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I will not yield on my time. If the gentleman has time, I would love to continue the dialog with him. But it should be a dialog; not do it my way or no way, as the majority party is saying. So I will not yield.

Shame on those who are saying that young FBI agent, that young DEA agent, maybe his wife is pregnant, that they may not get health benefits next week because of this horrible political game. Members on the other side are bringing this House to a new low, telling law enforcement either they will not get the police program or they will get half pay; telling law enforcement unless it is done exactly our way they will get half pay.

Republicans are not the party of law and order any more. They are are not the party defending law enforcement any more. They have become the party of extremism, of political games, and the American people know it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke, I am afraid, is slightly confused on who is responsible for what. This bill covers part of the Federal Government, a part of which is mostly out and not working. But if we want to change it, we need to vote to override the President's veto because that will put the employees of the departments in this bill—Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary—back to work.

These are valuable departments. In 1994, I happened to have supported the 100,000 cops on the street proposal. After looking at the list where Justice gave those awards, I strongly support giving the community the funds and letting those closest to the problem make the decision. I was a coauthor with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] of the troops to cops proposal that is part of that program. And I must say I am disappointed at some of the judgments made by those in the Department of Justice.

I think the sooner we have the States, the counties, and the cities making these decisions, the more confidence we can have in the outcome.

□ 1700

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], for whom I have a great deal of respect. The gentleman did support the COPS Program. It took some courage. The gentleman had to break from some of his party's leadership last year to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would say this: Be a group. Sit down and negotiate. I am not talking to the gentleman from California per se, although I would be interested to hear what the gentleman had to say. I am talking to the Speaker and the leadership on that side.

The President vetoed the bill because of a fundamental disagreement. He thought the COPS Program should continue. He thought that the money that the majority party put in there for prisons only went to three or four States, instead of my State, which needs more money for prisons, so he vetoed the bill. That has been done by every President from George Washington on.

Mr. Speaker, that does not mean the President is causing this. This is the first Congress in history, with a Republican Speaker as its leader, to say, ''When the President vetoes, we shut down the Government until we force him to his knees.'' That is what is happening here, and let the American people hear it.

Again, a veto happens all the time, has happened hundreds of times. That is not what is shutting the Government down. I just want to make this point again. It happens all the time.

What is different today, for the first time in history a political party has the temerity, has the gall to say to the President, ''Unless you do it my way, we are shutting the Government down.'' And who loses? Who loses are the brave men and women whom we both support: Law enforcement, the FBI. They get half pay. They do not know what their health benefits are going to be next week. Shame on you.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the override of the Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support for an override of the Presidential veto of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations Act.

For those in this body interested in putting Federal employees back to work, this vote presents an opportunity to immediately restore funds for three extremely important agencies. Tens of thousands of Government workers will go back to work if we override the President's ill-conceived veto.

My colleagues have offered excellent reasons to vote in favor of the Justice Department provisions of H.R. 2076. It provides bloc grants to get cops on the street while avoiding the cookie-cutter, one-size-fits-all Federal bureaucracy, and funds an additional 1,000 border patrol agents to combat illegal immigration. As my colleague, the chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], has noted, it is a good, tough, anticrime bill.

But this Member, as vice-chairman of the Committee on International Relations, would alert his colleagues to some of the implications of the continued shutdown of the Department of State. We have sent representatives to every country on earth, and now we are refusing to support them. High-risk posts, such as Lebanon, Pakistan, and the Central Asian Republics, can no longer pay for personal security. In many of these locations, American diplomats are open targets. Two State Department employees were recently assassinated in Karachi. And now we cannot pay guards to protect these employees. My colleagues, this is just plain wrong.

Certainly most congressional offices have been contacted by angry constituents unable to get a passport. According to today's Washington Post, we now have a backlog of 200,000 passport applications waiting to be processed. In some cases, people with real family emergencies are finding it impossible to reach their destination because the State Department passport office is closed.

Likewise, individuals seeking to come to the United States are finding it impossible to get visas from our overseas Embassies. My colleagues, the Untied States is losing hundreds of millions of dollars daily because foreign tourists are unable to fulfill their vacation plans. This Member has been to American consular sections in places like Seoul, Korea, where even under normal conditions the line to get an American visa can be blocks long—with each visa applicant ready to spend thousands of dollars in the United States if given the opportunity.

In addition, our Embassies are beginning to face litigation or loss of basic services because of failure to pay our bills. This is not a trivial matter. Licenses for the sale of high-technology equipment are not being processed, and American commercial service centers have closed their doors. The United States compound in Vietnam is having its electricity cut off for failure to pay its bill. Drinking water is being shut off at the United States special interests section in Cuba. The Government of Bangladesh, one of the poorest nations on Earth, has offered us a loan to keep operations up and running. The United States simply cannot continue to function in this way—we are abnegating our basic international responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to support H.R. 2076. Overriding the Presidential veto will restore a range of basic services that currently are denied to the American people. Overriding the Presidential veto will get Federal employees back to work. Overriding the Presidential veto is just, plain good Government.

This Member urges his colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 2076.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I represent two Federal prison facilities in my district. Last week I was advised that the guards would not be paid, but some of the inmates would. This is the perverse consequence of a Washington-knows-best mentality. It is precisely this mentality that this bill attempts to change.

Even the Washington Post editorial board on September 21 of last year, which is hardly a Republican propaganda organ, says that our approach makes more sense: Crime is primarily a State and local issue.

Mr. Speaker, let us grant locals some flexibility in dealing with it. Let us end this absurdity. Let us override this veto.

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

Mr. Speaker, let us get it straight. Who is saying that, ''If I do not get it my way, I am going to shut the Government down''? It is the President. In his veto message he says, as I have said, ''I will not sign any version of this bill that does not fund the COPS initiative as a freestanding, discretionary, grant program as authorized.''

''If I do not get my way I will shut the Government down, and I vetoed the bill,'' and so there it is. The President vetoed the bill that funds the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Justice Department, the Judiciary, 20 independent agencies, and said, ''So there.''

We are saying to our colleagues on the other side, This is your time, Members of Congress. If you want to put 206,000 American workers in the Government back to work, vote yes on this bill. If you want to keep them out and deny them paychecks, vote no. But now is your chance.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side have all made speeches right here: ''If I had the vote, I would put them all back to work.'' Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have got it right now. Vote ''yes.'' Put them back to work.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the 1994 crime bill, we made a landmark commitment to provide an additional 100,000 police officers on the streets and sidewalks of our communities across America. When I talk to law enforcement officers and members of orange hat patrols, PTA presidents and parents in my district, they tell me that putting cops on the beat is the best way to fight crime. These officers walk the streets of our communities, get to know the people they serve, and the community members to get to know them. Their presence deters crime and instills a sense of safety in our neighborhoods.

But the Commerce, Justice, State apprpopriations bill which has been adopted by the Republican majority of this House eviscerates the COPS Program and its goal. This was the primary reasons President Clinton vetoed this bill. I applaud his actions, and urge my colleagues to sustain his veto.

No one can argue that the COPS Program isn't working. In the Fifth District of Maryland, the towns of Crofton, La Plata, Greenbelt, Laurel, Hyattsville, and the counties of Anne Arundel, Calvert, Charles, and Prince George's have all received funds to hire additional police officers. More than half the police departments in the country have been scheduled to receive additional officers.

Why are the Republicans dismantling this effective program? Why are they eliminating the funding for community officers? Why are they lumping money for COPS into a block grant that adds bureaucracy? Sheriffs across the country, including those in my district, Republican and Democrat alike, are opposed to this change. Fred Davis, the sheriff of Charles County and a Republican, told me that he wanted this funding to remain intact. Block granting it, he argues, will jeopardize the goal of adding 100,000 cops. ''My concern is that would be lost,'' he says. If the money is given to States, it ''could be used for other programs. I think to change the way it is now done adds another layer of bureaucracy. It's going to slow things down.'' Our superintendent of the Maryland State Police, David Mitchell, has also voiced his support for the COPS Program and I would like to submit it for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans in the House should listen to the voices of those like Sheriff Davis, Chief Mitchell and law enforcement organizations like the Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, and the National Sheriffs' Association, and keep street smart law enforcement officers on the streets of America.

Crime is a national emergency. We know that putting more police on the streets is an effective response to this crisis. We know that the COPS Program puts police officers in the place where they make the most difference—on the streets. I urge my colleagues to uphold the President's veto and support the Cops on the Beat Program.

STATE OF MARYLAND,
DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND
STATE POLICE,
Pikesville, MD, January 3, 1996.

Hon. STENY HAMILTON HOYER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HOYER: The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 provides needed assistance to many governmental agencies. In particular, the Community Oriented Policy Services (COPS) program provides much needed funding for manpower and equipment for the law enforcement community. Moreover, the COPS program provides an excellent framework from which to build a consistent community policing approach throughout the country. Additionally, many police departments would not otherwise be able to afford implementation of this innovative approach to policing without federal assistance.

Another extremely important component of the violent Crime Control Act is funding for addressing the problem of violence against women. The law enforcement community benefits greatly from funding for education, training and the formation of special investigative units to fight this terrible plague on society. Without continued funding many gains will be negated.

Should funding for this important act diminish or be abolished, the adverse impact will be felt at state and local levels throughout our country. Without the centralized administration and direction from the COPS office, much progress in these important endeavors will be lost. Ceasing these programs in their infancy will cause disruption in service to our communities, as most state and local governments cannot afford to pick up lost funding with local funds at this time.

As this act is of vital importance to the communities in Maryland, I strongly urge your support for continued funding by the federal government. The partnership currently in place among the federal, state and local governments, the police and our communities is far too important to allow to dissolve.

Sincerely,

DAVID B. MITCHELL,
Superintendent.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support overriding the President's veto of the Commerce-Justice-State fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill.

For more than 2 weeks, Federal workers within the affected agencies of this bill, have not been paid to perform the crucial services which this bill funds. This bill funds 3 Cabinet departments, the Supreme Court, the Federal judiciary, the U.S. Trade Representative, and 22 independent agencies.

The bill is diverse. It funds such disparate agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation [FBI], the Small Business Administration [SBA], the Securities and Exchange Commission [SEC], the United States Information Agency [USIA], the Legal Services Corporation, and the National Marine Fisheries Service. By overriding the President's veto today, we can return these Federal workers to work tomorrow.

Federal employees want to work. They want to go back and perform their vital and necessary functions—processing passports and visas, implementing strong crimefighting measures, collecting important commerce data, and allowing our Nation to be more globally competitive, among other critical duties.

Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that this bill also funds programs which are important to law enforcement and our economic competitiveness. During consideration of the conference report last month, I pointed out that funding for the Violence Against Women Act [VAWA] and other legal and law enforcement programs critical to the well-being of American families needed to be funded.

The bill also funds the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], the only Federal laboratory specifically charged with the mission of assisting U.S. industry. The bill funds the vital measurement and standards activities and other basic science research of the NIST laboratories upon which industry significantly relies.

The bill also provides NIST funding for its Manufacturing Extension Partnership [MEP] Program, the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards Program, and NIST Construction of Facilities Program, which is vital for NIST to be able to continue meeting its mission in the future.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to return our Federal workers to work. I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of this bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act, and in support of overriding the President's veto. This bill does exactly what needs to be done in this time of fiscal restraint: It sets priorities and it trims the fat.

This bill recognizes the fact that President Clinton's COPS Program is a myth; the communities will never see the 100,000 cops that the President has promised—the numbers just don't add up.

Instead, the bill empowers communities by providing for the block grants that passed as part of the Contract With America. We offer more funding and more flexibility; most of all, we have an approach that is realistic and very workable. It places power in the hands of our local governments, who can use the money to address the problems unique to their area.

This legislation also reduces funding for the Legal Services Corporation [LSC], an entity that has systematically abused taxpayer money by, for example, representing drug dealers in public housing. I would have preferred to eliminate the LSC altogether, but the bill makes a step in the right direction by placing restrictions on the types of cases it can engage in.

We also devote additional resources to combat illegal immigration by providing increased resources for the Immigration and Naturalization Service [INS]. New border patrol agents will enable us to police our borders more effectively, thus preventing the problems that arise once the illegals sneak in.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore urge my fellow Members to vote in support of overriding the President's veto of this Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act. Let's get the Federal workers in these Departments back to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 159, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—240

Allard
Archer
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Pryce
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—159

Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanders
Sanford
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Spratt
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—34

Abercrombie
Armey
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Callahan
Chapman
Clay
DeFazio
Dixon
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gibbons
Hoke
Hutchinson
LaTourette
Lightfoot
Meek
Mfume
Norwood
Pelosi
Quillen
Rush
Sawyer
Shuster
Souder
Stark
Stockman
Studds
Visclosky
Wilson
Wyden

□ 1724

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Armey and Mr. Hoke for, with Mr. Abercrombie against.

Mr. Lightfoot and Mr. Quillen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. BARCIA and Mr. DICKS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 4 on H.R. 2076. I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, due to the inclement weather in the Cleveland area, I was unable to arrive in Washington in time for votes this afternoon. As a result, I was unable to vote on rollcall votes No. 1—procedural vote—quorum call—2, 3, and 4. However, had I been present I would have voted "yes" on rollcall votes Nos. 2, 3, 4, and "present" on rollcall vote No. 1.

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2029) to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment to the title of the bill and concur in the Senate amendment to the text of the bill with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is this a unanimous-consent request that has been cleared?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous-consent request that has been cleared by both leaders and by the committee chairmen and ranking member on each side.