Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1714

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1469, 1997 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS, AND FOR OVERSEAS PEACEKEEPING EFFORTS, INCLUDING THOSE IN BOSNIA

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today to consider a conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, and that all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration be waived, and that the conference report be considered as read when called up.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1469) making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters and overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, June 4, 1997, at page H3442.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

□ 1715

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to once again come to the House with the conference report on the fiscal year 1997 emergency supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1469.

As Members of the House may recall, on April 24 of this year, the Committee on Appropriations reported out the bill, and roughly 2 weeks ago we had the bill on the floor. Unfortunately, we were unable to complete the conference quickly, and we had to adjourn over the Memorial Day recess prior to the completion of this very, very important bill that will provide disaster relief to the citizens of some 35 States.

Today we hope to remedy that situation because, after several weeks of negotiating with the Senate on the differences between the House and the Senate versions of this legislation, we have concluded conference yesterday and are able to bring this conference agreement to the House so that the process of providing that very necessary recovery for the vast number of natural disasters that have occurred around the country this year can be maintained.

This conference agreement includes $8.9 billion in new spending authority for fiscal year 1997, of which the discretionary portion is fully offset by the rescission of previously appropriated funds and by including other offsets.

I might stress, Mr. Speaker, that the conference report, as promised when we debated this issue on the floor 2 weeks ago, is fully, and I repeat fully, offset in budget authority.

The major reasons for the increase over the House reported bill are an increase for veterans compensation and pensions and SSI, Supplemental Security Income, benefits for legal aliens. These were deemed by the administration to be necessary to provide for those benefit programs through the end of the fiscal year, and the conference agreed that the benefits, if not paid for, might leave some individuals without compensation before October 1, 1997. It is intended that these sums, these additional sums, be included in this bill so that those people might be provided for.

A summary of the total conference report on the supplemental includes the following major categories: Nearly $5.6 billion for disaster recovery, as I said earlier, for 35 States; another $268 million for other appropriations; $240 million for SSI benefits for legal aliens. All of that is offset in the domestic category of the budget by $6.092 billion in rescissions. That leaves a deficit, or an extra amount of offset by about $21 million.

In the peacekeeping provisions or the defense side of the bill we have some $1.929 billion allocated to repay the Defense Department for what has already been outlaid in Bosnia and elsewhere in other operations around the world, and that is offset with moneys provided from the Defense Department of exactly that same amount of money.

Likewise, there are mandatory appropriations in the conference agreement, mostly for VA, of $937 million. And, as I indicated, the entire discretionary amount is offset in budget authority.

There is $3.3 billion of disaster relief bill going directly to FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, so that they can assist those people who have been devastated by floods, tornados, and other natural disasters.

There is $500 million in this bill going to Community Development Block Grants. The people in Minnesota and the Dakotas have indicated that they are concerned that the traditional assistance of FEMA has not been direct enough, has not been flexible enough to go to the people who have lost their businesses, lost their homes, and who are virtually thrown out of their entire towns. And in order to get those folks back and their cities working, they feel that the Community Development Block Grants will be more effective in solving these problems. Hopefully, that will be the case.

There is $650 million to be applied to transportation facility repair; $585 million for flood control and navigation facility repair; $166 million for watershed and flood prevention; $197 million for the national park repairs; $928 million for veterans compensation and pensions, as I mentioned earlier; and $240 million for continued SSI benefits for legal aliens; $1.26 billion for peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and $510 million for peacekeeping efforts in southwest Asia.

I would like to remind all my colleagues again that at the beginning of the 104th Congress; that is, the Congress preceding this one, we in the majority, the Republicans, began a policy of paying for all supplemental appropriations, saying to the country that no longer will we opt for the tradition that has been established in the past of

simply adding supplemental appropriations to what had previously been appropriated and not worrying about where the money comes from.

We adopted the policy of offsetting any additional or supplemental appropriations which had not been encompassed in the traditional appropriations process, which occurs in the fall, with rescissions of previously appropriated funds; that is, taking money out of other programs that we have already paid for and applying it to these supplemental needs so that there is no net cost to the taxpayer.

We have been successful. Every time we have come up with an additional or supplemental appropriation bill, we have offset it, since January 3, 1995, and I am pleased to say that we have done so again today. We have offset it with budget authority from other programs and other agencies. So I am proud to say again that this conference report complies with this policy, and that it is totally offset in budget authority.

The bill we brought to the House complied with this policy as does in this conference report. Mr. Speaker, the President has indicated, however, that because of two items, that do not have much to do with disaster relief, that he is going to veto the bill. I regret that. I hope that he does not do that.

Included in this conference agreement are matters that are very, very important to the majority of the Members of Congress and, admittedly, while they are not appropriation matters, I believe that the portions of this bill dealing with appropriations are not only acceptable but endorsed by the vast majority of the House, and I am proud of that.

But I believe also that the best thing to do is to go ahead and proceed with these extra issues because they are not consequential enough to deny aid to victims of natural disasters. One involves simply directing the Census Bureau not to sample, not to provide estimates of numbers of people in conducting the census every 10 years, as required by the Constitution, but to actually numerically count each and every person. Every person. No matter what background, no matter what ethnic identity, race, sex, or any other religious affiliation, count each and every person in America. And if the Census Bureau will do that, we will pay the bill for it, but we think that that is what the Constitution envisioned.

We hope that, in fact, the President would not veto this vital bill by saying, oh, well, let us just sample whoever is in America and not worry about counting them. We think that would be a terrible mistake, and so we have a provision in the conference agreement directing an actual count, and we have to do it this early because, otherwise, the Census Bureau will go ahead and make their plans. If we do it later on, they will say we were too late. So we have to address that issue now, and we just hope that that would not prompt the President to veto this very important bill.

Likewise, there is much concern from Members on both sides of the aisle about the fact that 2 years ago the Government closed down after the President did not sign four appropriations bills. A lot of people believe that that was unfortunate and that we should have avoided that mishap, and that we can avoid it by including in this bill what is known as a continuing resolution which says that if all of the appropriations bills for fiscal year 1998 are not passed, that full funding at 1997 levels will continue until such appropriations bills are passed.

That continuing resolution is included in this bill. All it says, or all it is, is an expression by the majority that says, Mr. President, we do not want to close down the Government. Just sign this bill with this continuing resolution and Government will stay open. If the President chooses to veto the bill because of that provision, I guess, in effect, he is saying that, well, he does not mind closing down the Government and he does not want to have a fail-safe that will keep the Government operating.

Be that as it may, he has given strong signals that he is prepared to veto the bill and I regret that, as I have said. I hope that he does not, but we will just have to confront it.

I believe the best thing to do at this point is for the Congress to express its views on the conference report and then let the President express his views. This will move the process forward. Should he veto it, we will readdress this bill. And it would be my expectation that we will still have a supplemental appropriations bill that provides disaster relief to the people that need it within a very few days under any circumstance.

But we are prepared to move this bill forward now. We hope that it will gain a majority of votes so that we can send it to the President for his signature, and we hope that he will sign it, and then we will be done with this and go on to the regular fiscal year 1998 appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker at this point I would like to insert a table reflecting the conference agreement into the RECORD.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	CHAPTER 1						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	Military Personnel						
.....	Military personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)..	.....	306,800,000	306,800,000	306,800,000	.....	.....
.....	Military personnel, Navy (emergency appropriations)...	.....	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	.....	.....
.....	Military personnel, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)	.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	.....	.....
.....	Military personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	.....	.....
	Total, Military personnel	.....	344,100,000	344,100,000	344,100,000	.....	.....
	Operation and Maintenance						
.....	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (by transfer) (sec. 101)	.....	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	.....	.....
104-3	Overseas contingency operations transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	2,006,214,000	1,566,300,000	1,312,900,000	1,430,100,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
104-3	OPLAN 34A/35 P.O.W. payments	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Operation and maintenance	2,026,214,000	1,586,300,000	1,332,900,000	1,450,100,000	-136,200,000	+117,200,000
	Revolving and Management Funds						
104-3	Reserve mobilization income insurance fund (emergency appropriations)	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	.....	.....
	General Provisions						
.....	Defense health program (sec. 102)	.....	21,000,000	.....	21,000,000	.....	+21,000,000
.....	Force protection initiatives (sec. 103)	.....	10,000,000	.....	10,000,000	.....	+10,000,000
.....	Additional transfer authority	.....	.....	(100,000,000)	.....	.....	(-100,000,000)
.....	Red Cross reimbursement (sec. 104)	.....	.....	50,000,000	25,800,000	+25,800,000	-24,200,000
.....	Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps (sec. 106)	.....	6,480,000	6,480,000	6,480,000	.....	.....
	Total, general provisions	.....	37,480,000	56,480,000	63,280,000	+25,800,000	+6,800,000
	Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,098,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	1,929,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
	Appropriations	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(83,280,000)	(+25,800,000)	(+6,800,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(1,846,200,000)	(-136,200,000)	(+117,200,000)
	(Additional transfer authority)	.....	.....	(100,000,000)	.....	.....	(-100,000,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	.....	.....
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY						
	Military Personnel						
.....	Military personnel, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-46,000,000	-57,000,000	-57,000,000	-11,000,000
.....	Military personnel, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-11,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-7,000,000
.....	Military personnel, Marine Corps (rescission)	.....	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	.....
.....	Military personnel, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-15,000,000	-23,000,000	-23,000,000	-8,000,000
	Total, Military personnel	.....	.....	-77,000,000	-103,000,000	-103,000,000	-26,000,000
	Operation and Maintenance						
.....	Operation and maintenance, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-174,000,000	-196,000,000	-196,000,000	-22,000,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-51,000,000	-51,000,000	-51,000,000	.....
.....	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (rescission)	.....	.....	-17,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+14,000,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-117,000,000	-117,000,000	-117,000,000	.....
104-44	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (rescission)	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-25,000,000	-25,000,000	-15,000,000	.....
.....	Environmental restoration, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....
.....	Environmental restoration, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....
.....	Environmental restoration, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....
.....	Environmental restoration, Defense-wide (rescission)..	.....	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000	.....
.....	Environmental restoration, Formerly used defense sites (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-250,000	-250,000	-250,000
.....	Former Soviet Union threat reduction (rescission)	.....	.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	Total, Operation and maintenance	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-387,000,000	-395,250,000	-385,250,000	-8,250,000
	Procurement						
.....	Aircraft procurement, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-9,085,000	-19,085,000	-19,085,000	-10,000,000
.....	Missile procurement, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-73,707,000	-26,707,000	-26,707,000	+47,000,000
.....	Procurement of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, Army, (rescission)	.....	.....	-7,296,000	-22,696,000	-22,696,000	-15,400,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-28,236,000	-32,236,000	-32,236,000	-4,000,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Other procurement, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-23,502,000	-23,502,000	-23,502,000	.....
.....	Aircraft procurement, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-62,000,000	-86,000,000	-86,000,000	-24,000,000
.....	Weapons procurement, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-22,000,000	-22,000,000	-22,000,000	.....
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps (rescission)	.....	.....	-4,812,000	-812,000	-812,000	+4,000,000
.....	Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-43,000,000	-61,700,000	-61,700,000	-18,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-15,237,000	-15,237,000	-15,237,000	.....
.....	Procurement, Marine Corps (rescission)	.....	.....	-5,207,000	-1,207,000	-1,207,000	+4,000,000
.....	Aircraft procurement, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-114,650,000	-130,376,000	-130,376,000	-15,726,000
.....	Missile procurement, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-193,195,000	-179,020,000	-179,020,000	+14,175,000
.....	Procurement of ammunition, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-7,700,000	-7,700,000	-7,700,000
.....	Other procurement, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-20,659,000	-33,659,000	-33,659,000	-13,000,000
.....	Procurement, Defense-wide (rescission)	.....	.....	-9,860,000	-29,973,000	-29,973,000	-20,113,000
104-44	National Guard and Reserve equipment (rescission)	-62,000,000	.....	-5,029,000	-13,029,000	-13,029,000	-8,000,000
	Total, Procurement	-62,000,000	.....	-637,475,000	-704,939,000	-704,939,000	-67,464,000
	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	-14,366,000	-22,366,000	-22,366,000	-8,000,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	-35,978,000	-26,478,000	-26,478,000	+9,500,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	-150,396,000	-196,245,000	-196,245,000	-45,849,000
.....	Research, development, test and evaluation, Defense-wide (rescission)	.....	.....	-176,090,000	-182,714,000	-182,714,000	-6,624,000
.....	Developmental test and evaluation, Defense (rescission)	.....	.....	-890,000	-6,692,000	-6,692,000	-5,802,000
.....	Operational test and evaluation, Defense (rescission)	.....	.....	-160,000	-160,000	-160,000	.....
	Total, Research, development, test and evaluation	.....	.....	-377,880,000	-434,655,000	-434,655,000	-56,775,000
	Revolving and Management Fund						
.....	National Defense Sealift Fund (rescission)	.....	.....	-35,000,000	-25,200,000	-25,200,000	+9,800,000
	Other Department of Defense Programs						
.....	Defense health program (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-21,000,000	-21,000,000	-21,000,000
.....	Chemical agents and munitions destruction, Defense (rescission)	.....	.....	-48,108,000	-48,108,000	-48,108,000	.....
.....	Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, Defense (rescission)	.....	.....	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	.....
	Total, Other Department of Defense programs	.....	.....	-50,108,000	-71,108,000	-71,108,000	-21,000,000
	General Provisions						
104-3	DOD-wide savings proposals (offset)	-4,800,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Dual-use applications program (rescission)	.....	.....	-100,000,000	.....	.....	+100,000,000
.....	Revised economic adjustments, FY 1997 (rescission)	.....	-307,000,000	.....	.....	+307,000,000	.....
.....	Foreign currency savings, FY 1997 (rescission)	.....	-308,000,000	.....	.....	+308,000,000	.....
.....	Prior year unobligated balances (rescission)	.....	-246,367,000	.....	.....	+246,367,000	.....
.....	Prior year rescissions	.....	-982,500,000	.....	.....	+982,500,000	.....
.....	Military construction, rescissions (sec. 201)	.....	-180,000,000	-235,000,000	-189,000,000	-9,000,000	+46,000,000
.....	Military construction, Navy (rescission) (sec. 202)	.....	-6,480,000	-6,480,000	-6,480,000	.....	.....
	Total, general provisions	-4,800,000,000	-2,030,347,000	-341,480,000	-195,480,000	+1,834,867,000	+146,000,000
	Total, Chapter 2:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+110,715,000	-23,689,000
	Rescissions	(-72,000,000)	(-2,040,347,000)	(-1,905,943,000)	(-1,929,632,000)	(+110,715,000)	(-23,689,000)
	Offsets	(-4,800,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, title I:						
	Discretionary budget authority (net)	-2,773,786,000	-467,000	-100,463,000	-152,000	+315,000	+100,311,000
	Appropriations	(20,000,000)	(57,480,000)	(76,480,000)	(83,280,000)	(+25,800,000)	(+6,800,000)
	Rescissions	-72,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+110,715,000	-23,689,000
	Offsets	(-4,800,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Emergency appropriations	(2,078,214,000)	(1,982,400,000)	(1,729,000,000)	(1,846,200,000)	(-136,200,000)	(+117,200,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	(23,000,000)	.....	.....

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE II - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RECOVERY FROM NATURAL DISASTERS						
	CHAPTER 1						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Farm Service Agency						
104-58	Emergency conservation program (emergency appropriations)	20,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	17,000,000	65,000,000	77,000,000	70,000,000	+5,000,000	-7,000,000
.....	Tree assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	9,000,000	9,500,000	9,000,000	.....	-500,000
	Total, Farm Service Agency	37,000,000	74,000,000	86,500,000	79,000,000	+5,000,000	-7,500,000
	Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account						
	Loan subsidies:						
	Farm operating loans:						
.....	Direct	.....	.....	12,600,000	6,300,000	+6,300,000	-6,300,000
.....	Guaranteed subsidized (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	10,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000	-5,000,000
	Subtotal	.....	.....	22,600,000	11,300,000	+11,300,000	-11,300,000
.....	Emergency disaster loans (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	18,000,000	18,000,000	+18,000,000	.....
	Total, loan subsidies	.....	.....	40,600,000	29,300,000	+29,300,000	-11,300,000
	Loan authorizations:						
	Farm operating loans:						
.....	Direct	.....	.....	(100,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(-50,000,000)
.....	Guaranteed subsidized	.....	.....	(110,000,000)	(55,000,000)	(+55,000,000)	(-55,000,000)
	Subtotal	.....	.....	(210,000,000)	(105,000,000)	(+105,000,000)	(-105,000,000)
.....	Emergency disaster loans	.....	.....	(59,000,000)	(59,000,000)	(+59,000,000)	.....
	Total, loan authorizations	.....	.....	(269,000,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,000,000)
	Commodity Credit Corporation Fund						
	Disaster reserve assistance program:						
.....	Livestock indemnity program	.....	.....	.....	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
	Natural Resources Conservation Service						
104-58	Watershed and flood prevention operations (emergency appropriations)	66,100,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	18,000,000	150,700,000	171,000,000	166,000,000	+15,300,000	-5,000,000
	Total, Natural Resources Conservation Serivce	84,100,000	150,700,000	171,000,000	166,000,000	+15,300,000	-5,000,000
	Rural Housing Service						
	Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program:						
	Rental housing (sec. 515):						
104-58	Loan subsidy (emergency appropriation)	250,000	.....	250,000	.....	.....	-250,000
104-58	(Loan authorization)	(488,000)	.....	(488,000)	.....	.....	(-488,000)
104-58	Rural housing assistance program (emergency appropriations)	750,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	4,000,000	.....	.....	-4,000,000
	Total, Rural Housing Service	1,000,000	.....	4,250,000	.....	.....	-4,250,000
	Rural Utilities Service						
104-58	Rural utilities assistance program (emergency appropriations)	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	6,500,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000	-2,500,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Housing Programs						
.....	Preserving existing housing investment	.....	3,500,000	.....	3,500,000	.....	+3,500,000
104-3	Drug elimination grants for low-income housing (by transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	.....	.....	(-30,200,000)	.....
	Capacity Building for Community Development and Affordable Housing						
.....	National community development initiative (by transfer)	.....	.....	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(+30,200,000)	.....
	Community Planning and Development						
104-71	Community development block grants fund (emergency appropriations)	100,000,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	250,000,000	-250,000,000	-250,000,000
.....	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	.....	250,000,000	+250,000,000	+250,000,000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	100,000,000	503,500,000	500,000,000	503,500,000	.....	+3,500,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	Federal Emergency Management Agency						
104-58	Disaster relief (emergency appropriations)	541,000,000	3,067,677,000	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	+232,323,000	+200,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	438,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
.....	Community disaster loans (by transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	.....
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	5,000,000	.....	.....	-5,000,000	.....
	Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	979,000,000	3,072,677,000	3,100,000,000	3,300,000,000	+227,323,000	+200,000,000
	Total, Chapter 10:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,832,000,000	4,329,177,000	4,353,000,000	4,731,500,000	+402,323,000	+378,500,000
	Appropriations	(753,000,000)	(761,500,000)	(753,000,000)	(931,500,000)	(+170,000,000)	(+178,500,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(641,000,000)	(3,567,677,000)	(3,600,000,000)	(3,550,000,000)	(-17,677,000)	(-50,000,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(438,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	.....	(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
	(By transfer)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	(30,200,000)	.....	.....
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	.....
	CHAPTER 11						
	OFFSETS AND RESCISSIONS						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Fund For Rural America (offset)	.....	-20,000,000	.....	-20,000,000	.....	-20,000,000
	Natural Resources Conservation Service						
.....	Wetlands reserve program (offset)	.....	-19,000,000	.....	.....	+19,000,000	.....
	Food and Consumer Service						
104-3	The emergency food assistance program (offset)	-6,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000	.....	.....
	Foreign Agricultural Service						
.....	Export credit (offset)	.....	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	.....	+16,000,000	+16,000,000
.....	Export enhancement program (offset)	.....	-23,000,000	-13,000,000	.....	+23,000,000	+13,000,000
	Total, Foreign Agricultural Service	.....	-39,000,000	-29,000,000	.....	+39,000,000	+29,000,000
	Public Law 480 Program Account:						
	Title I - Credit sales:						
104-44	Ocean freight differential (rescission)	-3,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-44	Loan subsidies (rescission)	-46,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Public Law 480 program account	-50,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Department of Agriculture	-56,000,000	-98,000,000	-49,000,000	-40,000,000	+58,000,000	+9,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	General Administration						
104-44	Working capital fund (rescission)	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	-6,400,000	.....	.....
	Legal Activities						
.....	Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)	.....	-3,000,000	.....	-3,000,000	.....	-3,000,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Food and Consumer Service						
104-3	Child nutrition programs	6,250,000					
104-3	Special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children (WIC)	100,000,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+18,000,000
	Total, Food and Consumer Service	106,250,000	76,000,000	58,000,000	76,000,000		+18,000,000
	Total, Chapter 1:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	229,350,000	300,700,000	366,850,000	354,300,000	+53,600,000	-12,550,000
	Appropriations	(106,250,000)	(76,000,000)	(70,600,000)	(82,300,000)	(+6,300,000)	(+11,700,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(88,100,000)		(250,000)			(-250,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(35,000,000)	(224,700,000)	(296,000,000)	(272,000,000)	(+47,300,000)	(-24,000,000)
	(Loan authorization)	(488,000)		(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
	CHAPTER 2						
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs						
	(emergency appropriations)			54,700,000	50,200,000	+50,200,000	-4,500,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		47,700,000			-47,700,000	
104-58	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)				2,000,000	+2,000,000	+2,000,000
	Contingent emergency appropriations		2,000,000			-2,000,000	
	Total, Economic Development Administration		49,700,000	54,700,000	52,200,000	+2,500,000	-2,500,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
104-58	Operations, research and facilities (emergency appropriations)	12,000,000					
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	22,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000	10,800,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce	22,800,000	60,500,000	65,500,000	63,000,000	+2,500,000	-2,500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	International Organizations and Conferences						
	Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment			100,000,000			-100,000,000
104-3	Arrearage payments (advance appropriation, FY 1999)	921,000,000					
	RELATED AGENCY						
	Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement						
	Salaries and expenses		2,000,000		2,000,000		+2,000,000
	Total, Chapter 2:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	943,800,000	62,500,000	165,500,000	65,000,000	+2,500,000	-100,500,000
	Appropriations		(2,000,000)	(100,000,000)	(2,000,000)		(-98,000,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(22,800,000)	(10,800,000)	(65,500,000)	(63,000,000)	(+52,200,000)	(-2,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations		(49,700,000)			(-49,700,000)	
	Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)					
	(By transfer)	(1,200,000)					
	CHAPTER 2A						
	FEDERAL FUNDS						
	Federal payment to the District of Columbia			31,150,000			-31,150,000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
	Public safety and justice			(8,800,000)			(-8,800,000)
	Capital outlay			(22,350,000)			(-22,350,000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds			(31,150,000)			(-31,150,000)
	CHAPTER 3						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
	Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee (emergency appropriations)		20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
104-58	Operation and maintenance, general (emergency appropriations)	39,000,000	150,000,000	137,000,000	150,000,000		+13,000,000
104-58	Flood control and coastal emergencies (emergency appropriations)	201,700,000	415,000,000	390,000,000	415,000,000		+25,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	50,000,000					
104-58	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	30,500,000					
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil	321,200,000	585,000,000	547,000,000	585,000,000		+38,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
104-58	Operation and maintenance (emergency appropriations)	4,500,000	7,355,000	7,355,000	7,355,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-78	Energy supply, research and development activities (by transfer)	(19,700,000)					
	Total, Chapter 3:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	325,700,000	592,355,000	554,355,000	592,355,000		+38,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(245,200,000)	(592,355,000)	(554,355,000)	(592,355,000)		(+38,000,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(50,000,000)					
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)					
	(By transfer)	(19,700,000)					
	CHAPTER 5						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
	Construction (emergency appropriations)		1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000	
104-58	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	
	Total, Bureau of Land Management		1,793,000	393,000	393,000	-1,400,000	
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
104-58	Resource management (emergency appropriations)	2,000,000	2,250,000	8,350,000	5,300,000	+3,050,000	-3,050,000
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	32,000,000	81,000,000	91,000,000	88,000,000	+7,000,000	-3,000,000
104-58	Land acquisition (emergency appropriations)	15,000,000	15,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	-5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	49,000,000	98,250,000	104,350,000	103,300,000	+5,050,000	-1,050,000
	National Park Service						
104-58	Construction	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
104-58	Emergency appropriations	147,779,000	156,912,000	157,321,000	157,321,000	+409,000	
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000		
	Total, National Park Service	187,779,000	196,912,000	197,321,000	197,321,000	+409,000	
	United States Geological Survey						
104-58	Surveys, investigations, and research (emergency appropriations)	1,300,000	4,290,000	4,650,000	4,650,000	+360,000	
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
104-58	Operation of Indian programs (emergency appropriations)	5,800,000	11,100,000	14,317,000	14,317,000	+3,217,000	
104-58	Construction (emergency appropriations)	5,000,000	5,554,000	6,249,000	6,249,000	+695,000	
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	10,800,000	16,654,000	20,566,000	20,566,000	+3,912,000	
	Total, Department of the Interior	248,879,000	317,899,000	327,280,000	326,230,000	+8,331,000	-1,050,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Forest Service						
104-58	National forest system (emergency appropriations)	25,000,000	37,107,000	39,677,000	39,677,000	+2,570,000	
104-58	Reconstruction and construction (emergency appropriations)	13,000,000	32,334,000	27,685,000	27,685,000	-4,649,000	
	Total, Forest Service	38,000,000	69,441,000	67,362,000	67,362,000	-2,079,000	

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Indian Health Service						
.....	Indian health services (emergency appropriations)	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Indian health facilities (emergency appropriations)	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Indian Health Service	.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Recreation fees (sec. 5001)	.....	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter 5:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	286,879,000	397,340,000	404,642,000	403,592,000	+6,252,000	-1,050,000
	Appropriations	(10,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	(17,000,000)	.....	.....
	Emergency appropriations	(246,879,000)	(350,340,000)	(357,642,000)	(356,592,000)	(+6,252,000)	(-1,050,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	.....	.....
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	.....
	CHAPTER 6						
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Health Resources and Services Administration						
.....	Health education assistance loans program	.....	.....	499,000	499,000	+499,000	.....
	Office of the Secretary						
.....	Public health and social services emergency fund	.....	.....	.....	15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
.....	Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	15,000,000	.....	.....	-15,000,000
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services	.....	.....	15,499,000	15,499,000	+15,499,000	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Education for the disadvantaged	.....	.....	585,000,000	101,133,000	+101,133,000	-483,867,000
.....	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	-386,824,000	.....	.....	+386,824,000
	Total, Department of Education	.....	.....	198,176,000	101,133,000	+101,133,000	-97,043,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	650,000	.....	650,000	.....	+650,000
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Child care and development block grant (sec. 6004)	.....	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000	.....
.....	Supplemental security income program (sec. 6005)	.....	240,000,000	240,000,000	240,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter 6:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	240,650,000	454,675,000	358,282,000	+117,632,000	-96,393,000
	Appropriations	.....	(240,650,000)	(826,499,000)	(358,282,000)	(+117,632,000)	(-468,217,000)
	Emergency appropriations	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	.....	.....	(-15,000,000)
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	(-386,824,000)	.....	.....	(+386,824,000)
	CHAPTER 7						
	CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
	SENATE						
	Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
.....	Secretary of the Senate (by transfer)	.....	.....	(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES						
	Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
.....	Gratuities, deceased Members	.....	.....	.....	133,600	+133,600	+133,600
	OTHER AGENCY						
	BOTANIC GARDEN						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	.....	33,500,000	+33,500,000	+33,500,000
	Total, Chapter 7:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	.....	33,633,600	+33,633,600	+33,633,600
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(5,000,000)	(5,010,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER 8						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Coast Guard						
.....	Operating expenses	.....	.....	6,473,000	1,600,000	+1,600,000	-4,873,000
104-3	Retired pay	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	9,200,000	+5,000,000	+5,000,000
	Total, Coast Guard	4,200,000	4,200,000	10,673,000	10,800,000	+6,600,000	+127,000
	Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Facilities and equipment (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)	.....	40,000,000	.....	.....	-40,000,000	.....
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports	.....	.....	15,520,000	.....	.....	-15,520,000
	Federal Highway Administration						
	Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):						
104-58	Emergency relief program (emergency appropriations)	276,000,000	276,000,000	276,000,000	650,000,000	+374,000,000	+374,000,000
104-58	Contingent emergency appropriations	15,000,000	374,000,000	374,000,000	.....	-374,000,000	-374,000,000
104-3	(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
	Total, Federal Highway Administration	291,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	650,000,000	.....	.....
	Federal Railroad Administration						
.....	Emergency railroad rehabilitation and repair (emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	.....	18,900,000	+18,900,000	+18,900,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	10,000,000	24,000,000	.....	-10,000,000	-24,000,000
	Total, Department of Transportation	295,200,000	704,200,000	700,193,000	679,700,000	-24,500,000	-20,493,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	National Transportation Safety Board						
104-3	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)	20,200,000	.....	14,100,000	29,859,000	+29,859,000	+15,759,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	23,300,000	.....	.....	-23,300,000	.....
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund):						
.....	Alcohol-impaired driving prevention incentive grants (sec. 8003)	.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	.....	.....
.....	National Driver Register (sec. 8004)	.....	2,500,000	.....	2,500,000	.....	+2,500,000
	Total, Chapter 8:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	315,400,000	730,500,000	714,793,000	712,559,000	-17,941,000	-2,234,000
	Appropriations	(4,200,000)	(47,200,000)	(26,693,000)	(13,800,000)	(-33,400,000)	(-12,893,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(296,200,000)	(276,000,000)	(290,100,000)	(698,759,000)	(+422,759,000)	(+408,659,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(15,000,000)	(407,300,000)	(398,000,000)	.....	(-407,300,000)	(-398,000,000)
	(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
	CHAPTER 9						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
	Departmental Offices						
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	.....	1,950,000	1,950,000	+1,950,000	.....
	U.S. POSTAL SERVICE						
104-3	Payment to the Postal Service Fund	5,383,000	5,300,000	5,383,000	5,383,000	+83,000	.....
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
104-71	Unanticipated needs for natural disasters (emergency appropriations)	200,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
104-61	Federal Election Commission	1,709,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter 9:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	207,092,000	5,300,000	7,333,000	7,333,000	+2,033,000	.....
	Appropriations	(7,092,000)	(5,300,000)	(7,333,000)	(7,333,000)	(+2,033,000)	.....
	Emergency appropriations	(200,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	CHAPTER 10						
	DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
	Veterans Benefits Administration						
104-3	Compensation and pensions	753,000,000	753,000,000	753,000,000	928,000,000	+175,000,000	+175,000,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Immigration and Naturalization Service						
.....	Construction (rescission)	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000
	Total, Department of Justice	-6,400,000	-10,400,000	-6,400,000	-10,400,000	.....	-4,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Institute of Standards and Technology						
.....	Industrial technology services (rescission)	.....	-7,000,000	.....	-7,000,000	.....	-7,000,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
.....	Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion (rescission)	.....	-2,000,000	.....	.....	+2,000,000	.....
	Total, Department of Commerce	.....	-9,000,000	.....	-7,000,000	+2,000,000	-7,000,000
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	Federal Communications Commission						
.....	Salaries and expenses (rescission)	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000
	Ounce of Prevention Council						
.....	Direct appropriation (rescission)	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000	.....	-1,000,000
	Total, related agencies	.....	-2,000,000	.....	-2,000,000	.....	-2,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
104-3	Construction, general (offset)	-50,000,000	.....	-30,000,000	.....	.....	+30,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	Energy supply, research and development activities (rescission)	.....	-22,532,000	.....	-11,180,000	+11,352,000	-11,180,000
	Power Marketing Administrations						
104-44	Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, Western Area Power Administration (rescission)	-2,111,000	.....	.....	-11,352,000	-11,352,000	-11,352,000
	Total, Department of Energy	-2,111,000	-22,532,000	.....	-22,532,000	.....	-22,532,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
104-57	Clean coal technology (rescission)	-10,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000	-17,000,000	.....	.....
104-44	Strategic petroleum reserve (rescission)	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Department of Energy	-21,000,000	-28,000,000	-28,000,000	-28,000,000	.....	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Administration for Children and Families						
.....	Job opportunities and basic skills (JOBS) (offset)	.....	-700,000,000	-700,000,000	-700,000,000	.....	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Federal family education loan program account (rescission)	.....	-849,000	.....	.....	+849,000	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	.....	-778,000,000	-750,000,000	-750,000,000	+28,000,000
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
.....	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	.....	-10,600,000	-13,000,000	-13,000,000	-2,400,000
	Federal Transit Administration						
.....	Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	.....	-271,000,000	-271,000,000	-271,000,000	.....
.....	Discretionary grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	.....	-588,000,000	-588,000,000	-588,000,000	.....
	Total, Federal Transit Administration	.....	.....	-859,000,000	-859,000,000	-859,000,000	.....
	Total, Department of Transportation	.....	.....	-1,647,600,000	-1,622,000,000	-1,622,000,000	+25,600,000

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	General Services Administration						
	Federal Buildings Fund:						
.....	Repairs and alterations (rescission)	.....	-1,400,000	.....	.....	+1,400,000	.....
104-44	Expenses, presidential transition (rescission)	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	.....	.....
	Total, General Services Administration	-5,600,000	-7,000,000	-5,600,000	-5,600,000	+1,400,000	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Housing Programs						
104-44	Annual contributions for assisted housing (rescission)	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,650,000,000	-3,650,000,000	+173,440,000	.....
	Federal Housing Administration						
	FHA - General and special risk program account:						
.....	Rescission	.....	.....	-85,000,000	.....	.....	+85,000,000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development	-250,000,000	-3,823,440,000	-3,735,000,000	-3,650,000,000	+173,440,000	+85,000,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Federal Emergency Management Agency						
.....	Salaries and expenses (emergency rescission)	.....	.....	-5,000,000	.....	.....	+5,000,000
	National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
.....	National aeronautics facilities (rescission of advance appropriation, FY 1998)	.....	-38,000,000	-365,000,000	-365,000,000	-327,000,000	.....
	Funds Appropriated to the President						
.....	Unanticipated needs (emergency rescission)	.....	.....	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	-4,200,000	.....
	Total, Chapter 11:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-391,111,000	-4,739,221,000	-6,575,800,000	-6,456,732,000	-1,717,511,000	+119,068,000
	Rescissions	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)	(+49,468,000)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	.....	(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
	Rescission of advance appropriation	.....	(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	.....
	Offsets	(-56,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
	Emergency rescissions	.....	.....	(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
	Total, title II:						
	Discretionary budget authority (net)	2,991,910,000	1,162,101,000	-280,702,000	-135,511,000	-1,297,612,000	+145,191,000
	Appropriations	(123,342,000)	(392,450,000)	(1,075,075,000)	(508,515,000)	(+116,065,000)	(-566,560,000)
	Rescissions	(-335,111,000)	(-3,903,221,000)	(-3,775,000,000)	(-3,725,532,000)	(+177,689,000)	(+49,468,000)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	.....	(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
	Offsets	(-56,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(1,740,179,000)	(4,797,172,000)	(4,882,847,000)	(5,260,706,000)	(+463,534,000)	(+377,859,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)	(-422,000,000)
	Emergency rescissions	.....	.....	(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
	Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)	.....	(-386,824,000)	.....	.....	(+386,824,000)
	Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	.....	(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
	Rescission of advance appropriation	.....	(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	.....
	(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
	(Loan authorization)	(488,000)	.....	(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
	(By transfer)	(51,100,000)	(30,200,000)	(35,200,000)	(35,210,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	.....
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	.....
	Mandatory budget authority	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTALS AND RESCISSIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 1997 (H.R. 1469) — continued

Doc No.	Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
Grand total, all titles:						
Discretionary budget authority (net)	218,124,000	1,161,634,000	-381,165,000	-135,663,000	-1,297,297,000	+245,502,000
Appropriations	(143,342,000)	(449,930,000)	(1,151,555,000)	(591,795,000)	(+141,865,000)	(-559,760,000)
Rescissions	(-407,111,000)	(-5,943,568,000)	(-5,680,943,000)	(-5,655,164,000)	(+288,404,000)	(+25,779,000)
Rescission of contract authorization	.....	.....	(-1,647,600,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(-1,622,000,000)	(+25,600,000)
Offsets	(-4,856,000,000)	(-798,000,000)	(-779,000,000)	(-740,000,000)	(+58,000,000)	(+39,000,000)
Emergency appropriations	(3,818,393,000)	(6,779,572,000)	(6,611,847,000)	(7,106,906,000)	(+327,334,000)	(+495,059,000)
Contingent emergency appropriations	(568,000,000)	(711,700,000)	(724,000,000)	(302,000,000)	(-409,700,000)	(-422,000,000)
Emergency rescissions	.....	.....	(-9,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(-4,200,000)	(+5,000,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1998	(30,500,000)	.....	(-386,824,000)	.....	.....	(+386,824,000)
Advance appropriation, FY 1999	(921,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency advance appropriation, FY 1998	.....	.....	.....	(250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)	(+250,000,000)
Rescission of advance appropriation	.....	(-38,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-365,000,000)	(-327,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on obligations)	(318,077,043)	(318,077,043)	(933,193,000)	(694,810,534)	(+376,733,491)	(-238,382,466)
(Loan authorization)	(488,000)	.....	(269,488,000)	(164,000,000)	(+164,000,000)	(-105,488,000)
(By transfer)	(51,100,000)	(53,200,000)	(58,200,000)	(58,210,000)	(+5,010,000)	(+10,000)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(3,003,000)	(3,003,000)	(4,403,000)	(4,403,000)	(+1,400,000)	.....
(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+20,000,000)	.....
Mandatory budget authority	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total appropriations in bill (net)	975,324,000	1,918,834,000	376,035,000	801,670,600	-1,117,163,400	+425,635,600
SUMMARY OF 1997 SPENDING						
Total discretionary spending, title I	2,098,214,000	2,039,880,000	1,805,480,000	1,929,480,000	-110,400,000	+124,000,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title I	-4,872,000,000	-2,040,347,000	-1,905,943,000	-1,929,632,000	+110,715,000	-23,689,000
Total discretionary spending, title II	2,431,521,000	5,901,322,000	6,681,922,000	6,071,221,000	+169,899,000	-610,701,000
Total rescissions and offsets, title II	-391,111,000	-4,701,221,000	-6,210,800,000	-6,091,732,000	-1,390,511,000	+119,068,000
Total mandatory spending, title II	757,200,000	757,200,000	757,200,000	937,333,600	+180,133,600	+180,133,600
Total spending in bill	5,286,935,000	8,698,402,000	9,244,602,000	8,938,034,600	+239,632,600	-306,567,400

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on March 19 the President sent a request to this Congress for an emergency supplemental to pay for flood damage relief in some 35 States and to reimburse the Pentagon for additional costs incurred by America's responsibilities in Bosnia. That request was for around $5 billion.

Today is June 6, almost 80 days after the President sent his request to this Congress. Today, this House is apparently about to send to the President a bill that contains considerably more money and, unfortunately, it also contains three blatant political riders which have nothing whatsoever to do with disaster recovery or military readiness. Those riders will, and, in fact, they are doing it right now, they are, for all practical purposes, resulting in a second Government shutdown for the areas of the country who are desperately awaiting relief from Washington and are not getting it because of these three riders.

The first rider is a political restriction on the census. Now, I happen to agree with the language of that rider. I do not like the idea of having sample census supplement the enumeration in the census. But I also recognize that that fight ought to be made on the State-Commerce-Justice appropriation bill. It does not belong on an emergency proposal to get help to 35 States which need it very badly.

□ 1730

There is also a second rider which has to do with constructing roads on environmentally sensitive public lands in some 17 States across the country, most especially Alaska. No matter how one feels about the provision, that language does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill trying to help the American people.

Thirdly, there is another rider, which is posed as being a benign rider, which will simply extend the activities of Government at the end of the fiscal year. In fact, that rider is a pernicious effort to create a new imbalance of power between the Congress and the Presidency, because the effect of that rider is to essentially allow the majority in this House to pass through the Congress those appropriation bills which they want to cut, but it allows them to hold back any appropriation bill which contains administration priorities. That means that the President is being asked to put himself in a hole in terms of being able to defend what he considers to be legitimate national priorities. No matter how one feels about that, that language again does not belong on an emergency appropriation bill.

Now, this bill is going nowhere. It is going to be vetoed over those three riders. The American people know that once again Congress is putting, by its action on these three riders, it is putting partisan political considerations ahead of the needs of the American people, and I think we ought to see to it that that does not happen this evening.

What we ought to do is to stop the political games. We ought to stop the delays which are preventing real help from getting out there to real people. So I am simply going to ask people tonight to vote ''no'' on the proposition. A ''no'' vote will actually speed up the needed relief to the affected areas of the country because we could, in fact, tonight go back to conference, strip that bill of these three offending riders, and in that way enable aid to get to these areas in the fastest possible way.

That is what I think we should do. We should pass the effective equal, H.R. 1796, which I have deposited at the desk today, which will contain all of the provisions in this proposition before us today except those three riders that are causing this bill to go nowhere. That is the responsible thing to do if we are worried about meeting the needs of our troops in Bosnia, if we are worried about meeting the needs of the Americans in the affected areas.

I would urge a ''no'' vote on this bill, not only because it is delaying the needed aid to these areas, but because it also is rapidly getting us into a place where our military is going to have to take a number of actions which are not in the national interest of this country.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS], who deserves all the credit as the prime sponsor of the continuing resolution involved in this bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about a resolution that is geared to prevent the shutdown of Government. What is so wrong about that? The same voices that are saying we cannot pass legislation to prevent Government shutdown are the voices that the last time were heard, ''You have shut down the Government. Why did you shut down the Government?''

This is a simple way, a commonsense way, and maybe that is why I cannot get it through to everybody, it is a commonsense way to prevent Government shutdowns.

What did the President say during the last time when the Government was shut down that should be part of the record for this debate here today? He said, and I quote, ''It is deeply wrong to shut the Government down while we negotiate under the illusion that somehow that will affect the decisions that I would make on specific issues. As I said, this is only casting a shadow over our talks. I will continue to do everything I can in good faith to reach an agreement, but it is wrong to shut the Government down.''

The President should be addressed in a way to indicate that this is exactly what we are doing: We are listening to his words, we should not shut down the Government. Same President, same arena.

In the last shutdown alone, the Federal Housing Administration was unable to insure single-family home loans for tens of thousands of deserving applicants, and many, many thousands of citizens could not get passports. Some veterans could not get benefits. Many Medicare claims could not be processed. Small businesses, lots of them, could not get loans to create new jobs, all of because of a shutdown.

We are asking in this particular amendment that we permit a commonsense way to prevent Government shutdown. The President said this about the cost of a shutdown on Saturday, January 20, 1996: ''We believe that we can go a long way towards bringing the forces of goodwill to a measure that everyone agrees should occur to prevent Government shutdown.''

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA].

(Mr. MURTHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, let me talk a little bit about the problems we have in defense. I include for the RECORD three letters, one addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Army, and the other addressed to Secretary Cohen from the Air Force.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR BILL, I want to thank you for your action to date on the FY 1997 Bosnia/Southwest Asia Supplemental request, but I want to share with you my concern and that of the Service Chiefs about the impact on operations and training if the supplemental is not approved soon.

In my testimony and discussions with Congress, I have emphasized the need for early action on the supplemental. Based on its likely passage by Memorial Day, few actions were taken by the Department to offset supplemental costs. However, since our request was not approved last month, the Chiefs of Staff of the Army and the Air Force have renewed their concern over the possibility of delayed passage of the supplemental. I have enclosed copies of recent memoranda from them. To ensure that their overall operations are properly funded, the Chiefs have indicated that they cannot risk being left with no options for funding Bosnia/Southwest Asia costs if the supplemental is delayed much longer.

I remain hopeful that quick action can be taken on the supplemental to preclude the disruptive impact to the Department's programs, especially those related to maintaining our readiness capability.

Sincerely,

BILL.

U.S. ARMY,
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.

Hon. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I need your assistance in expediting the Bosnia Supplemental currently on the Hill. In early April, I advised Congress that in the absence of supplemental funding or the clear assurance that such funding would be forthcoming, I would be forced to begin actions in early May that would result in a degradation of readiness. I have not initiated the planned actions to deal with the lack of supplemental funding because the progress made had convinced me that supplemental funding would be forthcoming.

Recent developments indicate passage of the supplemental may be at risk. This puts the Army in the position of having to provide fourth quarter resource allocation to the field without having supplemental funding in hand. We have a fiscal responsibility to ensure that the allocation of fourth quarter resources is done within current limitations. There are several actions presently under consideration to cope with this situation. Each will have direct readiness and quality of life implications. Actions include the cancellation of Army participation in JCS exercises, Combat Training Center (CTC) rotations, home station training, weapons qualification training, and the deferral of some real property and depot maintenance. Some of these actions could carry over into the next fiscal year. For example, canceling home station training in the fourth quarter of this fiscal year could impact on CTC rotations in the first quarter of FY 1998.

We continue to monitor the supplemental very closely. As the situation develops, the Army will initiate any and all actions necessary to train and operate within the means available to us.

Very Respectfully,

DENNIS J. REIMER.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, DC, June 3, 1997.

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense

From: HQ USAF/CC, 1670 Air Force Pentagon, Washington, DC 20330–1670

Subject: FY97 DoD Contingency Supplemental

I understand that quick passage of the Supplemental may be in jeopardy. The purpose of this memorandum is to make you aware of the impacts of delayed passage (beyond June) on Air Force day-to-day operations.

The Air Force is currently cash flowing over $700 million in support of Bosnia and SWA operations. We are doing so out of third and fourth quarter funding but are fast running out of flexibility and must soon take very dramatic action to avoid incurring an anti-deficiency in our O&M appropriation. On or about 1 July, Air Force commanders must begin taking the following kinds of actions:

Severely curtail or cease non-flying training—skill and proficiency levels reduced, e.g., weapons maintenance.

Severely curtail or cease flying training—squadrons and wings stand down—aircrew readiness degraded.

Cease all non-mission critical travel.

Defer further depot maintenance inductions—aircraft grounded.

Terminate benchstock fills—aircraft spares and consummables inventories drained.

Park non-mission critical vehicles.

Place moratoriums on all but safety related facility maintenance, including runway repair.

Impose civilian hiring freezes.

I know you are aware of the importance of this issue. We are well beyond the point where we can avoid serious disruption to Air Force operations if there is no supplemental. Timing is now critical.

RONALD R. FOGLEMAN,
General, USAF, Chief of Staff.

Mr. Speaker, we started doing our business as soon as we got the request. Chairman YOUNG called the subcommittee together. We recognized the concern of the military if we did not replenish their supplies, because of the Bosnia operation. There are a number people that were against the deployment to Bosnia, but our position in the Congress has always been, we are going to take care of the troops.

So we went to work immediately trying to make sure that we did our part in this supplemental. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations recognized the need. He has been on this subcommittee for years, and he recognized the need to do something immediately about it. Let me say that the military is really in a bind. The quicker we get this done, the sooner we will alleviate the problems in the military. But let me go back a few years and show you the difference.

In 1977, Johnstown, PA had a disastrous flood. The legislation had run out for flood relief. At that time it was handled by the Small Business Administration. I stayed for 2 or 3 days in Johnstown, and I recognized we could not do anything until we got legislation to extend and extended the coverage for the Small Business Administration.

I came back to Washington, talked to the Speaker at that time, who was Tip O'Neill. He called the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter. Within a week, we had passed the necessary legislation and we could go forward with opening up the disaster relief centers that were needed so desperately in our area.

The Federal Government spent $350 million in a very small area, within about a 4- or 5-month period, because of the cooperation of everybody in the House Chamber. There were no extraneous matters on the legislation. Everything was done in order to expedite it.

I know how those people feel. I understand their pain. We went through it. Three times we have had disastrous floods in our area. We are, in effect, shutting down the Government because of extraneous material. Here we are with the CR. If we could not do our job, the Government shuts down. The Committee on Appropriations realizes the importance of passing this legislation without a continuing resolution.

I remember the President of the United States standing up there with a continuing resolution passed under the Democrats, it was 2 or 3 feet thick, and he said this should never happen again. What we are doing here is trying to pass a continuing resolution, when we do not even know what would be in this, because we shut down the Government a year ago.

That is a mistake, and I feel very strongly that the Committee on Appropriations does not need the advice of the Whole House in telling us how to do our business. We do our business. We pass the legislation. If we had an opportunity, we would pass this legislation without any extraneous matters.

The census hurts Pennsylvania, this census matter that they are trying to pass in this legislation. So I would hope that we would pass this quickly, the President will veto it and get it back here, so we can get this flood relief and this defense relief that is so desperately needed for the people out there passed and signed into law and get help to them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to echo some of the thoughts that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA] has just spoken of. I would remind the Members, and as I have told Mr. MURTHA, when I was 5 years old and lived in a little house on the banks of the Allegheny River in western Pennsylvania, I had an opportunity to watch that little house get knocked off of its foundation by the flooded Allegheny River, and at that point we had no idea where we might be going to live. So I know firsthand, although it has been a while ago, I know firsthand the feeling and frustration of people that lose their homes because of natural disasters, and in this case floods.

Also, I would say that the needs of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard need to be met and need to be met quickly. In support of the work of the Committee on Appropriations, and especially the Subcommittee on National Security, we have done our job. We did it well.

When we got the request for the supplemental for the Armed Services, we were asked to wait until the disaster supplemental was sent also from the White House, so we did wait for that. It arrived at the end of March. The subcommittee marked up the defense supplemental on April 16. We were through the full committee on markup on April 24. The Senate passed the supplemental on May 8. The supplemental went to the House floor, was defeated by an overwhelming vote on that side, unfortunately. So we had to bring the supplemental rule back to the House again on May 15. We finally passed it and went to conference on May 20.

On the first day of the conference, the conferees on the national security issue, the defense supplemental, settled our differences with the other body, and we were prepared to move that legislation then. We recognized the need

that the Armed Services had. We did not delay. We have been prepared to go on this issue ever since May 20.

So I hope that we can settle this issue today. I hope that we can send it to the White House. I hope the President will recognize that what we are doing here is in good faith, sign this bill, get the disaster relief where it is needed, and get the money to the military before they have to stand down their training and other issues that might seriously affect readiness.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the sampling prohibition buried deeply within this measure. Legislating census methodology is not only wholly inappropriate, but holding disaster victims hostage to its political aims is unconscionable. For them, this is a Government shutdown.

Consider this: We have just told the world's premier statistical agency that they cannot use statistical methods. The truth is that sampling and statistical methods are not new to the census, but even decades-old traditional uses would be banned, and would guarantee that tens of millions of Americans all across this country will be missed and millions more will be double-counted. Even worse, errors resulting from this count will reverberate and compound themselves year after year in the maldistributions of hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade.

Without sampling, we will never be able to count every head by simply relying on return census forms and dedicated amateur enumerators. Who says so? Well, in 1991 the now Speaker of the House urged the use of statistical methods to improve the count. GAO and the Commerce Inspector General criticized the Census Bureau for not going far enough to incorporate sampling, and three separate panels of the National Academy of Sciences recommended the use of sampling and statistical methods to make the count more accurate.

Dr. Barbara Bryant, President Bush's director of the Census, said that the most accurate count possible will be the one that combines the best techniques for direct enumeration with the best known technology for sampling and estimating the unmeasured.

□ 1745

The bill before us rejects those judgments. There is nothing unconstitutional about the use of sampling or statistical methods. But prohibiting its use and holding disaster victims hostage to this very bad idea is unconscionable. This is for them a government shutdown. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations to engage in a colloquy.

The conference agreement contains an appropriation for the emergency repair and renovation of the Botanic Garden, which we all know is absolutely necessary. As the gentleman knows, the Joint Committee on the Library has jurisdiction over that program. Does the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on the Library extend to the direction of the expenditure of the funds for the renovation project that is contained in this supplemental?

Mr. WALSH. My response is yes. This is a supplemental appropriation which supplements the regular fiscal year 1997 appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Botanic Garden. The language in that supplemental says, and I quote, ''for an additional amount that is an additional amount over and above the appropriation in the regular appropriations bill and under the same terms and conditions as the regular fiscal year appropriation.''

The regular fiscal year appropriation clearly states, at 110 statute 2406 in Public Law 104–197, that ''all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden are under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.''

I confirm, therefore, that the repair and renovation project are covered by the terms and conditions of the basic appropriation. That means it will be conducted under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and I thank the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

Mr. STOKES. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the U.S. census sampling language contained in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. The prohibition of sampling will guarantee a miscount of the American people. The U.S. Census Bureau and the National Academy of Science's research and evaluations have proven that statistical sampling is absolutely necessary to improve the accuracy of the census count. In addition, the U.S. Department of Commerce inspector general has determined that the use of sampling to measure and correct the census undercount is the only way to eliminate the historic disproportionate undercount of people of color and the poor.

Mr. Speaker, the House leadership must not deny the American people their constitutional right to be counted. This is an issue of fundamental fairness and basic economics. Not only is the count used for reapportioning the House of Representatives, it is used in determining the allocation of billions upon billions of hard-earned taxpayer dollars.

To deny the American people their right to be accurately counted in the U.S. census is not only a blatant act of discrimination, it is also irresponsible. The 1990 census failed to count an estimated 4 million people and cost the American people a record high of $2.6 billion. The census counting system is broken and must be fixed. I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting ''no'' on the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I speak as the representative of the citizens of this country that have perhaps been hit the hardest by all of the natural disasters addressed in this bill.

The bill before us represents some of the very best and some of the very worst inclinations of this body.

Six days after the dikes broke in Grand Forks and the city was inundated, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was kind enough to add relief in the markup on this bill to respond to our situation. The very next day, the Speaker of the House gave up personal family time over the weekend to come and view the area. Two days after that the majority leader led a bipartisan delegation also to view the area and assess the damages. The very next week meaningful relief was added to the bill on the House floor, thanks to the work of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], another bipartisan effort.

Then, just when it looked to the people of the country that Congress perhaps could act in a bipartisan way to meaningfully respond to a disaster, the games started and brought the whole effort to a screeching halt, leading up to the disgraceful exit of this body at Memorial Day recess without addressing the flood disaster.

The bill before us still contains the political games that have slowed this effort and delayed relief to the people that need it, but I ask that it be enacted and sent to the White House. I have become convinced that we need to move this relief measure forward and that playing this silly game out, sending the bill up with the veto bait attached, ensuring the veto which will come, ensuring the sustaining of the veto which we know will then come, will then get us to a position where the bill can be passed, as it should have been all along, with just the relief component, so that at last, at long last, the families that I represent and others throughout the area that I am from, families that in some instances do not

have homes to go to tonight, families that will not have seen their children for 6 weeks, a city that does not know which way to turn until this bill is passed, only then can we begin the process of moving forward. Despite the reservations, I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise this afternoon in favor of the conference report. I would like to address one of the three objections mentioned by the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and that deals with the issue of census sampling. The distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin says that he agrees with the language of the conference report on sampling but he simply does not believe it is appropriate in this particular piece of legislation.

What are we talking about? There are people in the administration and in the Census Bureau who are proposing essentially to count approximately 90 percent of the people of our country and then to guess at the other 10 percent based on a computer sampling. That is the issue we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, we need an accurate count of every American. Constitutional principles dictate that we count every American. I am constantly amazed by the wisdom and foresight of our Founding Fathers. The U.S. Constitution, in Article I, section 2, calls for ''an actual enumeration'' of the people. Not a sample, not a guess.

Further, the 14th Amendment of the Constitution calls for apportionment based on ''counting the whole number of persons in each State,'' not just some of them and not guessing at the others. Each and every one of our constituents needs to be counted.

This ''Census Guessing Scheme 2000,'' as I call it, is not only unconstitutional but it is also inaccurate. According to independent studies from Congress, the proposal has a margin of error of up to 35 percent. We do not need to have an estimate where there are 100 people and it could be 65 or it could be 135. That is not the way it should be done. We will provide the money to count each and every American.

This issue is essential. It goes to the franchise of our citizens. It rises to constitutional dimensions, and it needs to be settled right now. I cannot for the life of me understand why the President of the United States would veto this essential bill on this particular issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON].

(Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report because it has the needed resources that we need in our community. I would also like to thank my friends in the majority for putting this bill together and making this a priority coming out and seeing our area. I represent the city of East Grand Forks and some other communities that have been damaged by this flood and, believe it or not, we have I think more damage to homes and more damage to businesses in our community than they have had in Grand Forks. We are a smaller community, a community of 9,000 people. We do not have the resources of some of the bigger communities, and we really need this legislation to help us put this community back together. We have to move probably 40 percent of this community. We have to rebuild the entire downtown area. We have got a lot of work ahead of us. We very much need this legislation.

One thing that really disturbs me and disturbs the people of our area is that we have got these extraneous items that are attached to this bill. The mayor was here yesterday. They are very frustrated that we are getting partisan political issues added to this bill that have no business being included, they have nothing to do with this bill, and it is really unfortunate that we are in this situation. This bill is going to be vetoed, and we are going to have to go through this process.

The other thing I would say is am really disappointed that we are not going to be here tomorrow and we are not going to be here Monday. We were planning on being here and I think we ought to be here. That way we could have the President veto the bill and we could have this thing shuttle back and forth and we could get it passed.

Every week that we lose is more of a problem for us. We are in a very cold climate. We have a very short window of opportunity to rebuild this community. If we have to wait until Tuesday and we have got more vetoes and more going back and forth, it is going to put us in a bigger problem. I reluctantly support this agreement in its current form and hope that we can get through this process, get to a clean bill and get the money to the people of the area that need it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is tragic that we now see Members whose districts have been impacted seriously by the floods being put in the situation of a bill that is now unacceptable because it continues to carry riders.

One of the most egregious riders in this legislation is the one that deals with the issue of roads and public lands, the RS–2477 roads, if you will. Just as the floods destroyed much of the property of the people in the upper Midwest and in California earlier this year, this rider is designed to destroy much of the wilderness and the public lands in the United States. The reason it is on this legislation is very simple. It could not pass the House of Representatives any other way and it cannot pass the Senate any other way. It may not even be able to get out of a Senate committee. Yet what we find is the sponsors of this measure are the chairs of those committees but they do not want to subject it to public scrutiny. They want to put it on a rider in appropriations that is supposed to speak to the desperate situation of people who have lost their homes, their lives, their property. That ought not to be allowed. This amendment ought not to be allowed. This amendment suggests that if you find any historical trail, any tracings of somebody going across public lands, that somehow that can then be exploited and turned into an improved road. Then of course that improved road is used to say that that land will not qualify for wilderness because it has a road on it. It is a little bit like the young man who killed his mother and father and then pleaded for mercy from the court because he was an orphan. This ought not to be allowed. This should be subjected to hearings in committees. This should be subjected to a full debate in the House of Representatives where it will be overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis rejected. But the senior Senator from Alaska decides that he would rather hold the flood victims hostage. The senior Senator from Alaska has decided rather than have open debate, he would rather stick it into a bill for people in a desperate situation.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the rules prohibit the last statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Is the gentleman making a point of order against the words?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not ask that the gentleman's words be taken down because of the lateness of the day. But I would make a point of order that the gentleman's words were out of order.

□ 1800

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly clear to stand to be corrected, if that is the case, and I guess I need to be reminded again about how we identify who is being talked about if we are talking about somebody in the Senate? What does one say? A Senator?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members not to mention specific Senators in a derogatory manner.

Mr. MILLER of California. Can we get fingerprints on the resolution then, or how do we do this?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would request the opportunity to place in the RECORD an earnest letter from my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to support sampling to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991.

How times have changed. I feel it is very wrong to legislate on the CR and certainly to change the census law banning sampling on the CR.

The letter referred to follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 30, 1991,

Hon. ROBERT A. MOSBACHER,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Based on recent press reports, it appears that there has been an undercount of the Georgia population in an amount in excess of 200,000. I respectfully request that the Census numbers for the state of Georgia be readjusted to reflect the accurate population of the state so as to include the over 100,000 which were not previously included.

Needless to say, if the undercount is not corrected, it would have a serious negative impact on Georgia. For example, if the population is adjusted to reflect the 200,000, then Georgia would be entitled to an additional congressional seat. In addition, without the adjustment, minority voting strength in Georgia will be seriously diluted. Based on available information, without an adjustment to compensate for the undercount, minorities in Georgia could lose two State Senate seats and 4-5 House seats. As a result of conversations with black legislators, it is my understanding that they have not only concurred with this request, but stated that they believe it is required under the Voting Rights Act.

In addition to these repercussions, the failure to make an adjustment based upon the admitted undercount would seriously affect federal funding which Georgia receives. In effect, Georgia would be required to utilize funds to provide for an additional 200,000 for which it was not receiving funding.

Based on these factors, I strongly urge you to adjust Georgia's population figures to reflect the correct population. I would appreciate your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

NEWT GINGRICH.

By including the sampling ban in the disaster relief bill you're effectively dumping on two segments of the population. Those who need flood relief, so they can recover their homes and businesses, and those minorities and poor—who are constantly overlooked by the majority in this House.

The House leadership talks a lot about inclusion. What's worse, the language in this bill prevents the bureau from checking for duplications, or even from making sure enough people are employed to do the door-to-door visits.

This bill even forces the Census Bureau to make mistakes and not tell anyone about it. I want to be clear about this. The 1990 census missed 10 million people. It then overcounted 6 million. It was the most inaccurate, unfair census in history.

Sampling would correct this attack on democracy. We need to let Americans know they can count on us not to count them out.

In fact one House leader talked a little more about inclusion. I have an earnest letter from my colleague, NEWT GINGRICH, urging the Secretary of Commerce to adjust the population numbers to reflect the fact that 300,000 people were missed in Georgia. The letter is dated April 30, 1991. How times change.

Banning sampling from the year 2000 census is a tidy way of making sure millions of Americans, mostly minorities and poor people, are not counted, and therefore have no representation on this floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote no on this supplemental. I voted yes the first time, hoping that it would be fixed in conference frankly. The ravages of rain and flood have victimized hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens. Yet we are holding them hostage, very frankly, holding them hostage so that we can get some special issues addressed and to try to hold the President of the United States in a position of being hostage himself.

That is not what this body ought to do. We should have long before this passed a clean supplemental appropriation for the victims of the floods and to supplement our troops keeping peace in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of our committee who would have tried to do that and who wanted to do that, in my opinion. His leadership was sound, it should have been followed.

Mr. Speaker, I will not support this supplemental.

I rise in opposition to this conference report.

We are simply continuing the delay in getting much-needed aid out to the Midwest. The President has made it clear that he will veto this bill based on provisions that have nothing to do with providing disaster relief to our fellow Americans.

This bill provides more than $5 billion for victims of disasters in 33 States. I support that funding which could have been approved before the Memorial Day recess, sent to the President, and signed into law.

I voted against the Memorial Day adjournment because I felt we could and should have finished work on a clean supplemental bill.

Instead, about a month after House passage, all we have is a bill that will be vetoed. How many more days, weeks, or months do my Republican friends want these disaster victims to wait?

Ironically, one of the administration's chief concerns is the automatic CR provision. In the name of preventing another Government shutdown next fall, the Republican leadership has sacrificed relief for victims of disasters. By giving the President a bill he cannot sign, we will effectively shut down many Federal disaster relief efforts. If we get about the business of getting our work done, there would be no fear of a shutdown.

The time we have spent dickering over extraneous provisions could have been used getting to the regular appropriations bills.

Holding disaster relief political hostage is not fair and it's not responsible. We ought to pass a clean appropriations measure and we ought to do it today.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I find our failure to reach agreement on the provision of funds for sorely needed public school repairs, and a deserved and overdue pay raise for police officers in the District of Columbia, highly regrettable.

District Subcommittee Chairman TAYLOR's concern and frustration with the pace of reforms in the District and with the District's leadership are not without some justification. However, I would remind my colleagues that these funds were sought by the control board, not the mayor.

Moreover, such concerns, however justified, must not lead us to turn a blind eye to the legitimate and pressing needs of both the District's citizens and those who do their very best, day in and day out, to serve and protect them—and us.

It will be unfortunate indeed if the District's schools are not able to open on time this September because we, who are in a position to preclude that outcome, declined to do so—and purely out of spite.

Mr. Speaker, the District's children, and the courageous Metropolitan police officers who protect the public safety of the District's residents and visitors—using scant resources, and in the face of increasing danger to their own lives—deserve better.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to craft a fiscal year 1998 funding bill which will address responsibly the education and public safety needs of the District.

In the meantime, I hope, for the sake of the victims, that we will soon put politics aside and pass a disaster relief bill the President can sign.

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

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

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue. This is a rider based on whim and certainly not science. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences has endorsed sampling as an accurate and effective way of doing the census.

The census spent $35 million in 1995 in 3 communities in the United States to carry out this sampling. This is not guess, this is not whim, this is science. We have the state-of-the-art. We cannot count heads by counting noses. We have done it in the 1970, 1980 and the 1990 census.

Follow the science like it's always being talked about. We have the facts; let us use it, Mr. Speaker. This is not doing it by whim or guessing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both gentleman have 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. THUNE], Mr. Speaker.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for yielding this time to me.

I do not have to tell my colleagues how frustrating this entire process has been for me, and I would add that I believe that the patience of the people in the heartland is wearing very thin, and to the credit of the Committee on Appropriations they have tried under, I think, some very trying circumstances to move this process forward, but we are here today, it has been frustrating. This process has certainly tried my soul.

But the disaster victims cannot wait any longer, and I believe that the credibility of the Congress and the Presidency is at stake if we fail to deliver on the commitment that we have made to the people who are in need.

Now I have been a proponent from the very start of this thing to keep this particular disaster relief bill clean from all the unrelated things that have been attached, but nevertheless the fact is that we are going to be voting on a bill today that includes those provisions, and I would simply ask that as we send this bill to the White House that the White House would not delay disaster assistance any further and not veto the bill over a provision that asks that we count people accurately or over a provision that will keep the government from shutting down. Those are both things that are attached to this bill.

I believe that we cannot afford to wait any longer. In my State, in particular, the construction season is very short. We have very short summers and long winters, and we have to get the work underway. There are things in this bill that are important to the people that I represent as well as to many other people around this country.

We have made a commitment. The Congress, the House and the Senate have approved this legislation. It is time that we deliver and that we get on with it and send it to the President, and I would call on the President as well to sign this bill and to get the disaster assistance out there, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for having yielded this time to me.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to point out that the gentleman from South Dakota has from the very inception of the floods in his State, in Minnesota, and North Dakota been there along with the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY]. They have been working very, very hard to try to move this bill forward. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON] and others; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] likewise, have all really knocked themselves out to try to move and progress this bill and make sure that it was signed into law by the President so that we could quit dickering with it legislatively.

Through no fault of theirs has this process been prolonged, and I just want to compliment the gentleman from South Dakota as well as the others for their strenuous hard work. They have made their case here. It is up to us to produce, and I urge the President to sign this bill so it will not go on any longer as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an exceedingly important bill for hundreds of thousands of victims of disasters in 35 States. The area I represent has seen $2 billion in losses and nine people die in the floods of January. We need this bill. But sadly it has become for those people in the affected areas another Government shutdown because we are walking right into the face of an inevitable veto, deferring even longer than is necessary the help that the people who elected us to come here and deal with their basic problems fundamentally need.

My constituents understand a Christmas tree. They understand how in Congress so often we tack on extraneous amendments that really impede our ability to get the job done. In this case there are two giant ornaments, one of which is an attempt, a partisan political attempt, to frustrate the most accurate census we could have, that census which the National Academy of Sciences and judicial experts say is not only constitutional, most accurate.

In addition, they attempt to cut back on the budget agreement in the name of keeping Government open.

This bill needs to go to the President, come right back here to be passed again.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, when the worst flood in 500 years swept through the Northern Plains 2 months ago, it was a natural disaster of historic proportions. Neighborhoods were evacuated, city blocks went up in flames, entire towns were under water. Overcome by these waters, the people called out for help. And how have the Republicans in Congress answered this call for help?

Well, I will tell my colleagues how. They have tried to high-jack this disaster relief legislation, loading it down with unrelated, politically motivated provisions that have nothing to do whatsoever with disaster relief, provisions that would slash student aid, deny veterans medical aid, devastate our national parks, and prevent the Census Bureau from taking an accurate census in the year 2000.

The American people know what an emergency is. They know that an emergency demands help and it demands help immediately. So what is the leadership of the majority doing in response to this flood? They are tinkering with mathematical formulas for the census in the year 2000.

Now what if the Founding Fathers had sent Paul Revere out on his midnight run, but asked him to drag along an iron bathtub, pick up a kitchen sink on his way to Lexington? Now, sadly, this disaster relief bill, with all of this political baggage, turns this into a legislative pack horse that will not be able to get out of the starting gate. The Republican leadership should send the President a clean disaster relief bill that deals with just that, disaster relief.

This whole process, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of how the Republicans shut down the Government not once, but twice, in an attempt to force their agenda on the American people. That was wrong, and this is wrong.

I urge my colleagues to quit holding flood victims hostage. Exploiting these suffering families for their own political agenda is just plain wrong. Let us get on with the business of a clean bill that we can send to the President and take care of the needs of the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

I want to talk briefly about the census. My subcommittee supervised, and funded the census in 1990, and we are doing the same, of course, for the year 2000 census. We want every American counted, not guessed at, not estimated, not manipulated. Counted. Nothing less than the U.S. Constitution says that every American shall be actually enumerated. It does not say guess, estimate, pontificate, manipulate. It says count, enumerate, and we are following the U.S. Constitution when we say there shall be no sampling.

We have never done sampling in the history of this country. This is a complete new departure. We insist in the House that there not be manipulation of the population count used to make up this body that governs the country. If one does what they want to do, if they want to guess, if they want to manipulate, try it. We will not stand for it because the Constitution says you shall actually enumerate citizens for the purpose of the apportionment of the U.S. House.

That is the way it has been, that is the way it shall be, and that is the way the Founding Fathers said that it should be done. We will not allow sampling. It is unconstitutional.

Lower courts have issued contradictory opinions on whether or not sampling is even possible.

Sampling is not the solution to the problem that we encountered in the 1990 census. The undercount in 1990 was because we had a cumbersome form, we did not market it, we did not send people out to find correct addresses. We had bad address lists. There was ineffective advertising, promotion, outreach and the like. We are correcting that in the census for 2000. We are appropriating nearly $4 billion to the 2000

census for the purpose of counting Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we want to count everyone in the inner cities, in the rural areas and every part of the country, and that is why we are spending $4 billion for that very purpose.

Now if we use sampling in the census, we are going to have the courts questioning the result for years to come, and we will have the census thrown out. We will have wasted $4 billion. More importantly, we will have a defective census and count of citizens that will not gain any confidence anywhere in the country. It is a prescription for chaos, Mr. Speaker. The bill that is before us prohibits sampling in the census and requires that we count every single American because we think every single American is important.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I currently have the privilege of being the chairman of the subcommittee of appropriations that deals with the disaster relief part of this bill. Throughout my career I have made a very serious effort to attempt to, where I could, eliminate partisan vitriol from subjects that relate to our subcommittee, but specially in the area of disaster relief.

□ 1815

When we recessed not so long ago, I was working in the conference dealing with this major bill. During that conference we had two or three items that were hanging up the bill, so we could not get the work done before that recess. Everybody but everybody knew there was enough money in the FEMA, that is the Federal Emergency Management Agency pipeline, to fund that which we could do in the very short term. There was some discussion of a slimmed-down version to make people feel good, but the facts were there was enough money to cover that 10-day period.

Because of that, I was astonished, while working in my district, to hear the President of the United States using his weekly radio address to suggest that one way or another, the Congress had walked away from those disaster victims. He suggested that they were unconcerned about the people of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Minnesota, and he said, as they go on vacation, ladies and gentlemen, disaster does not know of a vacation.

I was astonished that the President would take that position, when he knew full well, or at least he should have known, that there was money in the pipeline to cover that very short recess.

Now we find ourselves, we found ourselves today considering legislation in which the Republican committees have added $3.5 billion more than the President requested for disaster relief and put extra money in a housing program to make sure we can solve the problems of moving families from the floodplain way beyond the President's request in these cases, way beyond the President's request. And now we find ourselves with that same President who is talking about our vacation, threatening to veto this very important measure, because of two technicalities really, one having to do with the census in which we suggest at least everybody ought to be counted; and the other end has to do with whether we allow the President to deal with a continuing resolution, shutting down the House or not. He wants to strike the language that would eliminate the shutting down of the House.

I cannot understand why he would want to do that. Nonetheless, on technicalities, he is going to veto this bill and presume that that is not a vacation, presume these people do not have this problem any further.

Mr. President, you should sign this bill if you really care about those people in the disaster areas of this country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect and affection for my friend from California [Mr. LEWIS], but I come from a rural area, and I know that a lot of folks in this Congress do not understand much about small towns in rural America. In fact, a lot of them do not know the difference between a jersey and a guernsey. But I have to say that, if my colleagues think that there is enough money in the disaster pipeline to deal with the problems of rural areas, my colleagues need to think again.

There is not enough money in the pipeline to help with the crop planting that is essential if farmers are to recover in a number of States in this country. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with livestock replenishment, which is crucial to any farmer who has lost his operation orhis herd. There is not enough money in the pipeline to deal with the long-term housing problems that each of these mayors have. They need to know how to plan, and they cannot plan if they do not know what this Congress is going to do.

There is enough money in the pipeline to deal with the short-term emergency problems that people have, with the exceptions of some of the agricultural problems I have just laid out, but there is not enough money in the pipeline to enable people to plan for the long-term recovery of these communities. When one is a mayor trying to hold one's city together, every day counts.

What I want to say to my colleagues is simply this: The committee majority knows that these riders should not be in this bill. The committee majority tried to cooperate. In fact, the chairman of the committee—and I have great respect for him—the chairman of the committee tried to bring a clean bill to this House. But the leadership of his party had other ideas. So now, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], my good friend, is once again being asked to make a good argument for a bad case. He makes a very good argument, but the case is still bad.

I want to suggest that the 80-day delay which has been caused by the insistence of the majority party leadership in adding these three extraneous riders has effectively resulted in a second government shutdown for all of the areas of the country who need this help. There are 35 States who are still waiting for government to work for them, now, in their area on their problems. They are not interested in Washington games or Washington problems. They are interested in the problems of Carolina, of Florida, of California, of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, and the other areas. That is what they want to see action on.

In my view, the quickest way to end this political nonsense is to vote no on this bill, make the committee go back to work tonight, strip those riders out of this bill so that we can send the President a bill which is respectable, responsible, and can be signed. If we do not do that, this bill is going nowhere. We will all simply be back here next week doing what duty ought to require us to do this week, which is to end the Washington games and get on with helping real people with real things.

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

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

This bill provides $8.9 billion for people who are afflicted by disasters in 35 States, as well as to repay the Defense Department for the money that has been spent in Bosnia and Southwest Asia and elsewhere.

This money is needed. Yes, there are two extraneous provisions. There has been some criticism from the other side of the aisle that those extraneous provisions are in there. But, as recently as 1993 the other side put extraneous provisions on supplemental disaster bills. This is not new. It has always happened. Throughout the history of Congress it has happened. These are important provisions. If the President wants to veto the bill and say to the American people that he does not want to count each and every American in the census, if he wants to say that he does not mind shutting down Government, he will veto this bill. I hope he does not. People need help, and this bill will let them have the opportunity to get that help.

I urge my colleagues, do not get caught up in the political squabbles, do not rationalize this bill to death. Move the bill, vote for the bill, and, Mr. President, sign the bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. I do so reluctantly because it has many important provisions, including badly needed funding for flood relief measures in California and elsewhere across the country. As senior Democrat on the House committee with prime stewardship responsibilities for natural resources, I recognize that the conference report would provide significant assistance for repairs and enhancement of Yosemite National Park facilities and also would help with the restoration of watersheds, road decommissioning, and other flood-related priorities in our national forests.

But what makes this conference report unacceptable are the utterly nongermane legislative riders stuck into this conference report that have absolutely no relationship to the plight of flood victims and the needs to restore flood damage national parks. They will bring down this conference report, and make no mistake, they will delay much-needed, and unanimously supported, relief for the victims of the recent flooding as well as for peacekeeping in Bosnia.

The nongermane rider on RS 2477 road rights-of-way, a matter within jurisdiction of the Committee on Resources, should concern every Member of this House regardless of your position on the issue, because it is an insult to the jurisdiction and the rules of this House.

RS 2477 is a 19th-century statute enacted in the same era of Western giveaways of public resources that also produced the Mining Law of 1872. RS 2477 was repealed by Congress in 1976, so the current debate concerns only rights-of-way which were valid at that time. An amendment narrowly adopted in the other body was intended to overrule the Secretary of the Interior's current policies, leaving it to the States to determine which rights are valid and where roads can be built in national parks and other public lands.

The conferees have adopted an alternative that will establish a commission with members from affected States to determine the fate of these public lands that belong to all the American people. The commission is mandated to recommend changes in Federal law regarding road rights-of-way on Federal lands, ignoring the option that current policy on the Department of the Interior should be maintained and implemented. Should the Secretary of the Interior agree with the commission recommendations, the legislation provides for fast track consideration of legislation implementing the changes, including discharging of committees from consideration of the bill, limitations on amendments, and restrictions on debate time on the House floor.

Let me make a few clear statements on this provision.

First, this legislation is an insult to the House.

This is a big issue for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on the other side, and he demanded that this section be inserted into the report. Last year, he brought us the Government shut-down by demanding inclusion in a continuing resolution of a nongermane rider concerning the Tongass Forest in Alaska. Apparently, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations committee intends to use every appropriations bill, CR, and supplemental to promote his personal anti-environmental agenda. The House had better think about whether that is the way in which we will allow major environmental issues to be resolved.

Second, we don't need a commission to get this issue before the Congress. All the chairman of the Senate committee needs to do—if this is so important to his State—is to call up his Alaska colleagues who chair the respective authorization committees and demand that they bring such legislation out of the committees through the normal legislative process. Instead, we are subjected to this utter contempt for the regular legislating process.

Third, this provision allows Members of the other body, who surely are neither members of the House Resources committee nor the House Rules Committee, to dictate with no input whatsoever from those committees of jurisdiction the provisions of important national legislation to be considered by the House, as well as the conditions under which that legislation will be considered: who gets to speak, for how long, and what form the resulting bill may take.

With all due respect, any member of either committee who votes to sanctify this process needs to reconsider why he or she is serving on that committee.

We don't mandate fast track for bills affecting health care for children. We don't mandate fast track for bills to assist farmers, or seniors, or students, or taxes. We don't even fast track emergency supplementals. But now, we are told, we must fast tract RS 2477, and we have nothing to say about it. Just how much insult is this body prepared to accept?

The reason that we have not considered RS 2477 road right-of-way claims is because Senator STEVENS and others know full well that the House and the Senate would reject this giveaway for many of the same reasons that we have repeatedly voted to stop the giveaway of land claims under the Mining Law of 1872. Because it is a huge ripoff that threatens taxpayers and our public resources.

What is at stake here is a very serious threat to the integrity of our national parks, forests and other public lands throughout the West. In Alaska, Congress has created a world-class system of over 100 million acres of parks and other conservation areas which is riddled with claims to road access by miners with bulldozers, among others. In Utah, local development interests are anxious to use these road claims to prevent Congress from designating new wilderness areas on the public lands, and even illegally bulldoze to assert claims that the products of such activity negate inclusion of the area in future wilderness designations.

Mr. Speaker, the President made a serious error when he agreed to accept the anti-environmental the timber salvage rider on the 1995 Rescissions Act. We all learned a lesson from that experience, and he was right to veto Interior appropriations riders like the plan to increase logging in the Tongass National Forest. He should not be held hostage to this attempt to carry this pave-the-parks rider on the backs of flood victims. And I urge my colleagues to stand up for themselves and for the rights of this House and reject this conference report so that this insulting and inappropriate rider will be removed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1997.

This conference report will allow for supplemental appropriations which was originally introduced to provide assistance to flood victims. Unfortunately, the pain and suffering of those flood victims was not enough to prevent good old-fashioned partisan Hill politics from corrupting this bill.

There are serious problems with the emergency supplemental appropriations which are so great that the President indicated early in the conference process that if they were included he would veto the bill.

The conference on H.R. 1469 today will only delay the much-needed assistance that the flood victims are waiting on.

Contained in the emergency supplemental appropriation's conference bill is a provision to create an automatic continuing budget resolution if funds have not been appropriated at the close of an agency's fiscal year.

There is an important reason that this Nation's Founding Fathers explicitly established that Congress is accountable for administering the Federal Government. We must remain accountable for tough decisions and not allow ourselves to give into anxiety over how or when we will resolve budgetary matters between the Congress and the administration.

We should not place the Federal Government on automatic pilot with changes like the one suggested in this emergency supplemental funding legislation. There are programs which should be reduced in funding or changes made to meet current or foreseeable future situations.

A major part of the Congress' work deals with the authorization and appropriation of the Federal Government's spending.

Last year, I joined with many of our colleagues to address the problems of the last Congress' budget disagreements. I attempted to avoid the Government shutdowns which occurred by introducing legislation to raise the debt ceiling limit to avoid a Federal Government default of its financial obligations and insulate critical agencies.

I stood with many Members on the issue of the budget crisis and fought to resolve the issue.

I believe that this conference report would complicate the budget process by attempting to meet the Government's obligations without requiring the Congress to do its job.

The reconciliation directives in a budget resolution usually require changes in permanent laws. They instruct each designated committee to make changes in the laws under the committee's jurisdiction that will change the levels of receipts and spending controlled by the laws.

The 435 Members of the House who have the honor of being Members of this body must and should insist on remaining accountable for all of their actions.

The constituents of the 18th Congressional District deserve no less than my best effort to participate actively and enthusiastically in all of the business of the people's House as their elected representative.

We should not give into the anxiety created by our experience of the last Congress. We should work with each other during the budgetary process through our management of this House to do this job well.

With over 200 years of history to support the way we have provided funds to operate the U.S. Government there is no precedent for making this amendment law.

I am further concerned with the supplemental appropriation's legislation by the inclusion of language which would effectively and permanently bar the use of statistical sampling for the 2000 Census and beyond.

The subject of the Census was so serious that it was addressed in article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States. It explicitly states that, ''The actual Enumeration shall be made within three years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent Term of Ten Years.'' The proposed change to the 2000 Census and beyond would require large increases in funding to attempt to physically count every resident of the United States, which would be a tremendous waste of taxpayer dollars.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences have recommended that the Census Bureau use sampling in the 2000 census to save money and improve census accuracy. The conclusions of this unbiased professional group of scientists should be respected by allowing the version of the conference bill to reflect their conclusion regarding statistical sampling.

The ability to take samples during the 2000 census will insure that any undercounting which may occur in this census because of sparsely populated regions of our State and the dense populations of our cities, can be held to a minimum. Undercounting the results of the 2000 census would negatively impact Texas's share of Federal funds for block grants, housing, education, health, transportation and numerous other federally funded programs. The census, as you know, is also used in projections and planning decisions made by every State, all counties within those States and their city governments.

I would like to ask that my colleagues join in opposition of this conference report.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act of 1997. The disastrous floods of January 1997 had an enormous impact on my congressional district in California and the effects of the flooding will be with us for years to come.

The scenes last month of the Red River flooding in North Dakota and South Dakota are very familiar to my constituents. The flooded homes, the damaged businesses, and the destroyed crops are what people in my district will remember of this winter's floods. What they will also remember is the tremendous outpouring of help from their neighbors and friends. The community response to the flood disasters was truly overwhelming.

I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank those men and women in the various agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments that worked tirelessly to ensure that all residents were protected from harms way. I am certain that my fellow northern California colleagues will agree with me when I say they did an extraordinary job considering what they were up against. I know that my constituents will be forever grateful.

I think it is very important to note that, just as bad as the Red River flood damage was, my district was equally crippled by the floods. My constituents have an incredible challenge ahead of them to rebuild and recover from the damage. Damages from the California floods are expected to exceed $1.6 billion. In my district alone, San Joaquin County endured an estimated $59 million in damages to homes, over $12.5 million to businesses, $13 million to agriculture, and $14.7 million to infrastructure. Of the area I represent in Sacramento County, the damages to agriculture have not yet been determined, but it is estimated that there is over $1 million in damages to homes.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues just one of the very important issues that have arisen from the California floods this winter. This issue concerns the Cosumnes River in the northern part of my district, which lies in Sacramento County. The levees along the Cosumnes suffered catastrophic failure resulting from this year's California floods. More than 30 levee failures allowed river waters to flood homes and destroy fertile farmlands along the Cosumnes. H.R. 1469 provides assistance to local officials in my district for the repair, restoration, reconstruction, and replacement of the levees along the Cosumnes River.

I would like to reinforce that the figures listed above are purely estimates and more than likely will increase as floodwaters subside. However, we all need to recognize that the flooding in northern California is not necessarily over. More flooding is expected in the near future when the Sierra Nevada snowpack begins to melt. Since final estimates of damage caused by the floods have not been determined in all cases, I believe Congress must be vigilant in its efforts to ensure that additional emergency funding requests are met if they become necessary.

It is my hope that I do not have to return to the House floor next year and speak on this subject again because my district is underwater. However, I feel that without common sense policy towards flood control systems to prevent future flood calamities, we will continue to live with the fear of future flooding.

It is unfortunate that flooding has become a way of life for many communities throughout the United States. As my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of California can attest to, flooding at any level can be devastating. It is essential that this Congress pass H.R. 1469, which provides much needed assistance for urgent levee repair programs as well as other Federal natural disaster emergency programs.

In the interest of protecting the lives and property of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1469 to assist in resolving these problems caused by the California floods.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that we are finally considering the conference report to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. Our Nation has faced an unusual array of natural disasters recently and the bulk of the money in this bill is earmarked for recovery efforts. It is my hope that the President will sign this legislation so that Americans impacted by these disasters can continue the process of rebuilding their lives.

Mr. Speaker, as the author of a provision in the conference report that extends the San Carlos Apache Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 1992, I want to clarify one aspect of the settlement agreement. Section 6003 of the conference report to H.R. 1469 contains a section allowing the United States, and subsequently, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, to take over the operation of the Black River Pump Station from Phelps Dodge Corp. This section also provides for the lease of 14,000 acre feet per year of the tribe's Central Arizona Project [CAP] water to Phelps Dodge Corp. for a term of up to 50 years, with a right of renewal based upon a finding by the Secretary of the Interior.

The language is clear, understandable, and supported by Department of Interior officials, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, and Phelps Dodge Corp. But to avoid any confusion regarding the intent of the provision, I want to further clarify the language relating to the $5 million lease payment which Phelps Dodge is required to make to the tribe at the beginning of the initial lease term. This sum constitutes a one-time prepayment for the first 4166 acre feet of water which will be delivered in each year during the 50 year term of the lease. In effect, Phelps Dodge Corp. will be paying the tribe in advance for the delivery of 208,300 acre feet of CAP water, that will be delivered under the lease at the rate of 4166 acre feet per year over the 50 year initial lease period. The remaining water to be delivered each year under the lease will be paid for by Phelps Dodge Corp. as provided in the legislation.

Thank you and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this provision.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the inclusion of provisions in this conference report to require the Census Bureau to conduct, as the Constitution says, an ''actual enumeration'' rather than using the statistical technique known as sampling. Following the 1990 census we had a debate over whether to use the number resulting from the actual enumeration or a number adjusted by sampling. This time the bureau does not even intend to try to count everyone. As I understand it, the plan is to try to count 90 percent of the people and estimate the rest.

I oppose the use of sampling for several reasons. It would leave the census numbers open to political manipulation and would tend to undermine the public's confidence in the census. We have seen various administrations manipulate the FBI, IRS, and reportedly even the Immigration and Naturalization Service for political gain. Once we move away from a hard count what guarantee do we have that this or a future administration will not manipulate the census numbers for partisan gains?

A member of the other body has recently stated that we should all support sampling since we all rely on something similar, public opinion polls, to get elected. The problem with this thinking is that we may use polls to guide us but we don't let them determine the winner. I would have no objection if the bureau uses sampling to determine where there may have been an undercount, and then goes back in and redoubles its efforts to count those people. That would be analogous to the way we use opinion polls. But to rely on sampling rather than a physical count is comparable to changing election returns if they are at variance with the polls.

Sampling is said to adjust for undercounts in major cities. But once you estimate how many people are in a given city, to what wards, neighborhoods and precincts do they belong?

How can State legislatures and school boards and city councils be apportioned if we don't know where these estimated people live? Is sampling really accurate enough to tell us if some small town has 3,300 people instead of the 3,000 from a hard count? When a State, such as Wisconsin, has hundreds of towns of such size, will sampling adjust for an undercount there the way it might in Los Angeles or some other major city? In 1990 an entire ward in one town in my district was missed. The community leaders pointed this out during the postcensus review and the mistake was corrected. For 2000 the bureau will not do a postcensus review, presumably because no one can know what mistakes were made since everyone wasn't supposed to be counted anyway.

Will the undercount of Indian reservations, of which there are several in Wisconsin, be corrected? My understanding is that the bureau plans to do a hard count on Indian reservations. Yet native Americans were among the most undercounted in the last census. How then can it be claimed that the reason the bureau wants do use sampling is to correct for past undercounts?

I do believe that it is appropriate to bring this issue up in an appropriations bill as the main argument of those supporting sampling is that it will save money. Well that may or may not be true but that can't be the only basis for designing the census. The cheapest possible census would be if the numbers were just made up altogether. We obviously aren't going to do that but the point is that saving money is not the one and only goal. Fairness is a goal and sampling is unfair to smaller communities and rural States. Following the Constitution, which calls for an actual enumeration, is a goal and the Supreme Court has never ruled on the issue.

What happens if we complete the 2000 census using sampling to estimate 10 percent of the population and then the Supreme Court throws it out? Then we will have wasted the $4 billion spent on the original census not to mention who knows how much in litigation. Rather than saving money, sampling could end up costing the taxpayers two or three times as much money as a hard count if we have to redo the whole thing.

I believe a greater effort should be made to reach all Americans to provide an accurate hard count. 50 percent of the undercount from the last census was caused by people never receiving the forms. Better mailing lists and better coordination with the Post Office and local governments can correct this problem. Approximately 32 percent of the undercount can be corrected through the use of easier to read forms and perhaps an 800 information number. The rest will have to be reached through better outreach. Instead the bureau plans to spend less money on outreach, figuring that sampling can make up the difference.

I don't believe the bureau's plan will provide for the fairest and most accurate census.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, however, about rescissions of trust fund moneys and additional transportation spending that is included in this bill and is unrelated to disaster relief.

The bill rescinds almost $1.6 billion in contract authority, including nearly $900 million from the transit program.

These rescissions were included in the House bill and were stricken by the Transportation Committee on a point of order. Yet this bill adds them back in.

The spending provided for highways by the Senate goes beyond correcting any error and directs funding to specific States. This is unnecessary and I am opposed to this type of extraneous provisions in a disaster supplemental bill.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this supplemental emergency assistance measure. I very much regret that the substance of this proposal has superimposed issues on the emergency response provisions included in the bill. This is being used as a way of avoiding full debate and attempting to force the President to accept such policy and law that he and others oppose.

The emergency funding in this measure is very much needed in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the other States affected by flooding and natural disasters this spring. I supported the House-passed measure and helped improve that measure when we initially considered this matter 3 weeks ago, with the expectation that in counsel with the Senate and administration the differences concerning the controversial unrelated riders could be resolved.

I was very disappointed that the House didn't conclude its work on this emergency measure prior to the Memorial Day congressional recess, and now after nearly 2 weeks of delay, the end product before the House, and to be sent to the President not only doesn't resolve the matter of the controversial riders and changes in law, but increases the total number of problems and exceptions.

Our GOP colleagues in the past Congress shut down the Government in an attempt to enact into law massive cuts in health care, education and the environment—a GOP retreat from basic programs that form the foundation of trust and the tools that the American families need to care for themselves and one another. And the GOP Congress in the last session proposed a massive tax break giveways which would have made deficit reduction and the goal of balancing the budget a mirage.

When the Government was shut down for months, based on the GOP refusal to back down from these radical positions and wild proposals, the American people rightly rejected the GOP tactics just as they rejected the policies on their merits. The fight to add antishutdown language to this bill is an effort to rewrite history and in the bargain to try and gain an advantage for GOP spending priorities. The American people need neither revisionist history or a rearrangement of the congressional powers regarding the power of the purse. Congress should accept its responsibility with the constitutional and legal framework to pass the annual spending measures and work out differences with the President in time to avoid government shutdowns.

The GOP census rider is a blatant attempt to attack the technical and scientific means of counting our population every decade for a Republican partisan advantage—it is unfair, unworkable, and unacceptable.

The new GOP rider from the Senate in this conference report undercuts the Federal Government's role to manage public lands in the 17 Western States and would slice and dice the Federal lands, parks, and wilderness into pieces and in the end cost billions of taxpayer dollars to buy back that which the American people already own. This legislative blackmail under the guise of ''rights of way access'' and a newly minted Commission is just one more in a series of ongoing efforts to deny the American people their natural heritage of landscapes and public domain. This Civil War era policy made little sense in 1866 and makes no sense in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the much-needed help for natural disasters and Bosnia peacekeeping, we must not permit this pattern of policymaking to become successful. Vote ''no,'' and if this passes, the President will veto it. Hopefully, we will uphold such a veto and then enact a measure which will not include these controversial provisions in a timely manner.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to oppose the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act conference report. Although this bill will provide needed relief for disaster victims—which I support—for the victims of this bill, it will be a disaster. This is not a clean bill—this is not a good bill.

This bill is loaded down with extraneous items that have no place in this measure. One item is an antienvironmental rider which diminishes the quality of our public natural resources.

However, the most disturbing item is the prohibition of statistical sampling in the census. This language, inserted by the conferees, was not agreed to by the full House. This is a blatant attempt to legislate through an appropriations bill.

As a representative of California's 37th Congressional District, I am particularly opposed to any language that would impair the Census Bureau's ability to make an accurate count of the U.S. population. Too many Americans were left out of the count during the last census. Ten million Americans were not counted and 6 million were counted twice—which distorted our attempts to ensure equal representation for all Americans. In 1990, 800,000 people were undercounted in California. California represented 20 percent of the 1990 undercount.

This undercount was not uniform across the population. The undercount between the African-American population and the non-African-American population rose dramatically to reach the highest level since 1940. In 1990, the census was six times more likely to leave out an African-American than a non-Hispanic white American. The 1990 census left out Hispanic-Americans at a rate of seven times the undercount for non-Hispanic white Americans.

The Census Bureau is developing a design for the 2000 census that corrects past mistakes and makes the upcoming census the most accurate in our history—and sampling is one tool that will help. An accurate count of the population is required to apportion congressional seats. An accurate count brings fairness to the distribution of billions of dollars in funding and planning decisions such as school and highway construction.

We can't afford to leave Americans out of the census. This bill is, in fact, muddier than the flood waters it purports to clean up. I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully must oppose this spending legislation, which commits taxpayers to foot the bill for dozens of special-interest items having nothing to do with disaster relief.

First, the House-Senate compromise bill costs $200 million more than the House bill.

Second, it includes $262.2 million in nonemergency spending, an increase of $150.4 million over the House passed version.

Third, it includes such nonemergency items as: $35 million for the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute for Standards and Technology under the Commerce Department; $2 million for the Commission on the Advancement of Law Enforcement; $3 million for Ogden, UT, in anticipation of the 2002 Winter Olympics; $650,000 for the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education; $101 million in education grants; $33.5 million for Botanic Garden Conservatory in DC; $15 million for health research; $1.9 million for the Denver Summit of the G–8, June 20–22, 1997; $16 million to the Customs Service for the Automated Targeting System; $5.383 million to the U.S. Postal Service to subsidize free and reduced rate mail; $12.3 million for a multistory parking lot in a Cleveland, OH, Veterans' Administration facility; $1 million ''special purpose grant'' of which $500,000 goes to a parking lot and $500,000 for renovation of the Paramount Theater in Ashland, KY; and $30.2 million for HUD Demonstration Act purposes.

This is supposed to be an emergency measure to help flood and disaster victims. The inclusion of such expenditures indicates it is not. In the exercise of fiscal prudence, I must therefore vote ''no''.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1469, the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1997. This important legislation is key to the long-term rehabilitation of communities devastated by natural disasters across this great country. It is also essential to ensure our continued military preparedness through the replenishment of critical defense accounts.

Mr. Speaker, the Energy and Water Development chapter of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill represents the dedicated efforts of Members from both sides of the aisle and from both sides of the Hill to deliver needed assistance to those areas of our country which have suffered the crippling effects of uncontrolled floods. From the Pacific Northwest to the Ohio Valley, from the Deep South to the Great Plains, floodwaters have been especially furious during the past year. We have all been deeply touched by the heart-wrenching images of dislocated families, destroyed homes, and inundated cities. Recognizing the emergency nature of these consequences, the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development have acted expeditiously, responsibly, and in good faith to help flood victims get back on their feet.

The conference agreement includes $585 million for the Corps of Engineers and $7.4 million for the Bureau of Reclamation to address flood related needs. These desperately needed funds will support the rehabilitation of levees, the repair of Federal flood control works, and the performance of emergency dredging. These public works are more than mere infrastructure; they represent a foundation for the continued vitality, protection, and economic viability of the towns, villages, and cities that constitute a free and strong America.

In order to help pay for emergency disaster assistance, the conference agreement includes a rescission of $11.2 million from the Energy Supply, Research and Development account of the Department of Energy. Another rescission of $11.3 million from the Western Area Power Administration will also help offset the costs of this supplemental bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and thank the members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development for their dedicated efforts in producing this critical legislation. I am especially appreciative of the efforts of the ranking minority Member, the Honorable Vic Fazio. His cooperation and hard work have been indispensable, and I look forward to continuing our bipartisan working relationship as we move on to the consideration of the regular appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the conference report.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm opposition to a ban in the fiscal year 1997 Supplemental Appropriations Conference Report that disallows the use of statistical sampling in the 200 census. We must not dictate to the experts in the U.S. Census Bureau how they are to conduct this most important, Constitution mandated count of our population. Furthermore, this ban would ignore the need to restore accuracy to the census by accounting for groups grossly undercounted in the last decennial census—minorities and low-income individuals.

The bill language states, ''the proposed use of statistical sampling by the Bureau of the Census exposes taxpayers to the unacceptable risk of an inaccurate, invalid, and unconstitutional census.'' Rather, a ban on the use of sampling poses this unacceptable risk and increases the cost to taxpayers for the 2000 census.

All evidence reviewed from the 1990 census clearly demonstrates the inaccuracy of a persistent undercount. The Census Bureau acknowledges that this last decennial count failed to include more than 4 million residents—the highest undercount ever recorded. These included a disproportionate number of racial and ethnic minorities in this country. Hundreds of thousands of Asian-Pacific-Americans were not counted by census, at an estimated rate of 2.3 percent. For Hispanics this rate was 5.0 percent and for African-Americans, 4.4 percent. It is inexcusable that these rates were two times, five times and four times greater than the undercount for white Americans. Inaccuracy to this degree itself is an invalidation.

As to the claim of unconstitutionality, a letter of May 8, 1997, from Census Bureau Director D. Martha Farnsworth Riche to Speaker GINGRICH recapped three options from the U.S. Department of Justice under the Carter, Bush, and Clinton administrations: ''All three opinions concluded that the Constitution and relevant statutes permit the use of sampling in the decennial census. Every federal court that has addressed the issue had held that the Constitution and federal statutes allow sampling.'' the clear constitutionality of the use of census sampling has been stated repeatedly, in a nonpartisan manner.

Sampling opponents further claim that this new methodology would only be to the benefit of large cities. A recent dear colleague from a supporter of the ban stated ''If a smaller town in undercounted, chances are we would never even know about it much less be able to adjust the census.'' This situation existed under previously used methods. However, under new sampling methods, the Census Bureau would in 2000 adjust for the undercount to the census block level in every single poor and rural community, rural and urban, for greater accuracy and fairness. The sampling plan would also:

Complete the count of those who do not mail back their form or phone in the answers—only 65 percent of households mailed back the census form;

Include those people missed in the census—about 10 million in 1990—and remove duplications—about 6 million in 1990; and

To collect information from a sample of the population for poverty, highway, and housing programs.

Sampling is necessary because it would:

Save approximately $500 million in taxpayer dollars, rather than spend more money for a census that is less accurate;

Locate those people traditionally missed and take out those counted twice; and

Allow the census to provide correct numbers for the distribution of Federal funds.

By the words of the Commerce Department's Inspector General, in a recent report to the Senate, the use of sampling to measure and correct the undercount is the ''only proven method to correct the greatest obstacle to an accurate count.'' The General Accounting Office supports this recommendation as well.

Three separate panels convened by the National Academy of Sciences [NAS] recommended the use of sampling in the 2000 census for improved accuracy and savings, instead of greater cost, ''Simply providing additional funds to enable the Census Bureau to carry out the 2000 census using traditional methods, as it has in previous censuses, will not lead to improved data coverage or data quality.'' We must not ignore the counsel from these scientific, statistical experts.

We are here today to say that everyone counts—whether you are a person of color, poor or elderly, whether you are a recent immigrant or a citizen, whether you live in an urban or rural area. The charge of the Census Bureau is to make an accurate count of all those within our borders.

The simple fact is that in a country as immense and diverse as ours, we should use the most advanced methodologies to assure an accurate census count of all our population, even those that are hard to reach. Not because we want a certain political party to

gain seats in the Congress. Not because we want to favor urban areas over rural areas, but because we want a fair and accurate enumeration of our population.

Too many times in our history it has been the person of color and the poor that have gone uncounted. If we do not allow sampling in the 2000 census history tells us that we will once again make many of these individuals invisible, like they simply do not exist.

This attack on utilizing a scientifically proven method of enumeration is an attack on the people of color in this country. It is another example of the Republican effort to downgrade, to diminish the voice of minorities in this country. We cannot allow this to happen.

This is not simply a technical issue of concern only to statisticians. The accurate count of our population has enormous consequences from the apportionment of our elected offices to the allocation of Federal and State funds. And if people of color and the poor are not accurately accounted for their voice in our Government and our communities is weakened.

For the sake of an accurate and fair census, we must reject any legislation to limit the use of sampling in the 2000 census. We must ensure that everyone counts. I urge my colleagues to oppose this egregious language in the fiscal year 1997 supplemental appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). All time has expired.

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 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 201, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 169]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
DeLay
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek
Metcalf
Minge
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Saxton
Sessions
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Campbell
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McNulty
Meehan
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Neumann
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stupak
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—13

Andrews
Archer
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Farr
Goode
Jefferson
Lantos
McKinney
Pickering
Schiff
Schumer
Turner

☐ 1841

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Goode for, with Mr. Turner against.

Messrs. MORAN of Virginia, BROWN of Ohio, and INGLIS of South Carolina changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. TAUSCHER changed her vote from ''nay'' 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on Rollcall No. 169, the Conference Report for H.R. 1469, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to return to Washington, DC, today due to a death in my family and missed the following votes:

Rollcall vote No. 165, passage of the rule on House Resolution 160. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Rollcall vote No. 166, on agreeing to the Conference Report House Concurrent Resolution 84, the FY 1998 Budget Resolution. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Rollcall vote No. 167, the Campbell Amendment (No. 52) to the Smith Amendment (No. 41) on H.R. 1757, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. Had I been present, I would voted ''nay.''

Rollcall vote No. 168, the Smith Amendment (No. 41) to H.R. 1757, to prohibit U.S. population assistance for foreign organizations that perform abortions in foreign countries, or lobby for changes in such laws. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Rollcall vote No. 169, on agreeing to the Conference Report H.R. 1469, the Disaster Recovery Act. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''