NOT VOTING—34

Ackerman	Green	Roemer
Baker	Houghton	Schiff
Blumenauer	LaFalce	Smith (OR)
Combest	Lipinski	Souder
Cubin	McInnis	Stark
Dickey	Miller (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	Myrick	Watkins
Flake	Nussle	Wexler
Fowler	Ortiz	White
Furse	Pickett	Yates
Gilman	Pryce (OH)	
Gonzalez	Riley	

□ 2004

So the Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution waiving certain enrollment requirements with respect to certain specified bills of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 867) ''An Act to promote the adoption of children in foster care.''.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill , a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1371. An act to establish felony violations for the failure to pay legal child support obligations and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to provide for the convening of the Second Session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

S. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to adjourn sine die the First Session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress.

PROVIDING FOR CONVENING OF SECOND SESSION OF ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 311, I call up the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) to provide for the convening of the Second Session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 311, the joint resolution is considered read.

The text of S.J. Res. 39 is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second regular session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress shall begin at noon on Tuesday, January 27, 1998.

SEC. 2. Prior to the convening of the second regular session of the One Hundred Fifth Congress on January 27, 1998, as provided in the first section of this joint resolution, Congress shall reassemble at noon on the second day after its Members are notified in accordance with section 3 of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to assemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The joint resolution was read a third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VACATING VOTE ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 328

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which House Resolution 328 was passed be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FAZIO OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to that resolution at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FAZIO of California:

Strike the election of David Price of North Carolina to the Committee on Budget.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Appropriations, the following Member:

Robert ''Bud'' Cramer of Alabama

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 13, 1997.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: I respectfully request that you accept my resignation from the Government Reform and Oversight Committee, effective Friday, November 14, 1997.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROB PORTMAN,
Representative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 331) and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 331

Resolved, That the following Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM AND OVERSIGHT: Mr. Miller of Florida.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF TWO MEMBERS TO INFORM THE PRESIDENT THAT THE TWO HOUSES HAVE COMPLETED THEIR BUSINESS OF THE FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTH CONGRESS AND ARE READY TO ADJOURN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair appoints as Members on the part of the House to the Committee to notify the President the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 330, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2267), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS].

GENERAL LEAVE

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

2267 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 11 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we are honored to be the last train leaving the station of this session. I am also here to tell my colleagues that this is the last time I am going to be the last train leaving the station, for a variety of reasons.

But I am pleased to report and bring to my colleagues today the conference report on our bill. This bill provides $31.8 billion for the programs under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations. We have come a long way in addressing a number of very important issues, but we have not let up on our strong commitment to law enforcement and the fight against crime.

That is what this bill really is all about. It is not about census. It is not about 245(i). It is mainly the fight against crime. Of the total funding in this conference report, the lion's share, $17.5 billion, is for the Department of Justice programs. That is an increase of $1.04 billion over fiscal year 1997 dedicated to continuing the war on drugs, making our neighborhoods safer for children and their families, bringing our borders under control, and boosting juvenile justice efforts to get kids on the right track and away from a life of crime.

This Congress deserves credit for its leadership in reducing crime. The Nation's crime rate is lower today than in over a decade. Our commitment over the last 2 years has triggered a decline in the crime rate in each of those years.

In 1996 alone, serious reported crime in the United States declined 3 percent, including an 11 percent decline in murder rates. For State and local law enforcement assistance, our communities, our sheriffs, and our police departments, the conference report includes over $4.8 billion. That is a $658 million increase to give our communities an arsenal of programs that target violent criminals, sex offenders, domestic violence, child abuse, and juvenile crime.

And on juvenile crime, the hottest topic today in law enforcement, we hit the problem head on using both prevention and law enforcement initiatives. We provide a $489 million amount, triple the amount provided last year, for juvenile crime to build a hopeful future for America's youth. That is this Congress in action.

While overall crime is down, our kids are committing violent crimes at an alarming rate. One out of five people arrested for violent crimes is under 18 years of age, a 70 percent increase in the last 10 years. The conference report provides $239 million for juvenile crime prevention, a 36 percent increase over last year, for programs targeting dangerous precursors to crime, like teenage drug and alcohol abuse and programs that steer troubled kids away from crime. We provide $250 million for a new juvenile crime block grant to States to encourage them to adopt reforms to stop the revolving door of juvenile justice and to ensure that kids know that they will be punished if they commit a crime.

For the war on drugs, we provide another substantial increase, including an $84 million increase for the Drug Enforcement Administration, to target drug traffickers in the Southwest border and Caribbean drug corridors, and an $89 million increase to block the manufacture and distribution of heroin and methamphetamine.

To control our borders, we provide a $228 million increase for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, including 1,000 new border patrol agents, double what the administration asked of us.

□ 2015

We restore integrity to the naturalization process by ending the fingerprint scam that allowed felons by the thousands in 1996 to receive the most precious benefit this country can offer, United States citizenship. We are also requiring criminal record checks by law, no longer a policy, by law. The department did not follow their policy. They waived the policy last year and allowed felons to come into the country unchecked for their criminal records. No longer.

And we address the personal hardships of families and employers that have relied on section 245(i) by allowing people who file for permanent immigrant visas and later certifications before January 14, 1998 to continue to adjust to permanent residency under this provision without having to leave the country. At the same time, by letting this provision sunset, we require future immigrants to play by the rules and respect them.

For the Judiciary, $3.2 billion is provided, including a cost-of-living salary adjustment for justices and judges.

Regarding the 9th Circuit of the Federal Courts of Appeal, the conference agreement provides for a study of all circuits that has a timetable of 10 months from the date of quorum to conduct necessary studies plus up to an additional 2 months to submit recommendations on alternative structures for the Federal Circuit Courts.

On the Hyde provision, we have language that we believe is acceptable to all parties, that allows the recovery of attorneys' fees in criminal cases where the defendant is acquitted where the court finds that the prosecutor acted vexatiously, frivolously or in bad faith.

For the Commerce Department, the conference report provides $4.3 billion, a $450 million increase, most of which is related to the ramp-up for the year 2000 decennial census.

And on the 2000 census, we include provisions to provide for an expedited review by the courts on the legality and constitutionality of statistically adjusting the 2000 census. There is a legitimate question. I firmly and strongly believe that the Constitution requires an actual enumeration. Others in this Chamber, as honestly as me, believe to the contrary.

We will let the courts decide that, and only they can decide it. They should have decided it in my judgment long ago, as members of the subcommittee requested. The gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] I think in times past have thought the same.

We also require the administration to plan for an actual head count in the 2000 census and to test that plan in the 1998 dress rehearsal. And we commission an 8-person bipartisan census monitoring board to oversee the whole process from the inside, so that everyone can be assured that it is being done in the proper way.

We also provide $390 million for the decennial census, $35 million more than the President's request, an increase of $305 million over current spending. There can be no question of our willingness to spend what it takes for the most accurate census possible.

For the international programs in the bill—State Department operations, the U.S. Information Agency, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency—for all practical purposes, the bill level-funds them at $5 billion. A major new initiative is $35 million to fund the 24-hour broadcasting service to China through Radio Free Asia and the Voice of America, an initiative proposed by the Speaker and endorsed by the President.

For international organizations and peacekeeping, we provide $33 million less than 1997. Within that reduced amount, $100 million is provided for United Nations arrearages, but only if an authorization bill passes and only if that authorization bill contains real and substantial reforms as a condition for release of the money.

For Legal Services, we provide $283 million, the same level as 1997. The restrictions in last year's bill are retained, and added are new public disclosure requirements for grantees of the corporation.

In summary, I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking minority member. No chairman of any subcommittee has a more able ranking member than I do. The gentleman from West Virginia has provided leadership for the things he strongly believes in. He has been able to work with us in every respect in constructing a bill that is best for the Nation. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia personally and profusely for his hard work and loyal dedication.

I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], our committee chairman, without whose help we would not be here tonight. He has

been superb in helping us bring this bill through some really rocky shoals to this nice peaceful shore. And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] the ranking minority member on the full committee, who has been helpful all the way through. And all the members of the subcommittee for their help and support.

Most of all, I think I want to thank the staff, some of whom are in the room with me at this time. Others are absent from the room. But these are the people who really have stayed up all night, time and again. They were up all night last night reading this bill all the way through. The staff, we appreciate their dedication and their service beyond words. We could not do this without them. We appreciate them very much.

This conference report shows the American people our commitment to continue our fight to make our streets safer and the future brighter for our children. I urge support for this conference agreement.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267)

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	75,773,000	79,959,000	76,199,000	79,373,000	76,199,000	+426,000
Emergency appropriations	3,600,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,600,000
Total, salaries and expenses	79,373,000	79,959,000	76,199,000	79,373,000	76,199,000	-3,174,000
Counterterrorism fund	9,450,000	29,450,000	20,000,000	29,450,000	52,700,000	+43,250,000
Emergency appropriations	20,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-20,000,000
Total, Counterterrorism fund	29,450,000	29,450,000	20,000,000	29,450,000	52,700,000	+23,250,000
Administrative review and appeals:						
Direct appropriation	62,000,000	70,007,000	66,700,000	20,007,000	70,007,000	+8,007,000
Emergency appropriations	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000,000
Crime trust fund	48,000,000	59,251,000	59,000,000	59,251,000	59,251,000	+11,251,000
Total, Administrative review and appeals	111,000,000	129,258,000	125,700,000	79,258,000	129,258,000	+18,258,000
Office of Inspector General	31,960,000	33,211,000	35,211,000	33,211,000	33,211,000	+1,251,000
Total, General administration	251,783,000	271,878,000	257,110,000	221,292,000	291,368,000	+39,585,000
Appropriations	(179,183,000)	(212,627,000)	(198,110,000)	(162,041,000)	(232,117,000)	(+52,934,000)
Emergency appropriations	(24,600,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-24,600,000)
Crime trust fund	(48,000,000)	(59,251,000)	(59,000,000)	(59,251,000)	(59,251,000)	(+11,251,000)
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses	4,845,000	4,799,000	4,799,000	5,009,000	5,009,000	+164,000
Legal Activities						
General legal activities:						
Direct appropriation	420,793,000	466,557,000	445,300,000	437,178,000	444,200,000	+23,407,000
Emergency appropriations	1,719,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,719,000
Crime trust fund	7,750,000	7,969,000	7,969,000	7,969,000	7,969,000	+219,000
Total, General legal activities	430,262,000	474,526,000	453,269,000	445,147,000	452,169,000	+21,907,000
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	.....
Independent counsel (permanent, indefinite)	3,000,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	9,500,000	+6,500,000
Antitrust Division	92,447,000	97,542,000	94,542,000	92,447,000	93,495,000	+1,048,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-18,000,000	-2,000,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-58,905,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-11,095,000
Direct appropriation	17,542,000	17,542,000	8,542,000	12,447,000	5,495,000	-12,047,000
United States Attorneys:						
Direct appropriation	923,340,000	1,018,617,000	973,000,000	986,404,000	972,460,000	+49,120,000
Emergency appropriations	10,900,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,900,000
Crime trust fund	43,876,000	50,828,000	62,828,000	46,128,000	62,828,000	+18,952,000
Total, United States Attorneys	978,116,000	1,069,445,000	1,035,828,000	1,032,532,000	1,035,288,000	+57,172,000
United States Trustee System Fund	107,950,000	116,721,000	107,950,000	116,721,000	114,248,000	+6,298,000
Offsetting fee collections	-49,869,000	-116,721,000	-107,950,000	-116,721,000	-114,248,000	-64,379,000
Direct appropriation	58,081,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-58,081,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	953,000	1,226,000	1,226,000	1,226,000	1,226,000	+273,000
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation	457,495,000	475,244,000	462,944,000	471,786,000	467,833,000	+10,338,000
Crime trust fund	25,000,000	25,553,000	25,553,000	25,553,000	25,553,000	+553,000
Total, United States Marshals Service	482,495,000	500,797,000	488,497,000	497,339,000	493,386,000	+10,891,000
Federal Prisoner Detention	405,262,000	462,831,000	405,262,000	405,262,000	405,262,000	.....
Fees and expenses of witnesses	100,702,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	-25,702,000
Community Relations Service	5,319,000	7,500,000	5,319,000	5,319,000	5,319,000	.....
Assets forfeiture fund	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	.....
Total, Legal activities	2,508,760,000	2,645,395,000	2,509,471,000	2,510,800,000	2,509,673,000	+913,000
Appropriations	(2,419,515,000)	(2,561,045,000)	(2,413,121,000)	(2,431,150,000)	(2,413,323,000)	(-6,192,000)
Emergency appropriations	(12,619,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-12,619,000)
Crime trust fund	(76,626,000)	(84,350,000)	(96,350,000)	(79,650,000)	(96,350,000)	(+19,724,000)
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	.....
Advance appropriation	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	13,736,000	4,381,000	4,381,000	4,381,000	4,381,000	-9,355,000
Advance appropriation	.....	29,000,000	29,000,000	.....	.....	.....
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	15,736,000	37,381,000	37,381,000	6,381,000	6,381,000	-9,355,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement	359,430,000	294,967,000	294,967,000	294,967,000	294,967,000	-64,463,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses	2,257,880,000	2,482,267,000	2,475,463,000	2,495,267,000	2,445,471,000	+187,591,000
Anti-terrorism activities (emergency appropriations)	115,610,000					-115,610,000
Counterintelligence and national security	147,081,000	147,081,000	147,081,000	200,000,000	221,050,000	+73,969,000
Non-defense function				57,601,000		
Subtotal	147,081,000	147,081,000	147,081,000	257,601,000	221,050,000	+73,969,000
FBI Fingerprint identification	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	
Advance appropriation, FY 1999		47,800,000				
Health care fraud enforcement	-38,000,000					+38,000,000
Subtotal	2,566,971,000	2,761,548,000	2,706,944,000	2,837,268,000	2,750,921,000	+183,950,000
Crime trust fund	169,000,000	179,121,000	179,121,000	179,121,000	179,121,000	+10,121,000
Telecommunications carrier compliance fund		50,000,000				
Defense function		50,000,000	50,000,000			
Emergency appropriations	60,000,000					-60,000,000
Construction	41,639,000	49,006,000	38,506,000	59,006,000	44,506,000	+2,867,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	2,837,610,000	3,089,675,000	2,974,571,000	3,075,395,000	2,974,548,000	+136,938,000
Appropriations	(2,493,000,000)	(2,862,754,000)	(2,795,450,000)	(2,896,274,000)	(2,795,427,000)	(+302,427,000)
Advance appropriations		(47,800,000)				
Emergency appropriations	(175,610,000)					(-175,610,000)
Crime trust fund	(169,000,000)	(179,121,000)	(179,121,000)	(179,121,000)	(179,121,000)	(+10,121,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	798,212,000	740,293,000	872,731,000	697,533,000	782,109,000	-16,103,000
Diversion control fund	-52,824,000	-58,268,000	-58,268,000	-58,268,000	-58,268,000	-5,444,000
Direct appropriation	745,388,000	682,025,000	814,463,000	639,265,000	723,841,000	-21,547,000
Emergency appropriations	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Crime trust fund	220,000,000	400,037,000	310,037,000	441,117,000	403,537,000	+183,537,000
Construction	30,806,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	10,500,000	8,000,000	-22,806,000
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	1,001,194,000	1,087,562,000	1,130,000,000	1,090,882,000	1,135,378,000	+134,184,000
Appropriations	(776,194,000)	(687,525,000)	(819,963,000)	(649,765,000)	(731,841,000)	(-44,353,000)
Emergency appropriations	(5,000,000)					(-5,000,000)
Crime trust fund	(220,000,000)	(400,037,000)	(310,037,000)	(441,117,000)	(403,537,000)	(+183,537,000)
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses	1,590,159,000	1,651,463,000	1,606,441,000	1,430,199,000	1,657,886,000	+67,727,000
Emergency appropriations	15,000,000					-15,000,000
Immigration initiative (crime trust fund)	500,000,000	732,251,000	690,957,000	719,898,000	608,206,000	+108,206,000
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund	(2,105,159,000)	(2,383,714,000)	(2,297,398,000)	(2,150,097,000)	(2,266,092,000)	(+160,933,000)
Fee accounts:						
Immigration legalization fund	(1,893,000)	(1,259,000)	(1,259,000)	(1,259,000)	(1,259,000)	(-634,000)
Immigration user fee	(388,664,000)	(419,296,000)	(419,296,000)	(398,896,000)	(426,622,000)	(+37,958,000)
Land border inspection fund	(11,054,000)	(8,888,000)	(8,888,000)	(8,888,000)	(8,888,000)	(-2,166,000)
Immigration examinations fund	(567,550,000)	(646,916,000)	(667,477,000)	(646,916,000)	(785,342,000)	(+217,792,000)
Breached bond fund	(6,613,000)	(104,471,000)	(104,471,000)	(138,900,000)	(235,272,000)	(+228,659,000)
Immigration enforcement fines		(13,800,000)	(13,800,000)	(3,800,000)	(3,800,000)	(+3,800,000)
Subtotal, Fee accounts	(975,774,000)	(1,194,630,000)	(1,215,191,000)	(1,198,659,000)	(1,461,183,000)	(+485,409,000)
Construction	8,841,000	73,831,000	70,959,000	73,559,000	75,959,000	+67,118,000
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(3,089,774,000)	(3,652,175,000)	(3,583,548,000)	(3,422,315,000)	(3,803,234,000)	(+713,460,000)
Appropriations	(1,599,000,000)	(1,725,294,000)	(1,677,400,000)	(1,503,758,000)	(1,733,845,000)	(+134,845,000)
Emergency appropriations	(15,000,000)					(-15,000,000)
Crime trust fund	(500,000,000)	(732,251,000)	(690,957,000)	(719,898,000)	(608,206,000)	(+108,206,000)
(Fee accounts)	(975,774,000)	(1,194,630,000)	(1,215,191,000)	(1,198,659,000)	(1,461,183,000)	(+485,409,000)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	2,858,316,000	3,015,642,000	2,917,642,000	2,932,900,000	2,911,642,000	+53,326,000
Prior year carryover	-90,000,000	-50,000,000	-90,000,000		-90,000,000	
Direct appropriation	2,768,316,000	2,965,642,000	2,827,642,000	2,932,900,000	2,821,642,000	+53,326,000
Crime trust fund	25,224,000	26,135,000	26,135,000	6,135,000	26,135,000	+911,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,793,540,000	2,991,777,000	2,853,777,000	2,939,035,000	2,847,777,000	+54,237,000
Buildings and facilities	395,700,000	252,833,000	255,133,000	267,833,000	255,133,000	-140,567,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,042,000)	(3,930,000)	(3,490,000)	(3,042,000)	(3,266,000)	(+224,000)
Total, Federal Prison System	3,189,240,000	3,244,610,000	3,108,910,000	3,206,868,000	3,102,910,000	-86,330,000
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice assistance:						
Direct appropriation	101,429,000	166,665,000	162,500,000	183,165,000	173,600,000	+72,171,000
Emergency appropriations	17,000,000					-17,000,000
Total, Justice assistance	118,429,000	166,665,000	162,500,000	183,165,000	173,600,000	+55,171,000
State and local law enforcement assistance:						
Direct appropriations:						
Byrne grants (discretionary)	60,000,000		46,500,000	75,000,000	46,500,000	-13,500,000
Weed and seed fund (earmark)			40,000,000	(33,500,000)	33,500,000	+33,500,000
Byrne grants (formula)	301,000,000		491,500,000	376,500,000	462,500,000	+161,500,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	361,000,000		578,000,000	451,500,000	542,500,000	+181,500,000
Crime trust fund:						
Byrne grants (discretionary)		75,000,000				
Weed and seed fund (earmark)	(28,500,000)	(28,500,000)				(-28,500,000)
Byrne grants (formula)	199,000,000	505,000,000	13,500,000	128,500,000	42,500,000	-156,500,000
Community oriented policing services	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	
Police corps	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	30,000,000	+10,000,000
Law enforcement scholarship program		20,000,000				
Police recruitment grants program		5,000,000				
Prosecutorial initiatives targeting crime and violent juveniles program		100,000,000				
Juvenile crime block grant			300,000,000		250,000,000	+250,000,000
Local law enforcement block grant	523,000,000		523,000,000	503,000,000	523,000,000	
Underage drinking prevention				(25,000,000)		
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)	(20,000,000)		(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	
Domestic violence				(10,000,000)		
Child exploitation investigations				(2,400,000)		
Drug courts	30,000,000	75,000,000	30,000,000	40,000,000	30,000,000	
Upgrade criminal history records	50,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	-5,000,000
State prison grants	670,000,000	710,500,000	722,500,000	740,500,000	720,500,000	+50,500,000
State criminal alien assistance program	330,000,000	350,000,000	420,000,000	350,000,000	420,000,000	+90,000,000
Violence Against Women grants	196,500,000	248,750,000	305,500,000	263,750,000	270,750,000	+74,250,000
State prison drug treatment	30,000,000	63,000,000	63,000,000	61,200,000	63,000,000	+33,000,000
State courts assistance		50,000,000				
Other crime control programs	7,650,000	30,605,000	14,650,000	22,700,000	17,650,000	+10,000,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	3,456,150,000	3,697,855,000	3,857,150,000	3,594,650,000	3,812,400,000	+356,250,000
Total, State and local law enforcement	3,817,150,000	3,697,855,000	4,435,150,000	4,046,150,000	4,354,900,000	+537,750,000
Juvenile justice programs	174,500,000	230,422,000	238,672,000	235,422,000	238,672,000	+64,172,000
Crime trust fund				145,000,000		
Total, Juvenile Justice programs	174,500,000	230,422,000	238,672,000	380,422,000	238,672,000	+64,172,000
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits	30,126,000	31,003,000	31,003,000	31,003,000	31,003,000	+877,000
Disability benefits	2,200,000	2,264,000				-2,200,000
Federal law enforcement education assistance		2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000
Total, Public safety officers benefits program	32,326,000	35,267,000	33,003,000	33,003,000	33,003,000	+677,000
Total, Office of Justice Programs	4,142,405,000	4,130,209,000	4,869,325,000	4,642,740,000	4,800,175,000	+657,770,000
Appropriations	(669,255,000)	(432,354,000)	(1,012,175,000)	(903,090,000)	(987,775,000)	(+318,520,000)
Emergency appropriations	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Crime trust fund	(3,456,150,000)	(3,697,855,000)	(3,857,150,000)	(3,739,650,000)	(3,812,400,000)	(+356,250,000)
Total, title I, Department of Justice	16,425,003,000	17,264,021,000	17,554,891,000	17,277,990,000	17,462,460,000	+1,037,457,000
Appropriations	(11,680,174,000)	(12,006,221,000)	(12,305,141,000)	(12,053,168,000)	(12,277,460,000)	(+597,286,000)
Advance appropriations		(78,800,000)	(31,000,000)			
Emergency appropriations	(249,829,000)					(-249,829,000)
Crime trust fund	(4,495,000,000)	(5,179,000,000)	(5,218,750,000)	(5,224,822,000)	(5,185,000,000)	(+690,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,042,000)	(3,930,000)	(3,490,000)	(3,042,000)	(3,266,000)	(+224,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT						
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses	21,449,000	22,092,000	22,700,000	22,092,000	23,450,000	+2,001,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	40,850,000	41,980,000	41,400,000	41,000,000	41,200,000	+350,000
Total, Related agencies	62,299,000	64,072,000	64,100,000	63,092,000	64,650,000	+2,351,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration	270,000,000	271,636,000	279,500,000	280,736,000	283,066,000	+13,066,000
Export Administration						
Operations and administration	36,000,000	43,126,000	41,000,000	43,126,000	42,000,000	+6,000,000
CWC enforcement	.....	3,500,000	.....	.....	1,900,000	+1,900,000
Emergency appropriations	3,900,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,900,000
Total, Export Administration	39,900,000	46,626,000	41,000,000	43,126,000	43,900,000	+4,000,000
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs	328,500,000	319,000,000	340,000,000	250,000,000	340,000,000	+11,500,000
Emergency appropriations	25,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000,000
Emergency appropriations (1997 supplemental)	50,200,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,200,000
Subtotal	403,700,000	319,000,000	340,000,000	250,000,000	340,000,000	-63,700,000
Salaries and expenses	20,036,000	24,028,000	21,000,000	22,028,000	21,028,000	+992,000
Emergency appropriations (1997 supplemental)	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,000,000
Total, Economic Development Administration	425,736,000	343,028,000	361,000,000	272,028,000	361,028,000	-64,708,000
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development	28,000,000	27,811,000	25,000,000	27,811,000	25,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	825,935,000	753,173,000	770,600,000	686,793,000	777,644,000	-48,291,000
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE						
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses	45,900,000	52,196,000	46,000,000	47,917,000	47,499,000	+1,599,000
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses	135,000,000	138,056,000	136,499,000	138,056,000	137,278,000	+2,278,000
Periodic censuses and programs	210,500,000	523,126,000	550,126,000	520,726,000	555,813,000	+345,313,000
Total, Bureau of the Census	345,500,000	661,182,000	686,625,000	658,782,000	693,091,000	+347,591,000
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses	15,000,000	18,074,000	17,100,000	16,574,000	16,550,000	+1,550,000
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	15,250,000	.....	16,750,000	25,000,000	21,000,000	+5,750,000
Information infrastructure grants	21,490,000	36,000,000	21,490,000	21,490,000	20,000,000	-1,490,000
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	51,740,000	54,074,000	55,340,000	63,064,000	57,550,000	+5,810,000
Patent and Trademark Office						
Salaries and expenses	61,252,000	27,000,000	22,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	-34,252,000
Fees collected	(601,723,000)	(629,320,000)	(664,000,000)	(629,320,000)	(664,000,000)	(+62,277,000)
(Prior year carryover)	(30,000,000)	.....	(18,000,000)	(27,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-5,000,000)
Total, Patent and Trademark Office	(692,975,000)	(656,320,000)	(704,000,000)	(683,320,000)	(716,000,000)	(+23,025,000)
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	504,392,000	794,452,000	809,965,000	796,763,000	825,140,000	+320,748,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
Technology Administration						
Salaries and expenses	9,500,000	9,230,000	8,500,000	8,800,000	8,500,000	-1,000,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services	268,000,000	276,852,000	276,852,000	276,852,000	276,852,000	+8,852,000
Industrial technology services	313,000,000	399,000,000	298,600,000	311,040,000	306,000,000	-7,000,000
Construction of research facilities	.....	16,692,000	111,092,000	16,000,000	95,000,000	+95,000,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	581,000,000	692,544,000	686,544,000	603,892,000	677,852,000	+96,852,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities	1,854,067,000	1,476,245,000	1,391,400,000	1,999,052,000	1,512,050,000	-342,017,000
Offsetting collections - fees	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	.....
Direct appropriation	1,851,067,000	1,473,245,000	1,388,400,000	1,996,052,000	1,509,050,000	-342,017,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(66,000,000)	(62,381,000)	(63,881,000)	(62,381,000)	(62,381,000)	(-3,619,000)
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent)	6,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-1,000,000
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund)	-6,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	-5,000,000	+1,000,000
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,851,067,000	1,473,245,000	1,388,400,000	1,996,052,000	1,509,050,000	-342,017,000
Procurement, acquisition and construction	.....	503,464,000	460,600,000	.....	491,609,000	+491,609,000
Advance appropriations, FY 1999 - 2010	.....	3,485,517,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Coastal zone management fund	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	.....
Mandatory offset	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	.....
Construction	58,250,000	.....	.....	88,000,000	.....	-58,250,000
Emergency appropriations (1997 supplemental)	10,800,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,800,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion	8,000,000	.....	.....	15,823,000	.....	-8,000,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund	200,000	.....	.....	200,000	.....	-200,000
Fishermen's contingency fund	1,000,000	953,000	953,000	953,000	953,000	-47,000
Foreign fishing observer fund	196,000	189,000	189,000	189,000	189,000	-7,000
Fisheries finance program account	250,000	238,000	250,000	338,000	338,000	+88,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	1,929,763,000	5,463,606,000	1,850,392,000	2,101,555,000	2,002,139,000	+72,376,000
Total, Science and Technology	2,520,263,000	6,165,380,000	2,545,436,000	2,714,247,000	2,688,491,000	+168,228,000
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	28,490,000	30,085,000	26,490,000	28,490,000	27,490,000	-1,000,000
Office of Inspector General	20,140,000	21,677,000	20,140,000	20,140,000	20,140,000	.....
Working capital fund (by transfer)	(3,000,000)	.....	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	(-3,000,000)
Total, General administration	48,630,000	51,762,000	46,630,000	48,630,000	47,630,000	-1,000,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Construction of research facilities (rescission)	-16,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+16,000,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities (rescission)	-20,000,000	.....	-5,000,000	.....	-20,500,000	-500,000
General reduction	.....	.....	.....	-10,490,000	.....	.....
United States Travel and Tourism Administration						
Salaries and expenses (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	.....	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, Department of Commerce	3,800,921,000	7,700,695,000	4,103,531,000	4,172,851,000	4,250,755,000	+449,834,000
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	3,863,220,000	7,764,767,000	4,167,631,000	4,235,943,000	4,315,405,000	+452,185,000
Appropriations	(3,807,320,000)	(4,279,250,000)	(4,172,631,000)	(4,235,943,000)	(4,338,905,000)	(+531,585,000)
Rescissions	(-36,000,000)	.....	(-5,000,000)	.....	(-23,500,000)	(+12,500,000)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,485,517,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	(91,900,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-91,900,000)
(By transfer)	(69,000,000)	(62,381,000)	(63,881,000)	(65,381,000)	(62,381,000)	(-6,619,000)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,704,000	1,654,000	1,654,000	1,654,000	1,654,000	-50,000
Other salaries and expenses	25,453,000	27,624,000	27,624,000	27,249,000	27,591,000	+2,138,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	27,157,000	29,278,000	29,278,000	28,903,000	29,245,000	+2,088,000
Care of the building and grounds	2,800,000	3,997,000	3,400,000	6,170,000	3,400,000	+600,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	29,957,000	33,275,000	32,678,000	35,073,000	32,645,000	+2,688,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,898,000	1,887,000	1,887,000	1,887,000	1,887,000	-11,000
Other salaries and expenses	13,115,000	14,269,000	13,620,000	13,909,000	13,688,000	+573,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	15,013,000	16,156,000	15,507,000	15,796,000	15,575,000	+562,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,447,000	1,483,000	1,483,000	1,483,000	1,483,000	+36,000
Other salaries and expenses	9,667,000	9,995,000	9,995,000	9,995,000	9,966,000	+299,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,114,000	11,478,000	11,478,000	11,478,000	11,449,000	+335,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	225,956,000	227,674,000	227,674,000	227,674,000	227,674,000	+1,718,000
Other salaries and expenses	2,330,044,000	2,614,166,000	2,459,395,000	2,562,103,000	2,454,726,000	+124,682,000
Emergency appropriations	10,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-10,000,000
Direct appropriation	2,566,000,000	2,841,840,000	2,687,069,000	2,789,777,000	2,682,400,000	+116,400,000
Crime trust fund	30,000,000	50,000,000	40,000,000	.....	40,000,000	+10,000,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,596,000,000	2,891,840,000	2,727,069,000	2,789,777,000	2,722,400,000	+126,400,000
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,390,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	+60,000
Defender services	308,000,000	329,529,000	329,529,000	308,000,000	329,529,000	+21,529,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	67,000,000	69,651,000	66,196,000	68,252,000	64,438,000	-2,562,000
Court security	127,000,000	170,304,000	167,214,000	167,883,000	167,214,000	+40,214,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	3,100,390,000	3,463,774,000	3,292,458,000	3,336,362,000	3,286,031,000	+185,641,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salaries and expenses	49,450,000	54,108,000	52,000,000	53,843,000	52,000,000	+2,550,000
Federal Judicial Center						
Salaries and expenses	17,495,000	18,425,000	17,495,000	17,495,000	17,495,000	.....
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	30,200,000	32,200,000	34,200,000	34,200,000	34,200,000	+4,000,000
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salaries and expenses	8,490,000	9,480,000	9,000,000	9,480,000	9,240,000	+750,000
General Provisions						
Judges' pay raise	.....	.....	.....	6,000,000	5,000,000	+5,000,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	3,262,109,000	3,638,896,000	3,464,816,000	3,519,727,000	3,463,635,000	+201,526,000
Appropriations	(3,222,109,000)	(3,588,896,000)	(3,424,816,000)	(3,519,727,000)	(3,423,635,000)	(+201,526,000)
Emergency appropriations	(10,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,000,000)
Crime trust fund	(30,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	.....	(40,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs	1,700,900,000	1,291,277,000	1,706,577,000	1,727,868,000	1,705,600,000	+4,700,000
Registration fees	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	.....
Emergency appropriations (security)	23,700,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-23,700,000
Security	.....	.....	23,700,000	.....	23,700,000	+23,700,000
Machine-readable visa fees	.....	.....	.....	(140,000,000)	.....	.....
Fee proposal	.....	595,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	(1,725,300,000)	(1,886,977,000)	(1,730,977,000)	(1,868,568,000)	(1,730,000,000)	(+4,700,000)
Salaries and expenses	352,300,000	363,513,000	363,513,000	363,513,000	363,513,000	+11,213,000
Capital investment fund	24,600,000	64,600,000	50,600,000	105,000,000	86,000,000	+61,400,000
Office of Inspector General	27,495,000	28,300,000	28,300,000	27,495,000	27,495,000	.....
Representation allowances	4,490,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	4,100,000	4,200,000	-290,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials	8,332,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	7,900,000	-432,000
Security and maintenance of United States missions	364,495,000	373,081,000	373,081,000	420,281,000	404,000,000	+39,505,000
Emergency appropriations	24,825,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-24,825,000
Total, Security and maintenance of United States missions	389,320,000	373,081,000	373,081,000	420,281,000	404,000,000	+14,680,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	5,800,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-300,000
Repatriation Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000	.....
Administrative expenses	663,000	607,000	607,000	607,000	607,000	-56,000
Total, Repatriation loans program account	1,256,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	-56,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	14,490,000	14,490,000	14,000,000	14,490,000	14,000,000	-490,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	126,491,000	129,935,000	129,935,000	129,935,000	129,935,000	+3,444,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	2,679,874,000	2,879,796,000	2,709,306,000	2,807,982,000	2,773,743,000	+93,869,000
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	892,000,000	969,000,000	924,952,000	903,009,000	901,515,000	+9,515,000
Prior year assessment	.....	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	+54,000,000
Subtotal	892,000,000	1,023,000,000	978,952,000	957,009,000	955,515,000	+63,515,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	302,400,000	240,000,000	215,000,000	154,320,000	210,000,000	-92,400,000
Prior year assessment	50,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	-4,000,000
Subtotal	352,400,000	286,000,000	261,000,000	200,320,000	256,000,000	-96,400,000
International conferences and contingencies	.....	4,941,000	1,500,000	.....	.....	.....
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	1,244,400,000	1,313,941,000	1,241,452,000	1,157,329,000	1,211,515,000	-32,885,000
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	15,490,000	18,490,000	17,490,000	18,200,000	17,490,000	+2,000,000
Construction	6,463,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	6,463,000	.....
American sections, international commissions	5,490,000	5,660,000	5,490,000	5,010,000	5,490,000	.....
International fisheries commissions	14,549,000	14,549,000	14,490,000	14,549,000	14,549,000	.....
Total, International commissions	41,992,000	45,162,000	43,933,000	44,222,000	43,992,000	+2,000,000
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	5,000,000	8,000,000	.....
Total, Department of State	3,974,266,000	4,246,899,000	4,002,691,000	4,014,533,000	4,037,250,000	+62,984,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities	41,500,000	46,200,000	41,500,000	32,613,000	41,500,000	.....
United States Information Agency						
International information programs	440,000,000	434,097,000	430,597,000	427,097,000	427,097,000	-12,903,000
Emergency appropriations	1,375,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,375,000
Total, salaries and expenses	441,375,000	434,097,000	430,597,000	427,097,000	427,097,000	-14,278,000
Technology fund	5,050,000	7,000,000	5,050,000	10,000,000	5,050,000	.....
Educational and cultural exchange programs	185,000,000	197,731,000	193,731,000	200,000,000	197,731,000	+12,731,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	600,000	600,000	600,000	570,000	570,000	-30,000
Israeli Arab scholarship program	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000	.....
International Broadcasting Operations	325,000,000	366,750,000	391,550,000	339,655,000	364,415,000	+39,415,000
Broadcasting to Cuba (direct)	25,000,000	.....	.....	22,095,000	22,095,000	-2,905,000
Radio construction	35,490,000	32,710,000	40,000,000	32,710,000	40,000,000	+4,510,000
East-West Center	10,000,000	7,000,000	.....	22,000,000	12,000,000	+2,000,000
North/South Center	1,495,000	1,500,000	.....	3,000,000	1,500,000	+5,000
National Endowment for Democracy	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	.....
Total, United States Information Agency	1,059,410,000	1,077,788,000	1,091,928,000	1,087,527,000	1,100,858,000	+41,448,000
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	.....	-700,000	-700,000
Total, related agencies	1,100,910,000	1,123,988,000	1,133,428,000	1,120,140,000	1,141,658,000	+40,748,000
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,075,176,000	5,370,887,000	5,136,119,000	5,134,673,000	5,178,908,000	+103,732,000
Appropriations	(5,025,276,000)	(5,370,887,000)	(5,136,119,000)	(5,134,673,000)	(5,179,608,000)	(+154,332,000)
Emergency appropriations	(49,900,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-49,900,000)
Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-700,000)	(-700,000)
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authority)	(148,430,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(-97,400,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Maritime Security Program	54,000,000	52,400,000	35,500,000	35,000,000	35,500,000	-18,500,000
Operations and training	65,000,000	70,000,000	65,000,000	69,000,000	67,600,000	+2,600,000
Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	37,450,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	29,000,000	32,000,000	-5,450,000
Administrative expenses	3,450,000	4,000,000	3,450,000	4,000,000	3,725,000	+275,000
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	40,900,000	39,000,000	38,450,000	33,000,000	35,725,000	-5,175,000
Total, Maritime Administration	159,900,000	161,400,000	138,950,000	137,000,000	138,825,000	-21,075,000
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salaries and expenses	206,000	206,000	250,000	206,000	250,000	+44,000
Commission on the Advancement of Federal Law Enforcement						
Salaries and expenses	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,000,000
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salaries and expenses	8,740,000	11,000,000	8,740,000	8,740,000	8,740,000	.....
Commission on Immigration Reform						
Salaries and expenses	2,196,000	500,000	496,000	459,000	459,000	-1,737,000
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salaries and expenses	1,090,000	1,090,000	1,090,000	1,090,000	1,090,000	.....
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses	239,740,000	246,000,000	239,740,000	242,000,000	242,000,000	+2,260,000
Federal Communications Commission						
Salaries and expenses	188,079,000	219,079,000	177,079,000	185,949,000	186,514,000	-1,565,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-152,523,000	-162,523,000	-152,523,000	-162,523,000	-162,523,000	-10,000,000
Direct appropriation	35,556,000	56,556,000	24,556,000	23,426,000	23,991,000	-11,565,000
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses	14,000,000	14,300,000	13,500,000	14,300,000	14,000,000	.....
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	101,930,000	108,000,000	105,000,000	108,000,000	106,500,000	+4,570,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-16,000,000	-10,000,000	-18,000,000	-2,000,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-58,905,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-70,000,000	-11,095,000
Direct appropriation	27,025,000	28,000,000	19,000,000	28,000,000	18,500,000	-8,525,000
Gambling Impact Study Commission						
Salaries and expenses	4,000,000	.....	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	-3,000,000
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	283,000,000	340,000,000	250,000,000	300,000,000	283,000,000	.....
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses	1,189,000	1,240,000	1,000,000	1,240,000	1,185,000	-4,000
National Bankruptcy Review Commission						
Salaries and expenses	494,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-494,000
Ounce of Prevention Council						
Direct appropriation	500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-500,000
Crime trust fund	.....	9,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses	305,400,000	317,412,000	315,000,000	317,412,000	315,000,000	+9,600,000
Offsetting fee collections	-222,622,000	-249,523,000	-249,523,000	-249,523,000	-249,523,000	-26,901,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-45,000,000	-32,000,000	-32,000,000	-32,000,000	-32,000,000	+13,000,000
Direct appropriation	37,778,000	35,889,000	33,477,000	35,889,000	33,477,000	-4,301,000
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses	239,547,000	246,100,000	235,047,000	246,100,000	254,200,000	+14,653,000
Offsetting fee collections	-4,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+4,500,000
Direct appropriation	235,047,000	246,100,000	235,047,000	246,100,000	254,200,000	+19,153,000
Office of Inspector General	9,000,000	10,600,000	9,490,000	10,600,000	10,000,000	+1,000,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2267) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	1,691,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,691,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy	179,700,000	173,235,000	187,100,000	181,232,000	181,232,000	+1,532,000
Micro loan guarantees	2,317,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,317,000
Administrative expenses	94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	.....
Total, Business loans program account	277,708,000	267,235,000	281,100,000	275,232,000	275,232,000	-2,476,000
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	.....	.....	.....	.....	23,200,000	+23,200,000
Administrative expenses	191,932,000	173,200,000	199,100,000	173,200,000	150,000,000	-41,932,000
Emergency appropriations	135,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-135,000,000
Total, Disaster loans program account	326,932,000	173,200,000	199,100,000	173,200,000	173,200,000	-153,732,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	3,730,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	-230,000
Total, Small Business Administration	852,417,000	700,635,000	728,237,000	708,632,000	716,132,000	-136,285,000
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 1/	6,000,000	13,550,000	3,000,000	13,550,000	6,850,000	+850,000
Total, title V, Related agencies	1,675,831,000	1,619,366,000	1,462,036,000	1,515,532,000	1,489,499,000	-186,332,000
Appropriations	(1,540,831,000)	(1,610,366,000)	(1,462,036,000)	(1,515,532,000)	(1,489,499,000)	(-51,332,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(148,430,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(-97,400,000)
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
Congressional legal expenses (sec. 616)	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....
GOVERNMENT-WIDE						
Defense function (by transfer)	.....	(34,025,000)	(34,025,000)	(34,025,000)	(33,169,000)	(+33,169,000)
International function (by transfer)	.....	(47,089,000)	(46,592,000)	(46,592,000)	(45,432,000)	(+45,432,000)
Domestic function (by transfer)	.....	(31,845,000)	(31,845,000)	(31,845,000)	(31,061,000)	(+31,061,000)
Total, title VI, general provisions	.....	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....
Appropriations	.....	.....	(1,000,000)	.....	.....	.....
(By transfer)	.....	(112,959,000)	(112,462,000)	(112,462,000)	(109,662,000)	(+109,662,000)
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Working capital fund (rescission)	-36,400,000	.....	.....	-30,310,000	-100,000,000	-63,600,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Immigration Emergency fund (rescission)	-34,779,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+34,779,000
Total, title VII, Rescissions	-71,179,000	.....	.....	-30,310,000	-100,000,000	-28,821,000
TITLE VIII - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,000,000	+7,000,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	30,230,160,000	35,657,937,000	31,786,493,000	31,653,555,000	31,816,907,000	+1,586,747,000
Appropriations	(25,275,710,000)	(26,855,620,000)	(26,501,743,000)	(26,459,043,000)	(26,709,107,000)	(+1,433,397,000)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,564,317,000)	(31,000,000)	.....	.....	.....
Emergency appropriations	(536,629,000)	.....	.....	.....	(7,000,000)	(-529,629,000)
Rescissions	(-107,179,000)	.....	(-5,000,000)	(-30,310,000)	(-124,200,000)	(-17,021,000)
Crime trust fund	(4,525,000,000)	(5,238,000,000)	(5,258,750,000)	(5,224,822,000)	(5,225,000,000)	(+700,000,000)
(By transfer)	(69,000,000)	(175,340,000)	(176,343,000)	(177,843,000)	(172,043,000)	(+103,043,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,042,000)	(3,930,000)	(3,490,000)	(3,042,000)	(3,266,000)	(+224,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(148,430,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(135,000,000)	(51,030,000)	(-97,400,000)

1/ President's budget proposes $5,000,000 for State Justice Institute.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5¼ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is honored, I think I am more relieved to be here finally, and not any more excited about being the last vehicle out of town than he is as everybody jumps on our bill. I want to commend the gentleman for his fine management of this bill and his dealing with all the appropriation issues all year. He has been extremely capable, as always.

The gentleman from Kentucky is very gracious. He has allowed the minority to participate in the process fully, which the minority greatly appreciates. He has also been very adroit in his handling and compromising of the accounts that are under our jurisdiction as well as, particularly because we are the last vehicle out of town, as accommodating as he possibly can be to all of the authorizing requests that we have received in the last 2 weeks particularly. He has done an outstanding job, as he always does, and I am very grateful for the opportunity to cooperate with him as we move this bill forward.

Likewise, I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], who has been extremely active and constructive in ensuring that our process moves forward at every step of the way.

I would also like to extend a special thanks to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member, who has been tireless in giving needed attention to the details of not only this bill but particularly this bill, but what is really impressive, the detail that he gives to all 13 of our appropriations subcommittee bills. I am very personally appreciative for his help to me and his guidance. I thank the gentleman for the attention he has given to it. I know it has been tireless.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON] are tremendous contributors to our subcommittee on the minority. I very much appreciate and enjoy working with these friends and colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the hard work of all staff involved, particularly Sally Gaines and Liz Whyte of my personal staff, and Jim Kulikowski, Therese McAuliffe, Jennifer Millier, Mike Ringler and Jane Weisman of the committee staff, along with my sincere appreciation for all of the efforts of the minority appropriations staff, Mark MURRAY, David Reich and Pat Schleuter.

Mr. Speaker, joining in much of the sentiment expressed by our chairman, my colleagues should be pleased with the core funding contained in this bill. The centerpiece of this bill, the defining characteristic of it, if you will, is law enforcement, which is robustly funded. The FBI enjoys a $136 million increase over last year in this bill; the Drug Enforcement Administration, a $134 million increase; the Immigration and Naturalization Service, a whopping $714 million increase.

The INS funding provides for 1,000 new Border Patrol and the equipment to support them. The COPS program, fully funded at $1.4 billion, keeps us on track toward the President's promise to increase Federal funding for new policemen on the beat to the 100,000 number. The crime trust fund is increased by $356 million. The popular Byrne Grant program is robustly funded at $505 million. The Violence Against Women program is increased by $74 million. Juvenile crime prevention is $489 million, of which $239 is for prevention programs, which is an increase of $64 million. Legal services is increased in conference to $283 million.

Overall, the Justice Department enjoys a $1.037 billion increase under this bill. State, USIA, Arms Control is an overall $5.17 billion, an increase of $100 million. The Judiciary enjoys a $200 million increase to $3.4 billion. The Commerce Department in this bill is increased $450 million to $4.3 billion. Of that, NOAA enjoys a $100 million increase. ATP is funded at $192 million, $82 million in new grant money.

The census, Mr. Speaker, is increased by $349 million in preparation for the very important decennial census. This report contains a very imperfect compromise admittedly regarding the inclusion of sampling in the census process. The best thing I can say is that the agreement assures that this time-sensitive process, planning for the 2000 census, can go forward incorporating the statistical technique of sampling, which all the experts say will that the 2000 census can be the most accurate in the history of the Nation.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] all deserve our gratitude for the time and attention they have given to this issue. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] are students of it, and they have made insightful contributions to the democratic process as this process has moved forward. I appreciate their help.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report. It is on balance an excellent bill, while containing several difficult but, on balance, satisfactory compromises.

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

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

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding this time to me, and I congratulate him for doing an outstanding job on a difficult bill. The gentleman from Kentucky is one of our best negotiators. He has hung tough to the very last minute, and I think that he will not want to hang so tough until the last minute the next time, but I appreciate the great work that he has done on this bill.

I also want to pay tribute to the tremendous job by the gentleman from West Virginia, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking minority member of the full committee. They have been incredibly helpful in getting this bill through. I hope with their help that we will get it all the way through and that it will find its way through passage tonight and not at some later date.

I also want to thank the staff. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] has pointed out, they worked all night last night, and many went without sleep for a couple of days in order to get this bill prepared for the floor. Frankly, they and all of the staff on the Committee on Appropriations have just been invaluable throughout this very difficult year. I thank them for their service.

I would like to take this opportunity to just pose a colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, to congratulate him for his work and just ask him what in his mind might happen to the floor schedule if in fact a motion to recommit were adopted or if in fact this bill failed to pass tonight.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. If a motion to recommit should pass, under the rules of the House, the bill would have to be reconferenced with the Senate, which means we would have to reconvene a conference with the Senate and bring the bill back at some future time.

□ 2030

Now I am told that that may be difficult to do, because I am told most of the Members of the other body are not present in town at this time, which means that we would have to, I guess, go to next week or some other time to bring the House back in session and try to pass a bill at that time.

Now, if the bill fails tonight, by the same token, we have to reconference and come back at some future time, so we would be here next week.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to be absolutely clear. If Members think for some reason that it might be a good idea to vote for the motion to recommit and they happen to be in the majority, or, in the alternative, if they were to vote against the bill and they were to find themselves in the majority, and the bill for any reason were to be defeated tonight, the gentleman is absolutely correct, we could not convene a conference tomorrow. We could only convene a conference when the Members of both bodies could be accumulated some time

next week or some time later on this year, and we would have to go through an additional extended continuing resolution. We would risk the possibility of the closure of the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Justice Department.

I just caution Members, if in fact they are considering not supporting this bill or supporting the motion to recommit, it would be a bad idea. Let us get this bill passed, and let us put it to bed and say good night to the first session of the 105th Congress.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON], a very valuable member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I certainly would like to add my comments of congratulations to the chairman of the committee and the ranking member of the committee for the fine work that they have done. I think most Members realize that in this conference process it did not follow the traditional process, and I think under all the circumstances they have done an excellent job.

I rise in full support of the conference committee, and I certainly identify with the gentlemen and the ladies of the House who have expressed clear displeasure with the census language in this bill. If this was an up and down vote on census language, I would not be voting for it. But the truth of the matter is that no matter what we say about this reprehensible language, it does not prohibit sampling, statistical sampling, in the pilot program, nor does it prohibit it being used in the year 2000 but, rather, it leaves that fight to be fought another day.

The truth of the matter is that there are people who want an accurate count in the House and then there are people that want an accurate count. How do we count 270 million people in our country? Some would suggest it is door to door. I doubt that any of my colleagues really believe that.

If my colleagues look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, if they read the newspapers and if they listen to the 1 minutes, we use statistical data to illustrate our point. Most of that comes from statistical sampling, not door-to-door searches.

But more importantly, we have to look at what this bill does do, and for those who are interested in 245(I), it extends past the signing of the bill for 60 days the opportunity for people to get the I–130 forms. For those who are interested in legal services, it has $30 million more than this House provided. It is at a figure of $283 million. For those who are interested in crime prevention programs, it has $64 million above last year's programs. And for those who are interested in the Ninth Circuit in California, it sets up a reasonable way to take an objective approach to how we divide the Ninth Circuit Court up.

Mr. Speaker, it is for all those reasons that it does not prohibit the use of statistical sampling, that it has many good programs for law enforcement as well as social programs, that I urge each Member to vote aye on the conference report.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LATHAM], a very distinguished, hard-working member of our subcommittee who has contributed much to our cause here.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I especially want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, for all of his very hard work, and the ranking member that did such a great job, and I think the Members should be aware that we would not have any problems on this bill if it were not for extraneous provisions that were brought in.

This committee has worked very, very hard and on a bipartisan basis to get a very good bill to the floor, and I too, would like to commend the staff for doing a tremendous job. It has been a real pleasure in my first year on the subcommittee to work with such a professional staff, and they have done a great job.

Just some of the provisions in the bill and reasons I think that all Members should strongly support this bill: When we talk about the COPS Program, it does continue the funding at $1.4 billion for the 100,000 new police officers on the street. But very important to me is the fact that it increases from 10 to 20 percent the COPS More Program.

Many of the communities in my district cannot afford the COPS Program to put additional officers on the force and then 3 years later have to take over the funding. They just simply do not have it in their budget. So the COPS More Program is extremely important, that they can buy technology and equipment that they so desperately need.

The COPS Program also establishes four innovative new programs. There is $35 million for law enforcement technology grants, $35 million for drug enforcement grants, $34 million for methamphetamine initiatives, which is a problem that has exploded in the upper Midwest and in Iowa in my district; also, $1 million for police recruitment programs.

In the Office of the Justice programs, which are increased from $118 to $173 million, it includes a very important provision. There is $25 million for a new national sex offender registry, extremely important, I think, in this day and age.

As far as the State and local law enforcement assistance, it is increased dramatically, about $500 million, the highest level ever on the Byrne grants, and the Weed & Seed programs establish a new $250 million juvenile crime block grant and increases by $75 million the Violence Against Women grants, which is up to $271 million. Again, that is increased by $75 million. There is $720 million for State prison grants; when we talked about truth-in-sentencing, very, very important.

As far as funding for the INS, that is increased from $2.1 to about $2.5 billion, and that includes funding for improved INS fingerprinting equipment, requires fingerprinting services must be conducted by INS agents or law enforcement agents. If my colleagues remember, last year, we had testimony that Pookie's Bar & Grill in California was doing fingerprinting for us, paid by the tax dollars to fingerprint potential U.S. citizens.

And it also guarantees that citizenship cannot be granted without a full and completed FBI background check, and the reason for this, my colleagues, is in the rush last year to have more citizens register to vote, especially in California, there were 186,000 people who were given citizenship last year without an FBI background check.

By any standard, when we talked about sampling, about 20 percent of those people normally are convicted felons. That means, in a conservative way, there are over 30,000 convicted felons who are given citizenship. This will put a stop to that, and I urge support of this bill.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for this bill, and I personally want to thank the Chair and the ranking member and the subcommittee and the House for considering a number of issues critical for California in a favorable light.

I am unhappy about the Census language, but I will still support the bill for the reasons later to be explained by the gentleman from Ohio.

But what I would like the other party to explain to me is the strange logic by which, when they do not get the language they want, the Mexico City language on family planning programs abroad, they appropriate the money for family planning, and then, to retaliate for not getting that language, they take their highest priority for the last 3 years, the reform of the international relations bureaucracy, and kill it. They take their desire to leverage lower assessments in New York at the U.N. through very well calibrated conditions on arrearages and destroy it, and then risk all the consequences of financial instability that come from the currency fluctuations by destroying the IMF new borrowing authority. What a bizarre and strange reaction when they provide and appropriate the family planning funds which cause them to get so angry and strike out after all these things.

I support the gentleman from Wisconsin's motion to recommit, and I urge the body to do so.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], who has provided such leadership for our caucus on this issue.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition, but first I would like to thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SHAYS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER], for all their help on the Census issue.

And to the rest of my colleagues, if they believe in a fair and accurate Census, they simply cannot vote for this bill. Getting a fair and accurate count is the civil rights issue of the 21st century. If my colleagues are not counted, they are not represented. If they are not counted, they are not part of the Federal funding formulas.

This deal, as many have said, funding is provided for statistical sampling through September of 1998, yet at the same time it stacks the deck against achieving it by helping to build a case for those who plan to kill it in 1999. And the Speaker has vowed to kill the sampling issue in 1999.

This legislation aids this plan by putting into place a campaign to smear it. First the deal allows opponents to file multiple lawsuits to tie the Census up in court. The deal also allows the Speaker, using the House general counsel, to sue on behalf of the House to block sampling. In other words, the Speaker, representing the viewpoint of the RNC, will be using taxpayers' funds to block sampling.

Second, it asks the bureau to run two censuses at once; and, thirdly, it confuses the public by issuing four sets of numbers instead of just one. The opposition simply does not want to count our Nation's poor in our rural and our urban areas.

If this legislation becomes law, we are sending a message that we are willing to purposefully disenfranchise millions of Americans in the name of politics; in other words, we are willing to count them out of democracy. The Republican leadership is on record over and over again in their design to kill sampling. This language gives them the tools for the execution either by a thousand cuts in the courts or through spreading confusion about the results.

We cannot allow this to happen. I urge a no vote against the Commerce-Justice-State conference report.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

□ 2045

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what I really wanted to come to this floor tonight for was to show my appreciation for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] for work well done. Though my comments will criticize what we have secured with respect to census, I mean what I say with respect to the work that you gentlemen have done, and I thank you for that.

Particularly I thank you for working with me on the Prairie View A&M Justice Center, and as well working to curb pornography on the Internet for our children, developing a study by the Justice Department to find ways to prevent such horrible activities to be subjected to the Internet and for our children to see.

I need, however, to address this important and crucial issue which we hope we will find a solution for, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] and certainly the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] and the caucuses that worked on this issue.

But this census process will not work. This future litigation by the Speaker of the House will not work, as it proves to threaten sampling. This public relations campaign, using the monitoring board and a new House subcommittee just for census, shows us that this Congress is not serious about counting every American.

I ask my friends and colleagues to consider opposing this bill because of the concerns we have raised. I hope we can solve this problem, and have a true counting and a true census.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to share my concerns regarding the Conference Report on H.R. 2267, the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations bill.

The first of these concerns involves the failure of this Conference Report to provide protection to illegal immigrants who are the victims of domestic violence. The Conference Report to H.R. 2267 provides that only those immigrants who have 245(i) applications for permanent legal status pending at the time of the bill's enactment, may stay in the United States. In refusing to permanently extend 245(i) for most immigrants, the Conference Report makes one concession—it provides permanent extension of 245(i) for those immigrants holding employment-based visas. It makes no exception for battered illegal immigrants. In so doing, the Conference Report undermines the strides to protect battered immigrants made in the Violence Against Women Act (''VAWA'').

The Violence Against Women Act exempts battered immigrant women and their children from the three to ten year inadmissibility bars that apply to other illegal immigrants. These provisions were written to provide a way out of violent relationships for battered women and children abused by their U.S. citizen and lawful permanent resident spouses and parents. These provisions were included in VAWA in an effort to free battered immigrants to seek protection for themselves and their children from ongoing abuse and to allow them to cooperate in the criminal prosecution of their abusers.

The vast majority of battered immigrant women who qualify for protection under VAWA are in the United States in undocumented status because their citizen and lawful permanent resident spouses or parents have had control over their immigration status. These spouses also often control what information their abuse victims receive and with whom they associate.

Because the Conference Report does not provide permanent extension of 245(i) to battered immigrants, many of these women will be required to return to their home countries to obtain their green cards. All battered women who apply for relief under VAWA, however, must prove that their deportation will cause extreme hardship to themselves or their children. In requiring those women to return to the very country that INS agrees poses them a danger as the only means to obtain their permanent residency is dangerous and illogical.

Additionally, most battered immigrant women will have difficulty raising the funds to travel abroad to obtain their permanent residency. Many more will be required to travel to countries that cannot or will not protect them from their abusers, from their abuser's family or from the social ostracization that often accompanies women who publicly challenge abuse. Many victims will violate family court custody orders if they travel abroad or leave the jurisdiction where the court order was issued. Finally, many will be unable to make safe child care arrangements for their children if they are required to travel abroad or else they will have to take their children with them. Battered immigrant women should not have to be faced with leaving their children with an abuser or in a situation in which the children cannot be adequately protected from the abuser or possibly being charged with international kidnapping. Faced with these obstacles, many battered immigrants will choose to stay with their abusers.

It is important that both the battered immigrant and her children be able to obtain lawful permanent residency status under VAWA without interruption in the support, counseling, and legal relief they are receiving to help them and their children address the consequences of the violence. For VAWA's immigration provisions to offer victims of domestic violence the intended protection, battered women must be able to obtain their permanent residency without leaving the country regardless of when they file their self-petition.

The second area of concern that I would like to raise with respect to the Conference report on H.R. 2267, is the compromise reached on the census provisions. The revised language in the Conference Report regarding the census states that sampling poses the risk of an inaccurate census which is the very opposite of what is true.

The agreement on the Conference Report also allows the opponents of sampling to file suit in any and all courts in the country. If any one of those courts issues an injunction against the use of sampling it would take so long to clear up that the use of sampling in any ''dress rehearsal'' would effectively be blocked. If there is no sampling in the dress rehearsal, there will be no sampling in the census which means that the chance for an accurate census will be lost.

The Conference language regarding the census calls for the Census Bureau to issue several sets of census counts for both the dress rehearsal and the census. This would be confusing to the public and create chaos in the redistricting process. Redistricting experts dislike having multiple numbers so much that two years ago the National Conference of State Legislators passed a resolution calling for a one-number census in 2000.

Next I would like to discuss areas of the Conference Report that I am sure have not drawn the attention of many of my colleagues, but for which I believe the Conferees deserve my congratulations.

I worked with my colleagues during the appropriations process in an effort to find funding in the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations bill for the establishment of a National Center for the Study and Prevention of Juvenile Crime and Delinquency at Prairie View A&M University, located outside of Houston, Texas. While we were not successful in getting such funding into the House version of the Commerce-Justice-State bill, the Senate included in its version of this bill, $500,000 for the establishment of the Prairie View Center. Although I was disappointed that this specific line item did not survive in the Conference report, I am pleased that the Report requires OJJDP to carefully review Prairie View's grant application.

The National Center would fill some very important functions: (1) conducting academic programs, including continuing education and training for professionals in the juvenile justice field; (2) conducting policy research; and (3) developing and assisting with community outreach programs focused on the prevention of juvenile violence, crime, drug use, and gang-related activities.

Across America, violent crime committed by and against juveniles is a national crisis that threatens the safety and security of communities, as well as the future of our children. According to a recently released FBI report on Crime in the United States, in 1995, law enforcement agencies made an estimated 2.7 million arrests of persons under 18.

Studies show that prevention is far more cost-effective than incarceration in reducing the rates of juvenile crime. A study by the Rand Corporation, titled Diverting Children from a Life of Crime, Measuring Costs and Benefits, is the most recent comprehensive study done in this area. It is clear that juvenile crime and violence can be reduced and prevented, but doing so will require a long-term vigorous investment. The Rand study determined that early intervention programs can prevent as many as 250 crimes per $1 million spent. In contrast, the report said investing the same amount in prisons would prevent only 60 crimes a year.

Children hurting children on the streets of our nation is costly for the moral fabric of our society and the burden on our government. Public safety is now becoming one of the most significant factors influencing the cost of state and local governments. We can begin to bring those costs down and make both short term and long term positive differences in the lives of our young people by targeting the prevention of juvenile crime.

In Texas, the Historically Black Colleges and Universities are forging ahead. The Juvenile Justice Center at Prairie View A&M University will be come a state and national resource. It will perform a vital collaborative role by focusing on measures that target the prevention of juvenile violence, crime delinquency and disorder. The University will provide comprehensive teaching, research and public service programs. There is no single answer to this problem, but this Center will be a start to bridging the programs that work for the state of Texas and other states.

I thank the Conferees for their support of this important Center.

Finally, I am gratified that an amendment which I offered before on the floor of the House and agreed to has been included in the Conference Report for Commerce-Justice-State. The language in the conference report states that the Department of Justice should consult with the National Academy of Sciences to review computer-based technologies and other approaches that could help to restrict the availability to children of pornographic images through the Internet and on-line services.

Unfortunately, this language does not go far enough; my original amendment would have provided for the identification of methods that would locate illegal pornographic images with the goal of criminally prosecuting those purveyors of such pornographic images to children. The goal of my amendment was to create a pool of understandings regarding the technological capabilities currently available for identifying digitized pornographic images stored on a computer, network, or other computer communication mediums by the use of software or other computer technologies.

The funding for this amendment would have come from funds otherwise appropriated; therefore revenue neutral to the Department of Justice, which should not exceed $750,000.

I would like strongly urge the Department of Justice to pay attention to the intent of the Amendment when implementing this section of the conference report.

I would like to also ask that Members of the House join me in support of the original intent of the amendment to help eliminate the growing threat of pornographic images that our children who use the technology must face. This is an opportunity for us to help all of our nation's children have a safer future.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I want to express my agreement with the gentleman from California on the importance of putting back in here important international financial material. But secondly, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for his work on the census and say that I plan to vote for this bill.

I try very hard to avoid cliches, but it is much too late in the session to think fresh, so I am going to have to use one. I think some of my good friends here are trying to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory. The problem I and others had with the original census language was that it said we could not go forward with the sampling process until the Supreme Court had said it was okay. That would have killed it. That is not in the bill.

We now have parallel processes. We have the sampling going forward, and we have the court process. I disagree with my friends who say, oh, allowing the court process to go forward kills sampling.

I think sampling is constitutional. I do not think the Supreme Court is going to find it unconstitutional. Indeed, I am sceptical that the Supreme Court, given its own rules on ripeness and standing, will even decide this at all.

So what we have is a situation where previously sampling could not go forward until the Supreme Court acted, and we knew the Supreme Court was not going to be able to act because of its own doctrines, and now we have a situation where it can go forward.

I do not want to argue this too strongly, because I do not want to lose you any votes on this side, but the fact is the obstacle to census sampling that existed previously has been dissolved. Now we have been told, well, there will be a subcommittee that will propagandize.

I have to be honest with you, I hope I am not being unduly modest when I say I do not think most people pay too much attention to our subcommittees. They can dance and sing and whistle, and we can still go ahead with it. Yes, it may have to face a court test, but that is to be done.

In fact, I want to congratulate the Republicans. This is one more example of their belief in judicial activism, and I want to salute the Republican conversion to the notion that when there are important decisions that are to be made, we should ask some unelected, life-tenured Federal judges to arbitrate them for us. I think that is appropriate, as long as the work is not held up until then. So I think we have the best of both worlds.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs and Criminal Justice, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman. I first want to congratulate him for his hard work, and certainly the gentleman from West Virginia, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], who has worked on this diligently as well. I wanted to talk a minute about the census.

There were some accusations, and I probably agree with my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. We need to go forward. We need to have transparency in the system, and if there is an issue of whether this is constitutional or not constitutional, we probably ought to let the Supreme Court decide that issue. If there is an issue whether this is statutorily legal to do or not statutorily legal to do, we probably ought to let a court decide that.

But in the meantime, let me just say a couple things about transparency. Yes, there is going to be, first, a commission that looks at numbers, and, you know, it is not terrible to have four numbers, the four numbers in counting when you actually go out and count people and find out what the number is when you get counting and what the number is when you get done adjusting, which there is not an adjustment. So the number in counting, Number 1, will be the same as number 2.

Actually, when you get into sampling, which what you have is that you have a number when you get done, and that number will be X, and then it will be X plus or X minus something else, when you get done sampling. When you

do that census block by census block, people ought to be able to see what you do.

Whether you take population away from this precinct and you add population to that precinct, there ought to be a transparency about what this guessing business is all about. When the bureaucrats get done guessing what the population should be, because it meets their parameters of what they guessed it should be in the first place, there is a transparency, we can look at sampling, see if sampling is worthwhile, whether it has some value, whether it is constitutional, whether it is legal, and we will look at enumeration, which the Constitution talks about enumeration, counting, one by one. It has been going on in this country for 230-some years. It was prescribed by the forefathers of this country, and I think it is probably something we ought to continue to take a very serious look at.

I just have to tell my friends there is one government agency that basically goes door to door every day. They basically know how many people are in each house. It is called the Postal Service. If we need to do an extraordinary job of census, then maybe we could hire some people in the Postal Service on weekends on their time off. They can knock on doors. They know who lives in those houses.

Let us do the job that the Constitution says we should do. Let us move forward, let us do the census block, census block by census block, by geographical area by geographical area and put the numbers in there.

The test that was done in 1995 says there was a plus or minus 35 percent error rate when you get down to the lowest geographical area, which is usually the census block. If there is 100 people that live in a census block, we do not want to guess whether there are 65 people there or 135 people.

Let us get the numbers straight. Let us do it the way it is supposed to be done and pass this bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding me this time.

Sampling will clearly be one of the most important issues that we confront in the next session of Congress that is being addressed in this bill. I am going to support this bill, and I, too, congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for accomplishing a very difficult task.

I rise briefly, however, to call the attention to what the Speaker of the House said just a few years ago. I want to read it:

I respectfully request that the census numbers for the State of Georgia be readjusted, that is after counting, I tell my friend, from door to door, to reflect the accurate population of the State so as to include the over 300,000 which were previously not included.

That is in the door-to-door count, according to the Speaker.

Based on available information, without an adjustment to compensate for the undercount, minorities in Georgia could lose two State Senate seats and four to five 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.

Representative NEWT GINGRICH sent that to Bob Mosbacher, then Secretary of Commerce, with respect to sampling.

We are not going to argue situational ethics, I hope. If sampling was good then in this letter from Speaker NEWT GINGRICH in 1991 to Secretary Mosbacher, it is good today.

Now, my friends, let me tell you, there was a similar letter, and I will not read it, you can read it for yourself, from the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLAY SHAW], in a letter to Bill Clinton in 1994.

Barbara Bryant, who was the head of the census under George Bush, clearly says, in the long run our Nation is best served by accuracy. Sample surveys to estimate those who will not or cannot be counted in the 2000 census after the Census Bureau has made every reasonable and good faith effort to voluntarily enumerate will increase the accuracy of the census.

My friends, again, let us not be into situational ethics. Let us not be into which side gains politically. The Speaker thought in 1991 perhaps it served his political interest. But I also believe he said and believed that that was the accurate way to count. Let us not deviate from that for the situational effects that it may have.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], a very active and effective member of our subcommittee.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for the time.

I hope the Members of the House will support this conference report. It is basically a very good piece of work. In that regard, I want to thank our distinguished chairman from Kentucky and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] and the absolutely tireless work of a terrific staff in putting this all together. It is a good piece of work. Many areas, it is especially commendable to the Members.

One I would like to point to in particular is the substantial funding base that is given to the Department of Commerce and its several important science and research activities under NOAA, the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

There are still some problems. I am particularly distressed at the counterproductive and, I think, very backward-looking restrictions that are included in this bill on the activities of the Legal Services Corporation and its grantees. There is some gratuitous language in here about the census. But make no mistake about that, the bottom line on the census is that it allows the sampling process to move forward, and my colleagues particularly on this side of the aisle that are concerned about that ought to welcome this breakthrough, as was so well explained by previous speakers.

Finally, I hope the Members will support the motion to recommit that Mr. OBEY intends to offer. As Mr. BERMAN earlier explained, I think it is absolutely critical that we make good on at least a modest down payment on our arrearage to the UN, especially at this crisis time when we have to count on our working relationship within that body to deal with the difficult situation in Iraq, as well, as was explained, the need for funding flexibility to the IMF to deal with currency problems.

But the basic point here is a good conference report, worthy of Members' support.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1–3/4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Becerra, who has been extremely active on this issue and a leader of the Hispanic Caucus.

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

Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to speak during the rule, so I will try to be somewhat brief now on the actual bill.

I think that the ranking member of the subcommittee, the ranking member of the full committee, the Chair of the subcommittee and the Chair of the full committee have done a tremendous job trying to pull together a bill that could get the majority support in this House necessary to pull this together and send it off to the President. I commend them for the work they have done. I think that those four individuals have worked sincerely to try to pull together something that could get the support of all of us.

I must say that I continue to have the greatest of concerns with regard to the work on the census. I see no reason why we could not have sent this directly to the President and said, Mr. President, tell us what the experts say we should do with regard to a count of the citizens and the residents of this country when it comes to the year 2000.

□ 2100

Let us not inject politics into this, and let us go straight with what the experts say would be best to do for this country, because we know in the past we have left many Americans uncounted.

We had an opportunity to do that, but we failed. We failed miserably because the politics got in the way, and this legislation is apparently the best we could expect. The best we could expect says that we will have lawsuit

after lawsuit filed to try to stop statistical sampling, even though expert after expert has said that is the only way to get an accurate count of America.

Yet we stand here saying, this is what the President must sign. But in 16 or 17 minutes we will have to revisit this, because we do not have funding for a full dress rehearsal as sampling in the end to take place in the census. That is wrong, and that is why people should vote against this bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, but a very able, hard-working member of this subcommittee.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to commend the chairman, the staff and the ranking minority member for doing a good job. I strongly urge support of this bill.

We have heard a lot of speeches about the big picture tonight; I want to talk about the little picture with a big potential.

1998 is the International Year of the Ocean, and we have not paid enough attention to the ocean in terms of its impact on human life. One of the exciting things provided for in here, subsidies, $1.5 million for the Jason Foundation for Education. What the Jason Foundation will do is translate underwater research into the Internet, which means that school students and adults around the world will be able to interact with these researchers and learn more about our oceans and about what is being produced by the research that is taking place, in large part because it is the Year of the Ocean.

This is an exciting concept. I think we barely scratch the surface. What it means is that when it comes to fruition, that students will be able to interact with people at the National Gallery, at the Smithsonian, at the Kennedy Center, at colleges throughout the United States.

I saw this in action in my district where the Jason Foundation had a biologist at Yosemite talking about terminals, and the students in Wooster, Ohio could ask questions of this biologist and he could respond. It really worked out well, and it is an exciting concept. It is part of this bill.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say very briefly in response to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], we were engaged in a very difficult negotiation with the White House over the last several days, and in the end we gave half a loaf on the Mexico City policy which separates abortion from family planning. We said that foreign nongovernmental organizations would be precluded, those that are subsidized by the U.S. Government, would no longer be able to lobby in foreign capitals to topple their pro-life laws. It seems to me this was a very modest proposal. This was rejected.

The good news for the pro-life said that the Speaker of the House and the majority leader have given their solemn word that the IMF issue and arrearages payments, and those arrearages payments are in dispute, there are all different, conflicting numbers as to what they should be, that those three issues are intertwined and they will move forward together or they will not move forward at all.

We have offered the White House a true compromise; they have rejected it at this point. My hope is that in the spirit of comity, I would hope that we could move to a real compromise on this, and then we could work in partnership on all three of these issues.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], who has worked tirelessly on all of our 13 appropriations bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no objection to the job done by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] or the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. I think they have been imminently reasonable. I think they have produced a good product in what is in the bill. I certainly do not have any objections to the job done by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. I think he has done a very fine job. But I have to say my concern is what is not in the bill.

As my colleagues know, an agreement was made by the Republican Party, just referred to by the previous speaker to, for the moment, concede on their views on Mexico City and family planning issues on the fast track bill. In retaliation for that, for that concession, the decision was made to strike the State Department reauthorization language, to strike the currency stabilization fund, and to strike the U.N. arrearage authority.

I believe that is an extremely shortsighted and irresponsible decision, and I believe that decision significantly damages United States interests in two ways: It does not punish Bill Clinton, it punishes the country. It damages us in two ways because, first of all, it weakens our ability to develop consensus within the United Nations in building a proactive foreign policy against Saddam Hussein. It also undercuts the resources necessary to deal with the currency fluctuations and instability which we have seen throughout Asia and Latin America that could very well have incredibly serious effects on our own economy.

Now, the response of the House leadership on this matter I find most troubling. The Speaker sent a letter to the President today which says, ''With the challenge of Iraqi defiance against the world community and the importance of the United Nations Security Council in responding to that challenge, the U.S. must continue to play a central role in the U.N.'' It says, ''With the turmoil in international markets, it is clearly prudent for the Secretary of the Treasury to seek additional resources.''

And yet, this bill tonight withholds those resources until the President capitulates on a totally unrelated matter.

The letter then goes on to say, ''We do not believe that our disagreement over abortion should block action on national security issues.'' But then my colleagues proceed to block them anyway.

I have infinite respect for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and others who share his view on abortion policy; I share some of those same views. But the Constitution defines how one is supposed to win. In order to win on an issue, one needs to have a majority in both Houses or the signature of the President. If one does not have the signature of the President, then one needs two-thirds in both Houses. With all due respect, the only majority that the gentleman has at this moment is the majority in one House.

Now, what he is trying to do is to exercise leverage in order to expand that majority by holding other proposals hostage. Individual Members have a right to try that, but it is an obligation of leadership to say no when that puts in jeopardy severe and important interests of the United States. It is reckless for the leadership of this House to do otherwise.

Secretary Albright just called me. She was about to step on a plane going to the Middle East to try to build a tighter alliance to deal with Saddam Hussein. She said, ''I need those extra resources.''

I am going to be offering a motion to recommit, a straight motion to recommit, in order to give this committee an opportunity to put back into this bill the authority that they need for the $100 million in U.N. arrearages for the first year of the 3-year plan, and to also put into the bill the authority we need for currency stabilization. There is no problem in the Senate with that. The only group that seems to have any real problem with it is the House leadership.

It seems to me that the only way to meet our responsibilities, unless we want to walk out of here for three months and risk seeing a further unraveling of the currency markets and the security markets around the world, unless we want to risk seeing that, it seems to me we have an obligation tonight to provide those resources. That is what I will attempt to do by offering the motion to recommit, and I urge every single Member to support that motion. Without it, Congress will be

committing one of the most remarkably irresponsible abdications of responsibility that I have seen in all of the years that I have served in Congress.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

I just want to point out that in two separate packages we tried to put together an opportunity to pay the U.N. arrearages, for the IMF funding, for the State Department reauthorization, and yes, coupled with the promise that the President would not continue to use taxpayers' funds to lobby to use abortion as a family planning tool. It was a simple proposal. They did not want that.

So then we offered to put these together with all of the three appropriations bills that have just passed the House in the last two days. The President said he would veto it, the Senate said that they would filibuster it, and the Members of the other side in the minority said they were against it.

Now, look, this place is a place of compromise. Let us not say that we have held anybody hostage. The gentleman from New Jersey was very reasonable. He reduced his demands to simply say that he will not use taxpayers' funds to advocate abortion abroad as a family planning tool. That is not radical. The President refused it, and he refused to go along with this offer.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Chairman and the ranking member for their yeoman's work in crafting this conference report and bringing this legislation to the floor. This bill has a number of important provisions which will advance and promote the national interests. I am going to cite just some of them briefly.

First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee, for his work to fund the programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology. NIST is the Nation's oldest Federal laboratory, established by Congress in 1901, and its mission is to promote economic growth by working with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements and standards.

NIST currently has the need for repair and replacement of some of the critical laboratories. It has a maintenance backlog of over $300 million, and in addition, NIST requires new laboratory space. It must construct an advanced measurement laboratory. It is part of the funding appropriated for NIST. This bill includes $95 million for construction, renovation and maintenance for NIST laboratories. I applaud that.

In addition, it includes money for the core programs at NIST known as Scientific and Technical Research and Services programs, which include very important research conducted in its laboratories. The total is equivalent to the Senate-passed bill, $6 million below the amount originally authorized by the Committee on Science and appropriated by the House, but I applaud it.

Also, the bill includes $192.5 million for the advanced technology program; $113.5 million for the manufacturing extension program; $150 million for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which actually is $150 million more than what the House had asked for.

Let me comment just briefly on the compromise on 245(i) of the Immigration Act. I think it is very important. I am glad it was done. It should include the opportunity for victims of domestic violence to be accorded that treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Chairman and ranking member for their yeoman's work in crafting this conference report and bringing this legislation to the floor. The conference report on H.R. 2267, the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill, contains a number of important provisions which will advance and promote the national interest.

First, I thank Chairman ROGERS for his work to fund the programs of National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST].

NIST is the Nation's oldest Federal laboratory. It was established by Congress in 1901, as the National Bureau of Standards [NBS], and subsequently renamed NIST. As part of the Department of Commerce, NIST's mission is to promote economic growth by working with industry to develop and apply technology, measurements, and standards. As the Nation's arbiter of standards, NIST enables our Nation's businesses to engage each other in commerce and participate in the global marketplace.

The precise measurements required for establishing standards associated with today's increasingly complex technologies require NIST laboratories to maintain the most sophisticated equipment and most talented scientists in the world. NIST's infrastructure, however, is failing and in need of repair and replacement.

NIST currently has a maintenance backlog of over $300 million. In addition, NIST requires new laboratory space that includes a higher level of environmental control (control of both vibration and air quality) than can be achieved through the retrofitting of any of its existing facilities. In order to meet this pressing need, NIST must construct an Advanced Measurement Laboratory [AML].

As part of the funding appropriated for NIST, H.R. 2267 includes $95 million for construction, renovation and maintenance for NIST's laboratories. This funding level is slightly below the $111 million appropriated by the House, but well above the $16 million recommended by the Senate. The total should be sufficient to begin funding the construction of the AML, while at the same time allowing NIST to address some of its critical maintenance needs.

In addition, H.R. 2267 includes $276.9 million for NIST core programs, known as the Scientific and Technical Research and Services [STRS] programs, which include the important research conducted by its laboratories. This total is equivalent to the Senate passed bill and $6 million below the amount originally authorized by the Science Committee and appropriated by the House. While I would have preferred the House funding level, I understand the funding constraints under which the House and Senate Conferees had to operate.

The bill also includes $192.5 million for the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] and $113.5 million for the Manufacturing Extention Partnership [MEP] program. This level splits the difference between the House authorization and appropriation levels and the Senate appropriation for ATP. It seems to be a good compromise, and I applaud the House and Senate conferees for coming to an equitable conclusion on ATP and including the higher total for MEP.

I am pleased with the increase in funding for the National Oceanic and Atmosphere Administration—about $150 million more than the House bill.

I also want to recognize the compromise which was reached on section 245i of the immigration act. The expiration of this provision would have adversely and unfairly affected a number of families and businesses in my district. However, I am sorely disappointed that the conferees did not include the battered women immigrants provisions of the Violence Against Women Act in this compromise. The conferees demonstrated great compassion in extending the provisions of 245i until the beginning of next year; immigrants who are victims of domestic violence should be accorded the same compassionate treatment.

I am also disappointed that we have not yet found a way to repay our arrearages to the United Nations. Especially at a time when we are counting on the U.N. to maintain our position on Iraqi weapons inspections, continued delay of our debt repayment is, to say the least, embarassing.

I want to congratulate the conferees for the funding levels which were agreed to on the Legal Services Corporation. This funding is critical to assisting vulnerable people in our society. Women and children are among the vulnerable who without assistance often find themselves in abusive situations that they cannot control. The impact of these situations is significant and may result in homelessness and the loss of necessary financial resources for food, maintenance, and health care. In addition, LSC has been invaluable in allowing impoverished people to access the judicial system in support of their just claims. Much of their caseload, and almost half of the caseload in Maryland, deals with such issues as divorce, child custody, and domestic violence.

As with many eleventh hour compromises, this bill's Census provisions aren't perfect, but they have significantly improved thanks to the diligent work of many of my colleagues and the Administration.

While I am concerned that this compromise delays the decision of whether to use sampling in Census 2000 until 1999, I am pleased that, unlike the original bill, it does not significantly hinder the Bureau's critical work in preparation for Census 2000.

The failure of the 1990 Census, the GAO report on sampling, and the National Academy of Science's support of sampling should be more than enough evidence that we need to

use sampling to get the most accurate count possible in 2000, but a majority of my colleagues are not convinced. This decision allows for expedited court review of the constitutionality of sampling and it sets up a balanced monitoring board to carefully review the Census Bureau's plans.

This compromise allows the Census Bureau to test sampling in one of the three Spring dress rehearsal sites, the urban site in Sacramento, CA. Furthermore, this decision will not hinder the necessary preparation of the Long Form, the only reliable source of national data about who we are as a nation.

Finally, the agreement includes a $74 million increase for Violence Against Women Grants. While this bill's funding is $35 million less than the House bill, it is still $22 million more than the administration request and $7 million more than the Senate level of funding. This program provides funding to law enforcement agencies to encourage arrests in domestic violence cases and to train local prosecutors in the handling of crimes of domestic violence.

Again, I congratulate the Chairman and the ranking member for their work on this very contentious bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this bipartisan legislation, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], the ranking member, for the outstanding job they have done, especially with regard to the legislation and its development of National Sex Offender Registries, the Violence Against Women's programs, Missing and Exploited Children's programs, and the State and local law enforcement programs such as the COPS on the Beat initiative. I know, as a former assistant DA, these programs will help our local communities improve our local public safety.

I ask my colleagues to please support the legislation.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] who has provided such leadership for our caucus on this issue.

□ 2115

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report before us and intend to vote for it, not because I am so terribly satisfied with all of its provisions concerning preparations for the next Census, but because I believe it preserves the opportunity to continue down a path that will lead toward the most accurate and fair Census possible in 2000.

There are provisions of the agreement over the Census funding and design that I do not agree with. I wish they were not in this bill. I do not believe that the use of sampling and statistical methods, however, poses the risk of an inaccurate and unconstitutional Census. To the contrary, those methods, in combination with enhanced traditional accounting, hold the only real hope of overcoming the persistent high undercount of rural and urban poor and people of color and children that continues to plague every Census, and every court that has reviewed the question of whether sampling to supplement a good-faith traditional accounting effort is constitutional and legal has concluded that it is.

I do not think it is wise to ask taxpayers to foot the bill for a lawsuit by the Speaker of the House in an effort to prevent the use of sampling in the Census. In essence, the Speaker is asking taxpayers to help him ensure that millions of people will not be included in 2000. Shame on the Speaker, who supported the use of sampling in 1990, for insisting on this provision. Fortunately, I have every confidence that a lawsuit will not be successful, but it will be a waste of taxpayers' dollars, nonetheless.

The fact is that there is no realistic chance for an injunction to stop the dress rehearsal or the Census. Anyone challenging sampling would have to show an irreparable injury from the dress rehearsal going forward. There simply is no injury caused by a rehearsal. As with any litigation, suits can be brought in a number of courts. However, the bill allows for consolidation and requires expedited judicial review by the Supreme Court.

What the agreement does that is most important, however, is that it allows the Bureau to prepare for the kind of Census that it believes will be most accurate and cost effective. The Bureau will be able to carry out and evaluate a Census that uses sampling methods in the 1998 dress rehearsal.

I am confident that the dress rehearsal will demonstrate that the limited use of sampling and statistical techniques to supplement and improve direct counting methods will produce Census numbers that are far more accurate and inclusive at all levels of geography than a Census that relies only on methods that have not worked well in the past.

When that happens, my colleagues who oppose sampling ought to think twice about forcing an inaccurate Census on the American people through legislative fiat once again, as they tried to do on the disaster relief bill earlier this year. They ought to think twice about preventing the Census Bureau from eliminating the inevitable undercount of the poor and minorities through threats to deprive the Bureau of adequate funding 1 year before this historic undertaking begins.

All of us will be watching their oversight activities during the next year very closely. We will be using every opportunity to reach out to the American people, to build their confidence in the Census Bureau's work, and for the promise that it holds for a fair count. I urge the President to do the same. We will do whatever it takes to ensure that we can freely and objectively proceed to demonstrate that the use of sampling is wise and sound and, above all, necessary to achieving an accurate count in 2000.

If there is unwarranted interference with the process of preparing and implementing for the best Census possible, the American people will know it and this administration will fight back, because in the end, any effort to cause an incomplete count in some communities will guarantee an inaccurate count in all communities. Every State, county, city, and neighborhood will suffer.

So I urge my colleagues to refrain from causing the kind of chaos and confusion and misunderstanding about the Census process that some provisions in this bill may be designed to foster. If that is the purpose, then they ultimately will end up hurting the very people we claim to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the work of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] in crafting the bill, and the work of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] in making sure it is sound.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be voting for the bill?

Mr. SAWYER. Indeed I will, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman very much.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on the point of the United Nations payments, let us clear this up. The bill has in it $100 million to pay our arrearage at the United Nations. That is an amount that we owe. However, that is subject to passage of an authorization law by the Congress. Of course, that law has not yet been passed, but we have plenty of time early next year to do that, in which case the $100 million will be freed up to pay on the arrearage at the United Nations.

But there is a much bigger issue than that. If Members are concerned that at this time especially, we need to be supportive of the United Nations, then Members need to vote for this bill because in this bill are the funds to pay our annual assessment at the United Nations, which is $320 million. That is in this bill. If Members vote no, they are harming the United Nations at a very critical time.

This $320 million, if this bill does not pass, will not be paid by the United States. So if Members are worried about our standing at the United Nations, if they are worried about us not paying our bills at a time of international crisis, then imagine what the effect will be if this conference report is defeated.

If Members are worried about Iraq and whether the United Nations can stand up for our interests, Members need to vote for this bill, because it contains the funding to pay our dues in 1998 in full. That $320 million is at stake. That is one reason why Members need to support this bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, there is going to be a motion to recommit. If Members vote for the motion to recommit, we will be here at least next week, because the other body is not in session. We have to reconference this bill. I do not know when we will get to it. So if Members are worried about the schedule, then they need to vote no on the motion to recommit and yes on final passage.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly rise today to oppose the Commerce, Justice, State and the Judiciary Appropriations bill for FY 1998 which I believe poses a serious danger to the use of statistical sampling in the 2000 Census. By insisting on the language included in this legislation, Republicans continue in their opposition to sampling which has been universally accepted by the scientific community as the best way to ensure a fair and accurate census in 2000.

The census language in this legislation is problematic in several important ways. First, the bill states that the use of statistical sampling ''poses the risk of an inaccurate, invalid and unconstitutional census.'' This partisan language wrongly presumes the unconstitutionality of sampling when every federal court that has addressed the issue has held that the Constitution and federal statutes support the use of sampling. Second, the bill sets the stage for a legal assault on sampling by allowing opponents to file suit in federal courts across the country and seek injunctive relief that would halt the use of sampling in preparation for the 2000 Census. Third, this language gives unprecedented power to the Speaker of the House to sue on behalf of the House to block sampling and to use the resources of the House Counsel or outside counsel to pursue such litigation. While the Speaker is entitled to express his views on sampling wherever and whenever he chooses—as he has done frequently in voicing his strong opposition to sampling—I cannot support giving him my proxy or that of other Members of the House who share my belief that he is dead wrong on this issue.

Sampling is not an exotic or controversial theory. It is a scientific principle endorsed by the American Statistical Association, the General Accounting Office, and the National Academy of Science. And, it is non-partisan. In fact, the Republican-appointed director of the last census, Barbara E. Bryant.

Why do we need sampling to conduct an accurate census? The answer is simply that our history of conducting the decennial census clearly illustrates that the traditional method of enumeration, relying on a door to door count for each and every person in this country, is neither the most efficient nor the most cost-effective way to conduct the census. In fact, in 1990, the Census Bureau reported an undercount of 4 million people using the traditional method of enumeration or 1.6% of the total population. The Census Bureau estimates that nearly 5 million people will go uncounted if sampling is not implemented in the 2000 census.

The Republican leadership has a singular purpose for the 2000 Census and that is to make every effort possible to block the use of sampling. Unfortunately, I believe the language in this bill is representative of that purpose; therefore, I must oppose this bill.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Census language in the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill because all Americans must be counted in this nation's census.

Republican attempts to make sure that the 2000 census does not represent all Americans flies in the face of democracy. We now have the opportunity to accurately collect data from all sectors of society through the methodology of sampling. If we accept the language in this bill, we will direct the Census Bureau to separate planning and implementation activities for these ''dress rehearsal'' sites when the Census Bureau can barely support one—that is a set up for failure. If we accept this language, we will create an entire new subcommittee exclusively on the census issue—this not only wastes taxpayers' money on a method which all national organizations in the field of statistical analysis agree is the most accurate tool for determining the census, but also runs contrary to what the Republicans boast as one of their greatest accomplishments of the 104th Congress, eliminating subcommittees. Finally, if we accept this language, we will permit opponents of sampling to file suits in any court in the country, and they will file suits until they find a court to issue an injunction against the use of sampling. Such an injunction could be the death knell for sampling and with no sampling in the ''dress rehearsal'', there can be no sampling in the census and no way to avoid the inaccuracies of the 1990 census.

In 1990, four million Americans were not counted and several million were counted twice. Between 1940 and 1980 the net undercount of all Americans and legal immigrants decreased from 5.4 to 1.2 percent. However, the difference between black and non-black undercount increased from 3.4 percent in 1940 to 4.3 percent in 1970. In 1980, this undercount improved slightly to 3.7 percent, but this is still a significant miscalculation of the actual number and kind of people who make up this country. In 1990, the difference between Black and non-Black census undercount was the largest differential in the entire history of the census.

As a representative of California's 37th Congressional District, I am particularly concerned about the disproportionately high number of the California residents who were not included in the 1990 census. In 1990, 800,000 people were undercounted in California alone. The entire state represented 20% of the 1990 undercount. Because of these errors, my state was denied a Congressional seat that rightfully belonged to Californians.

My constituents deserve to be included and counted in the 2000 census and in all future census counts.

The census not only determines how the seats of the House are apportioned among the states, but is a significant force in shaping private and public sectors across the country. The census is used to allocate hundreds of billions of dollars to state and local governments. It is used to enforce the Voting Rights Act. It is used by businesses to locate specific work force populations. It is used to determine the kinds of services to provide to certain demographic areas. It is used to allocate resources for the construction of highways and the maintenance of adequate water supplies for communities.

This census is too important for it to not be accurate. Leading experts, including the National Academy of Sciences, have clearly stated the need for statistical sampling. Scientists admit that it is impossible to physically count every American citizen and legal immigrant in this nation. But it is not impossible to produce an accurate assessment of the American population.

The Census Bureau has made and continues to make tremendous strides in trying to accurately calculate census tracts throughout the country. With all of these improvements in distribution, collecting and analyzing the census surveys and the use of statistical sampling, the 2000 count could be the most accurate census yet. It could include all of the constituents of the 37th Congressional District, of the state of California, and of the entire nation. But if we let the current language remain in the Commerce, Justice, State bill, we will make the realization of this possibility impossible.

It is illogical, unscientific and wrong to endorse a proposal that we know would produce incomplete information about the people who make up this nation. We do not have the right to waste taxpayers' money on an old methodology that we know is not accurate. And we do not have the right to tie up a scientific methodology that is proven effective in the hands of adversarial politicians.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, regrettably, I must rise in opposition to this Conference Report, because I fear that the provisions pertaining to the availability of funds to the United States Patent and Trademark Office set a terrible precedent and could have the effect of stifling long-term innovation in this country.

The House version of the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill included a provision, contained in every appropriations bill to date, which allows the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, which does not receive any taxpayer funding, to spend all that it collects from its base user fees for its operations by stating that such funds ''shall remain available until expended.''

Unfortunately, the Senate version of the bill, for the first time since the PTO became self-sufficient, capped the amount of its user fees that the PTO may spend, diverting the rest to the general treasury to be used for other purposes.

I appreciate the efforts of the Chairman of the House CJS Appropriations Subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], in trying to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate versions of the bill. I know he did the best he could to keep the House version. However, a ''cap'' on the fees still exists in the compromise bill and I am dismayed to see, for the first time in history, that the PTO will not be able to spend appropriately all of its base fees which are set by the Congress.

We should not sanction a new tax on American innovation by holding back funds which come directly from the pockets of applicants for PTO services. In my opinion, all these fees are necessary for the efficient operation of our Patent and Trademark Office. Remember, not one tax dollar goes to the PTO. All the money they spend comes from applicants and should

be available for processing applications quickly and efficiently.

Any other result will stifle the engine of our growing economy in the information age.

I therefore will regrettably vote ''no'' on this Conference Report. We must stand up for inventors and trademark applicants in America.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for nearly three years almost since the day the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act of 1994 or CALEA was enacted, its journey has been problematic. CALEA is now more than three years old and is expected to be fully implemented on October 25, 1998. It now appears that this may not be the case. Conflicts between the FBI and the telecommunications industry over capability standards, capacity notices, and cost reimbursements, have become commonplace and serious. I have become very concerned that delays in putting standards in place have created major handicaps in fulfilling the Act. I have also concluded that law enforcement has been using CALEA to overreach, and that the FBI is looking to use CALEA for the perfect solution to their wiretapping wishes. Indeed, many of the so-called ''punch-list'' items clearly are beyond the scope of the Act.

These and other critical matters were raised during an October 23d oversight hearing on CALEA held by the Crime Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Chairman MCCOLLUM and our colleagues both sides of the aisle expressed the need for adjustments to ensure the workability of CALEA within the parameters of the Act.

As we attempt to bring this matter to a head, four issues must be dealt with as major areas of contention between industry and law enforcement: cost reimbursements, capability standards (through which the FBI has been seeking to use imposition of these standards to expand the government's wiretap capabilities; which is prohibited by CALEA's provisions), capacity notices, and compliance dates. They must all be resolved in order to put CALEA back on track.

Finally, a plan must be developed in which the government will pay to retrofit network facilities with no more than the $500 million available in the Act without shifting additional costs to industry. If we are successful, we will achieve the balance we seek between law enforcement security needs and protection of privacy concerns of individuals and industry.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 2267 to the committee on conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion to recommit is not debatable.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 171, nays 216, not voting 45, as follows:

[Roll No. 639]

YEAS—171

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Lampson
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn

NAYS—216

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
Kingston
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Murtha
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—45

Ackerman
Baesler
Baker
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boucher
Combest
Cubin
Dickey
Doggett
Ehlers
Ewing
Flake
Fowler
Gonzalez
Green
Houghton
King (NY)
LaFalce
Lipinski
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
Miller (CA)
Myrick
Neal
Nussle
Ortiz
Pickett
Pryce (OH)
Riley
Roemer
Salmon
Scarborough
Schiff
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Stark
Taylor (NC)
Watkins
Waxman
Wexler
White
Whitfield
Yates

□ 2141

Messrs. SNOWBARGER, GUTKNECHT, HOLDEN, KLINK and KANJORSKI changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. FORD, OWENS, BARCIA, SCHUMER and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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 282, nays 110, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

YEAS—282

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Clement
Collins
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paxon
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Turner
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—110

Barr
Bartlett
Becerra
Blunt
Bonior
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Campbell
Chabot
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crapo
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dellums
Doolittle
Duncan
Engel
Ensign
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hostettler
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Largent
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Moran (KS)
Nadler
Neumann
Olver
Owens
Paul
Payne
Pease
Petri
Pombo
Rangel
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Smith, Linda
Stearns
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)

NOT VOTING—40

Ackerman
Baesler
Baker
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boucher
Combest
Cubin
Dickey
Ehlers
Ewing
Flake
Fowler
Gonzalez
Green
Houghton
King (NY)
LaFalce
Lipinski
McInnis
McIntosh
Miller (CA)
Myrick
Neal
Nussle
Ortiz
Pickett
Pryce (OH)
Riley
Roemer
Schiff
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Stark
Taylor (NC)
Watkins
Waxman
Wexler
White
Yates

□ 2210

The clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ortiz for, with Mr. Roemer against.
Mr. Riley for, with Mr. Yates against.

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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1564. An act to provide redress for inadequate restitution of assets seized by the United States Government during World War II which belonged to victims of the Holocaust, and for other purposes.

S. 1565. An act to make technical corrections to the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act.

S. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to correct the enrollment of the bill S. 830.

S. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution to correct a technical error in the enrollment of the bill S. 1026.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J.Res. 106) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes, and that the House immediately consider and pass the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Louisiana if he would explain what the effect of this new continuing resolution is.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to explain.

The continuing resolution offers a 12-day continuing resolution so that the President may act on the bills that have been passed. In the meantime, I am happy to announce that we have concluded all action on the fiscal year 1998 appropriations bills, and this is the first time in 3 years that we will present to the President 13 individual appropriations bills, and I might add that they are all within the congressional budget.

The continuing resolution again represents a 10-day extension, but 12 when we consider Sundays, of the existing CR for those remaining bills so that they can be enrolled by a clerk and presented to the President. Ten days is the time span specified by the Constitution, and although I have every indication that the President will sign the bills that are on his desk, we should pass the simple extension out of comity.

I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, let me simply say that with respect to some of the priorities in the bills that we passed, I am reminded of the question asked by Peggy Lee, ''Is that all there is?'' But, nonetheless, I guess at this point we cannot do anything to change those priorities. This simply extends the date, as I understand it, to the 26th of November, and we have no objection on this side of the aisle.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is that Peggy Lee or Pinky Lee?

Mr. OBEY. Peggy. Pinky is more the gentleman's type.