SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS—Continued

[As of July 24, 1995]

H. Res. No. (Date rept.)	Rule type	Bill No.	Subject	Disposition of rule
H. Res. 197 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil	A: voice vote (7/24/95)
H. Res. 198 (7/21/95)	O	H.R. 2076	Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996	

Codes: O-open rule; MO-modified open rule; MC-modified closed rule; C-closed rule; A-adoption vote; D-defeated; PQ-previous question vote. Source: Notices of Action Taken, Committee on Rules, 104th Congress.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter for the RECORD:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 1995.

Hon. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: H.R. 2076, the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 1996, contains a provision that falls within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. Specifically, H.R. 2076 raises the fee rate under Section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 from the authorized level of 1/50th of one percent to 1/29th of one percent. Because the fee is raised to a level beyond that which is authorized by statute, this provision of H.R. 2076 would be in violation of clause 2 of Rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

Increases in this fee, coupled with difficulty in funding the SEC's operation, have been an ongoing problem, inherited from past Congresses. The Commerce Committee has been concerned that this situation not be allowed to continue indefinitely. Chairman Rogers, Chairman Archer and I have forged a permanent solution to the problem of SEC fees and funding. This agreement will be codified in the statutory reauthorization of the SEC; this agreement will, over a five year period, step down the 6(b) fee, together with other SEC fees, to a level approximately equivalent to the cost of running the Agency. At that point, the SEC will be funded entirely by means of an appropriation.

Based on the agreement I have with Chairman Rogers and Chairman Archer to work out this problem, I would not oppose a waiver of Rule XXI clause 2, with respect to a one-year extension of the 6(b) fee. This action is taken with the understanding that the Commerce Committee will be treated without prejudice as to its jurisdictional prerogatives during further consideration of this and any similar legislation.

I would appreciate inclusion of this letter as part of the RECORD during the consideration of this bill by the House.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter. With best regards,

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.,
Chairman.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1752

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. GUNDERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, on August 26, 1994, the President signed into law the fiscal year 1995 Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill and said this: ''This Act marks a bold first step in our effort to combat violent crime in America.''

Today, Mr. Chairman, we bring to the floor the second, even bolder, step in our effort to combat violent crime in America, a step that adds over $2 billion in Federal, State and local resources to the fight against crime.

We have done that in the context of a bill that, first, reduces general discretionary spending by some $700 million in budget authority and more than $1.1 billion in outlays from the current year; second, reduces the Commerce Department to basic programs; third, supports the State Department; fourth, provides funding for over 20 other independent agencies.

Overall, this bill provides $23.1 billion in regular discretionary budget authority, which is $722 million below the current year and $3.4 billion below the President's request.

For the crime trust fund, the bill provides almost $4 billion in budget authority, which is $1.7 billion above the current year, and $28 million below the budget request.

For law enforcement, one of the prime responsibilities of the Federal Government, this bill provides $14.5 billion, an increase of $2.2 billion over the current fiscal year, an 18 percent increase, to support key programs, Federal, State, and local, to fight violent crime.

Of that, $4 billion is from the violent crime reduction trust fund, an increase of $1.7 billion over the current year, to provide substantial new resources to our local communities, including: $2 billion for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant, passed by this House on February 14, 1995, to reach 39,000 law enforcement agencies around the country. This program provides funding for local officials to decide what they need to fight crime—cops, equipment, drug courts, prevention programs, whatever they believe important—not Washington telling them what they need, rather local officials tell us what they need. Mr. Chairman, this program has come to be known as the ''COP-TION'' program, ''COPS'' with a local option.

It also provides $525 million for the Byrne State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grants, very popular with our local officials; $500 million for the Truth-in-Sentencing Grants for State prison construction, to help States lock away violent criminals, a brand new program; and other programs providing more than $3 billion in resources to State and local communities to aid in their fight against crime.

The bill also provides major new funding initiatives for immigration, anti-terrorism and Federal law enforcement.

For enforcing our Nation's immigration laws, the bill provides $2.3 billion, an increase of $730 million, including a $378 million increase for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to hire 3,000 more employees. It means 1,000 more Border Patrol agents and 400 more inspectors on the border, and doing that with no new border fee as the administration has proposed. It means over 1,450 more investigators and detention and deportation personnel to locate, apprehend and remove illegal aliens from the United States.

Spending on Federal law enforcement and the Judiciary will increase by 4 percent, up $438 million, including

funds to sustain the 750 DEA and FBI agents we restored in fiscal year 1995; and $236 million to provide 1,100 staff to activate 10 new and expanded prisons scheduled to open in 1996.

In addition, the bill provides $243 million for anti-terrorism resources requested by the President in a budget amendment submitted just last Monday, July 17, in response to the tragic Oklahoma City bombing.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, this bill is the toughest anti-crime appropriations bill this House of Representatives has ever produced.

But as tough as the bill is on crime, it is even tougher on low priority spending. Every other title of this bill is down, and down significantly: Commerce, down 17 percent; State, USIA, and Arms Control and Disarmament, down 9 percent; related agencies, down 23 percent. In the Department of Commerce, the bill provides $3.4 billion, down $715 million below the current year and $1.3 billion below the President's request.

For many, we have not cut enough. For many, we have cut too much.

The National Institute of Standards and Technology is down $350 million, from $750 to $400 million. No new funding is provided for the Advanced Technology Program, but bill language is included to assure that the $180 million in anticipated unobligated carryover funding is used for a 1-year closeout of prior year commitments. It maintains $81 million for manufacturing centers and $263 million for our NIST's premiere internal research program.

□ 1800

NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is down $200 million to $1.8 billion. Its basic functions, though, are preserved.

EDA has been cut 25 percent, as is the Minority Business Development Agency. U.S. Travel and Tourism gets $2 million through the October White House Conference and then it is abolished.

It regroups the functions of the Commerce Department into three basic functions which we think will help as we consider what we do with the Commerce Department: first, trade and infrastructure; second, economic and statistical information; and third, science and technology.

We hope this sets the stage for the decisions about the Department's future that will be made through the authorization process.

For the State Department, and other international accounts, the bill is down $500 million from $5.7 billion to $5.2 billion, conforming international spending to the budget realities we face here. Funding is at or below all the authorization levels in the House-passed bills and includes some major reductions, particularly for the USIA.

Peacekeeping contributions at the U.N. are funded at $425 million, down $108 million from last year and $20 million below the request. The bill includes language requiring notification by the President to the Congress of any new or expanded peacekeeping mission. The bill merges the Inspectors General of State and USIA ahead of schedule to begin consolidation of those agencies right away.

On related agencies, we reduced the Legal Services Corporation by one-third to $278 million. We impose real restrictions to end abuses by the LSC. As an interim step, while the authorization process gears up, the bill imposes restrictions on what LSC-funded attorneys can do, including: requiring a competitive bidding process for those local grants; timekeeping requirements on the local field agencies; independent auditing, so the Congress knows how funding is spent; prohibitions on representing cases on redistricting, lobbying, class action suits against the government, prisoner litigation, representation of drug dealers; and subject LSC grantees to Federal waste, fraud and abuse standards.

We have reduced the SBA by $333 million to $590 million, preserving its core functions of assisting small business, but at less cost to the taxpayer.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, the bill provides $27.6 billion: $23.1 billion in discretionary budget authority, down $723 million; $4 billion in the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, $1.6 billion above last year.

Mr. Chairman, we produced a bill, I think, that is as tough on crime as any we have ever produced and even tougher on low-priority spending programs. I want to thank all the members of the subcommittee who worked with us under very difficult circumstances to craft a bill that, I think, most of us can support.

Mr. Chairman, I want to pay special tribute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]; the ranking member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee, who has just done yeoman's work assisting us; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking Democrat; and all the members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], and the gentleman from California [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. Chairman, these are hard times. I have said before that in this bill this year we are eating bugs and drinking rainwater. We attempt to reduce overall spending, but preserve what is important.

I have told our members that this is a year for hard choices, but the rewards are enormous. The American people have sent us here to do a job, and that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill for what it is: a bold step in our effort to combat violent crime in America and a bill that is tough on crime, but even tougher on spending.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses:					
Direct appropriation	119,643,000	73,229,000	74,282,000	-45,361,000	+1,053,000
Crime trust fund 1/	17,400,000	15,500,000	.....	-17,400,000	-15,500,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	137,043,000	88,729,000	74,282,000	-62,761,000	-14,447,000
Counterterrorism fund	.....	26,398,000	26,898,000	+26,898,000	+500,000
Administrative review and appeals:					
Direct appropriation	.....	54,336,000	39,736,000	+39,736,000	-14,600,000
Crime trust fund 1/	.....	33,180,000	47,780,000	+47,780,000	+14,600,000
Total, Administrative review and appeals	.....	87,516,000	87,516,000	+87,516,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	30,484,000	36,744,000	30,484,000	.....	-6,260,000
Total, General administration	167,527,000	239,387,000	219,180,000	+51,653,000	-20,207,000
Appropriations	(150,127,000)	(190,707,000)	(171,400,000)	(+21,273,000)	(-19,307,000)
Crime trust fund	(17,400,000)	(48,680,000)	(47,780,000)	(+30,380,000)	(-900,000)
United States Parole Commission					
Salaries and expenses	7,450,000	6,781,000	5,446,000	-2,004,000	-1,335,000
Legal Activities					
General legal activities:					
Direct appropriation	416,834,000	437,080,000	401,929,000	-14,905,000	-35,131,000
Crime trust fund	4,600,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	+2,991,000	.....
Total, General legal activities	421,434,000	444,671,000	409,520,000	-11,914,000	-35,131,000
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	2,500,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	+1,528,000	.....
Independent counsel (permanent, indefinite)	4,000,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	-1,116,000	.....
Civil liberties public education fund	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	-5,000,000	-5,000,000
Antitrust Division	85,143,000	91,752,000	85,143,000	.....	-6,609,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-4,500,000	.....	-16,000,000	-11,500,000	-16,000,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-39,640,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,622,000	.....
Direct appropriation	41,003,000	43,490,000	20,881,000	-20,122,000	-22,609,000
United States Attorneys:					
Direct appropriation	829,024,000	909,463,000	896,825,000	+67,801,000	-12,638,000
Violent crime task force	15,000,000	15,000,000	.....	-15,000,000	-15,000,000
Crime trust fund	6,800,000	14,731,000	14,731,000	+7,931,000	.....
Total, United States Attorneys	850,824,000	939,194,000	911,556,000	+60,732,000	-27,638,000
United States Trustee System Fund	103,183,000	109,245,000	101,598,000	-1,587,000	-7,649,000
Offsetting fee collections	-40,597,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-3,594,000	.....
Direct appropriation	62,586,000	65,054,000	57,405,000	-5,181,000	-7,649,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	830,000	905,000	830,000	.....	-75,000
United States Marshals Service:					
Direct appropriation	396,782,000	446,887,000	418,973,000	+22,191,000	-27,914,000
Crime trust fund	.....	16,500,000	25,000,000	+25,000,000	+8,500,000
Total, United States Marshals Service	396,782,000	463,387,000	443,973,000	+47,191,000	-19,414,000
Support of United States prisoners	296,753,000	295,331,000	250,331,000	-46,422,000	-45,000,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	77,982,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+7,018,000	.....
Community Relations Service	20,379,000	20,695,000	.....	-20,379,000	-20,695,000
Assets forfeiture fund	55,000,000	55,000,000	35,000,000	-20,000,000	-20,000,000
Total, Legal activities	2,235,073,000	2,424,619,000	2,221,408,000	-13,665,000	-203,211,000
Appropriations	(2,223,673,000)	(2,385,797,000)	(2,174,086,000)	(-49,587,000)	(-211,711,000)
Crime trust fund	(11,400,000)	(38,822,000)	(47,322,000)	(+35,922,000)	(+8,500,000)
Radiation Exposure Compensation					
Administrative expenses	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	.....	.....
Advance appropriation	.....	2,655,000	.....	.....	-2,655,000
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	.....	18,264,000	.....	.....	-18,264,000
Advance appropriation	.....	30,000,000	16,264,000	+16,264,000	-13,736,000
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	2,655,000	51,574,000	18,919,000	+16,264,000	-32,655,000
Interagency Law Enforcement					
Interagency crime and drug enforcement	374,943,000	378,473,000	374,943,000	.....	-3,530,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses	2,038,774,000	2,305,387,000	2,084,857,000	+46,083,000	-220,530,000
Counterintelligence and national security	80,421,000	82,224,000	82,224,000	+1,803,000	.....
FBI Fingerprint identification	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	.....	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Other initiatives (crime trust fund)	.....	13,100,000	80,600,000	+80,600,000	+67,500,000
Construction	.....	99,259,000	98,400,000	+98,400,000	-859,000
Subtotal	2,203,595,000	2,564,370,000	2,430,481,000	+226,886,000	-153,889,000
(Counterterrorism supplemental)	(28,200,000)	.....	(48,940,000)	(+20,740,000)	(+48,940,000)
Subtotal, operating level	(2,231,795,000)	(2,564,370,000)	(2,479,421,000)	(+247,626,000)	(-104,949,000)
Digital telephony (crime trust fund)	.....	33,400,000	.....	.....	-33,400,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	(2,231,795,000)	(2,617,770,000)	(2,479,421,000)	(+247,626,000)	(-138,349,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses	799,944,000	845,409,000	828,729,000	+28,785,000	-16,680,000
Diversion control fund	-43,431,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-3,810,000	.....
Direct appropriation	756,513,000	798,168,000	781,488,000	+24,975,000	-16,680,000
Crime trust fund	.....	12,000,000	12,000,000	+12,000,000	.....
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	756,513,000	810,168,000	793,488,000	+36,975,000	-16,680,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Salaries and expenses:					
Direct appropriation	1,102,475,000	1,453,471,000	1,421,481,000	+319,006,000	-31,990,000
Immigration legalization fund	(3,482,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(-1,659,000)	.....
Immigration user fee	(330,952,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(+26,132,000)	.....
Land border inspection fund	(1,584,000)	(5,965,000)	(5,965,000)	(+4,381,000)	.....
Immigration examinations fund	(291,097,000)	(304,572,000)	(450,217,000)	(+159,120,000)	(+145,645,000)
Breached bond fund	(6,200,000)	(6,356,000)	(6,356,000)	(+156,000)	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	(1,735,790,000)	(2,129,273,000)	(2,242,926,000)	(+507,136,000)	(+113,653,000)
Immigration initiative (crime trust fund)	100,800,000	335,498,000	152,842,000	+52,042,000	-182,656,000
Border control system modernization (crime trust fund)	154,600,000	.....	150,900,000	-3,700,000	+150,900,000
Construction	50,000,000	.....	11,000,000	-39,000,000	+11,000,000
Immigration Emergency Fund	30,000,000	.....	.....	-30,000,000	.....
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(2,070,990,000)	(2,464,771,000)	(2,557,470,000)	(+486,480,000)	(+92,699,000)
Appropriations	(1,182,475,000)	(1,453,471,000)	(1,432,481,000)	(+250,006,000)	(-20,990,000)
Crime trust fund	(255,200,000)	(335,498,000)	(303,542,000)	(+48,342,000)	(-31,956,000)
(Fee accounts)	(633,315,000)	(675,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(+188,132,000)	(+145,645,000)
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses	2,381,634,000	2,630,259,000	2,614,578,000	+232,944,000	-15,681,000
Prior year carryover	-30,000,000	.....	-40,000,000	-10,000,000	-40,000,000
Direct appropriation	2,351,634,000	2,630,259,000	2,574,578,000	+222,944,000	-55,681,000
Crime trust fund	.....	13,500,000	13,500,000	+13,500,000	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,351,634,000	2,643,759,000	2,588,078,000	+236,444,000	-55,681,000
National Institute of Corrections	10,302,000	10,158,000	.....	-10,302,000	-10,158,000
Buildings and facilities	276,301,000	323,726,000	323,726,000	+47,427,000	.....
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)	.....
Total, Federal Prison System	2,638,237,000	2,977,645,000	2,911,806,000	+273,569,000	-65,839,000
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice Assistance:					
Direct appropriation	97,977,000	102,345,000	97,977,000	.....	-4,368,000
Crime trust fund:					
Drug Courts	29,000,000	150,000,000	.....	-29,000,000	-150,000,000
Violence Against Women Grants	26,000,000	174,900,000	74,500,000	+48,500,000	-100,400,000
Ounce of Prevention Council	1,500,000	.....	.....	-1,500,000	.....
Crime prevention	.....	30,000,000	.....	.....	-30,000,000
Model intensive prevention	.....	48,216,000	.....	.....	-48,216,000
State prison drug treatment	.....	27,000,000	27,000,000	+27,000,000	.....
Other crime control programs	.....	4,426,000	900,000	+900,000	-3,526,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	56,500,000	434,542,000	102,400,000	+45,900,000	-332,142,000
Total, Justice Assistance	154,477,000	536,887,000	200,377,000	+45,900,000	-336,510,000
State and local law enforcement assistance:					
Direct appropriations:					
Byrne grants	62,000,000	240,000,000	50,000,000	-12,000,000	-190,000,000
Weed and seed fund	13,456,000	5,000,000	(23,500,000)	-13,456,000	-5,000,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	75,456,000	245,000,000	50,000,000	-25,456,000	-195,000,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Crime trust fund:					
State and local block grants:					
Byrne grants	450,000,000	260,000,000	475,000,000	+25,000,000	+215,000,000
Local law enforcement block grant	1,300,000,000	1,902,964,000	2,000,000,000	+700,000,000	+97,036,000
Subtotal, State and local block grants	1,750,000,000	2,162,964,000	2,475,000,000	+725,000,000	+312,036,000
Upgrade criminal history records	100,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-75,000,000	
State Correctional Grants	24,500,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	+475,500,000	
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program	130,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+170,000,000	
Youthful offender incarceration		9,843,000	19,843,000	+19,843,000	+10,000,000
Rural law enforcement		10,252,000			-10,252,000
Other crime control programs		26,799,000	13,700,000	+13,700,000	-13,099,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	2,004,500,000	3,034,858,000	3,333,343,000	+1,328,843,000	+298,485,000
Total, State and local law enforcement	2,079,956,000	3,279,858,000	3,383,343,000	+1,303,387,000	+103,485,000
Juvenile justice programs	155,250,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	-6,750,000	
Public safety officers benefits program:					
Death benefits	27,645,000	26,474,000	26,474,000	+829,000	
Disability benefits	2,072,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	+62,000	
Total, Office of Justice Programs	2,419,400,000	3,995,853,000	3,762,828,000	+1,343,428,000	-232,825,000
Appropriations	(358,400,000)	(526,453,000)	(327,085,000)	(-31,315,000)	(-199,368,000)
Crime trust fund	(2,061,000,000)	(3,469,200,000)	(3,435,743,000)	(+1,374,743,000)	(-33,457,000)
Total, title I, Department of Justice	12,243,088,000	15,291,039,000	14,474,522,000	+2,231,454,000	-816,517,000
Appropriations	(9,898,088,000)	(11,326,839,000)	(10,534,035,000)	(+635,987,000)	(-792,804,000)
Crime trust fund	(2,345,000,000)	(3,964,200,000)	(3,940,487,000)	(+1,595,487,000)	(-23,713,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)	
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses	20,949,000	20,949,000	20,949,000		
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	42,500,000	47,177,000	42,500,000		-4,677,000
Total, Related agencies	63,449,000	68,126,000	63,449,000		-4,677,000
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration	286,093,000	279,558,000	284,885,000	-1,208,000	-14,673,000
Export Administration					
Operations and administration	36,844,000	46,441,000	36,644,000		-9,797,000
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs	407,783,000	407,783,000	328,500,000	-79,283,000	-79,283,000
Salaries and expenses	32,144,000	31,183,000	20,000,000	-12,144,000	-11,183,000
Total, Economic Development Administration	439,927,000	438,966,000	348,500,000	-91,427,000	-90,466,000
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development	43,789,000	47,921,000	32,000,000	-11,789,000	-15,921,000
United States Travel and Tourism Administration					
Salaries and expenses	16,326,000	16,303,000	2,000,000	-14,326,000	-14,303,000
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	868,230,000	899,315,000	749,476,000	-118,752,000	-149,837,000
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses	46,896,000	57,220,000	40,000,000	-6,896,000	-17,220,000
Economics and statistics administration revolving fund	1,677,000			-1,677,000	
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses	136,000,000	144,812,000	136,000,000		-8,812,000
Periodic censuses and programs	142,063,000	193,450,000	135,000,000	-7,063,000	-58,450,000
Total, Bureau of the Census	278,063,000	338,262,000	271,000,000	-7,063,000	-67,262,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses	20,961,000	22,932,000	19,709,000	-1,252,000	-3,223,000
Public broadcasting facilities, planning and construction	28,983,000	7,959,000	19,000,000	-9,983,000	+11,041,000
Endowment for Children's Educational Television	2,499,000	2,502,000	.....	-2,499,000	-2,502,000
Information infrastructure grants	48,962,000	99,912,000	40,000,000	-8,962,000	-59,912,000
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	101,405,000	133,305,000	78,709,000	-22,696,000	-54,596,000
Patent and Trademark Office					
Salaries and expenses	82,324,000	110,868,000	100,000,000	+17,676,000	-10,868,000
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	510,385,000	639,855,000	489,709,000	-20,676,000	-149,946,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services	264,486,000	310,679,000	263,000,000	-1,486,000	-47,679,000
Industrial technology services	434,673,000	642,458,000	81,100,000	-353,573,000	-561,358,000
Construction of research facilities	64,639,000	69,913,000	60,000,000	-4,639,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	763,798,000	1,023,050,000	404,100,000	-359,698,000	-618,950,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research and facilities 2/	1,829,292,000	2,021,135,000	1,690,452,000	-138,840,000	-330,683,000
Offsetting collections - fees	-6,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+3,000,000	.....
Direct appropriation	1,823,292,000	2,018,135,000	1,687,452,000	-135,840,000	-330,683,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	.....	.....
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent)	8,500,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	-4,600,000	.....
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund)	-1,500,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	.....
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,830,292,000	2,018,135,000	1,687,452,000	-142,840,000	-330,683,000
Coastal zone management fund	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	.....	.....
Mandatory offset	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	.....	.....
Construction	97,254,000	52,299,000	42,731,000	-54,523,000	-9,568,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion	22,936,000	23,347,000	20,000,000	-2,936,000	-3,347,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund	1,273,000	1,282,000	1,032,000	-241,000	-250,000
Fishermen's contingency fund	999,000	1,000,000	999,000	.....	-1,000
Foreign fishing observer fund	400,000	396,000	196,000	-204,000	-200,000
Fishing vessel obligations guarantees	250,000	250,000	.....	-250,000	-250,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	1,953,404,000	2,096,709,000	1,752,410,000	-200,994,000	-344,299,000
Technology Administration					
Salaries and expenses	9,992,000	13,908,000	5,000,000	-4,992,000	-8,908,000
National Technical Information Service					
NTIS revolving fund	8,000,000	.....	.....	-8,000,000	.....
Total, Science and Technology	2,735,194,000	3,133,665,000	2,161,510,000	-573,684,000	-972,155,000
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses	36,471,000	35,826,000	29,100,000	-7,371,000	-6,726,000
Office of Inspector General	16,887,000	22,249,000	21,849,000	+4,962,000	-400,000
Total, General administration	53,358,000	58,075,000	50,949,000	-2,409,000	-7,126,000
Total, Department of Commerce	4,103,718,000	4,682,564,000	3,368,197,000	-715,521,000	-1,274,367,000
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	4,167,167,000	4,730,710,000	3,451,646,000	-715,521,000	-1,279,064,000
(By transfer)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	.....	.....
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices	1,657,000	1,662,000	1,662,000	+5,000	.....
Other salaries and expenses	22,583,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	+1,589,000	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	24,240,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	+1,594,000	.....
Care of the building and grounds	3,000,000	4,003,000	3,313,000	+313,000	-690,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	27,240,000	29,837,000	29,147,000	+1,907,000	-690,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,758,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	+134,000	.....
Other salaries and expenses	11,680,000	13,603,000	12,178,000	+498,000	-1,425,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	13,438,000	15,495,000	14,070,000	+632,000	-1,425,000
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,385,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	+28,000	.....
Other salaries and expenses	10,300,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	-854,000	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,685,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	-826,000	.....
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	220,428,000	226,024,000	226,024,000	+5,596,000	.....
Other salaries and expenses	2,119,699,000	2,419,941,000	2,185,000,000	+65,301,000	-234,941,000
Direct appropriation	2,340,127,000	2,645,965,000	2,411,024,000	+70,897,000	-234,941,000
Crime trust fund	.....	30,700,000	41,500,000	+41,500,000	+10,800,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,340,127,000	2,676,665,000	2,452,524,000	+112,397,000	-224,141,000
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,250,000	2,320,000	2,318,000	+68,000	-2,000
Defender services	250,000,000	295,761,000	260,000,000	+10,000,000	-35,761,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	59,346,000	72,008,000	59,028,000	-318,000	-12,980,000
Court security	97,000,000	116,433,000	109,724,000	+12,724,000	-6,709,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	2,746,723,000	3,163,187,000	2,883,594,000	+134,871,000	-279,593,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses	47,500,000	53,445,000	47,500,000	.....	-5,945,000
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses	16,828,000	20,771,000	18,828,000	.....	-1,943,000
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	28,475,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	+4,425,000	.....
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses	8,800,000	9,500,000	8,500,000	-300,000	-1,000,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	2,904,699,000	3,335,994,000	3,045,398,000	+140,709,000	-290,596,000
Appropriations	(2,904,699,000)	(3,305,294,000)	(3,003,898,000)	(+99,209,000)	(-301,396,000)
Crime trust fund	.....	(30,700,000)	(41,500,000)	(+41,500,000)	(+10,800,000)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs	1,726,878,000	1,748,438,000	1,716,878,000	-10,000,000	-31,560,000
Security enhancements	.....	9,720,000	9,720,000	+9,720,000	.....
Registration fees	700,000	700,000	700,000	.....	.....
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	1,727,578,000	1,758,858,000	1,727,298,000	-280,000	-31,560,000
Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	372,480,000	363,276,000	-20,696,000	-9,204,000
Security enhancements	.....	1,870,000	1,870,000	+1,870,000	.....
Total, Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	374,350,000	365,146,000	-18,826,000	-9,204,000
Capital investment fund	.....	32,800,000	16,400,000	+16,400,000	-16,400,000
Office of Inspector General	23,850,000	24,250,000	27,669,000	+3,819,000	+3,419,000
Representation allowances	4,780,000	4,800,000	4,780,000	.....	-20,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials	9,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	-1,000,000	.....
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad	421,780,000	421,780,000	391,780,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	6,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-500,000	.....
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	593,000	593,000	593,000	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	183,000	183,000	183,000	.....	.....
Total, Repatriation loans program account	776,000	776,000	776,000	.....	.....
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	15,465,000	15,465,000	15,165,000	-300,000	-300,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	129,321,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	-3,919,000	.....
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	2,723,561,000	2,773,040,000	2,688,975,000	-34,606,000	-84,065,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
International Organizations and Conferences					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	872,661,000	923,057,000	870,000,000	-2,661,000	-53,057,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year assessment	533,304,000	445,000,000	425,000,000	-108,304,000	-20,000,000
International conferences and contingencies	6,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	1,411,965,000	1,374,057,000	1,298,000,000	-113,965,000	-76,057,000
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	12,858,000	13,858,000	12,358,000	-500,000	-1,500,000
Construction	6,644,000	10,398,000	6,644,000		-3,754,000
American sections, international commissions	5,800,000	6,290,000	5,800,000		-490,000
International fisheries commissions	14,669,000	14,669,000	14,669,000		
Total, International commissions	39,971,000	45,215,000	39,471,000	-500,000	-5,744,000
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
Appropriation (FY 1995 Defense Bill, P.L. 103-335)	5,000,000			-5,000,000	
Total, Department of State	4,190,517,000	4,202,312,000	4,036,446,000	-154,071,000	-165,866,000
RELATED AGENCIES					
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency					
Arms control and disarmament activities	54,378,000	76,300,000	40,000,000	-14,378,000	-36,300,000
United States Information Agency					
Salaries and expenses	475,845,000	496,002,000	445,845,000	-30,000,000	-50,357,000
Technology fund		10,100,000	5,050,000	+5,050,000	-5,050,000
Office of Inspector General	4,300,000	4,593,000		-4,300,000	-4,593,000
Educational and cultural exchange programs	238,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	-46,189,000	-60,586,000
Transfer (FY 1995 Foreign Ops Bill, P.L. 103-336)	42,000,000			-42,000,000	
Subtotal	280,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	-88,189,000	-60,586,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	2,800,000	300,000	300,000	-2,500,000	
Israeli Arab scholarship program	397,000	397,000	397,000		
International Broadcasting Operations 3/	468,073,000	395,340,000	341,000,000	-127,073,000	-54,340,000
Radio Free Asia: Operations 3/	10,000,000	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	-10,000,000	
Broadcasting to Cuba 3/	24,809,000	(26,063,000)	(24,809,000)	-24,809,000	
Radio construction	85,314,000	85,919,000	70,164,000	-15,150,000	-15,755,000
East-West Center	24,500,000	20,000,000		-24,500,000	-20,000,000
North/South Center	4,000,000	1,000,000		-4,000,000	-1,000,000
National Endowment for Democracy	34,000,000	34,000,000	28,000,000	-6,000,000	-6,000,000
Total, United States Information Agency	1,414,117,000	1,300,327,000	1,082,646,000	-331,471,000	-217,681,000
Total, related agencies	1,468,495,000	1,376,627,000	1,122,646,000	-345,849,000	-253,981,000
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,659,012,000	5,578,939,000	5,159,092,000	-499,920,000	-419,847,000
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Maritime Administration					
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
Maritime Security Program		175,000,000			-175,000,000
Operations and training	76,067,000	81,650,000	64,600,000	-11,467,000	-17,050,000
Ready reserve force:					
Maintenance, operations and facilities	149,653,000			-149,653,000	
Rescission	-158,000,000			+158,000,000	
Total, Ready reserve force	-8,347,000			+8,347,000	
Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program Account:					
Guaranteed loans subsidy	25,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	+23,000,000	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(250,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(+750,000,000)	
Administrative expenses	2,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,000,000	
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	27,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	+25,000,000	
Total, Maritime Administration	94,740,000	308,650,000	116,600,000	+21,860,000	-192,050,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses	206,000	212,000	206,000	.....	-6,000
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses	9,000,000	11,400,000	8,500,000	-500,000	-2,900,000
Commission on Immigration Reform					
Salaries and expenses	1,894,000	2,877,000	2,377,000	+483,000	-500,000
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses	1,090,000	1,122,000	1,090,000	.....	-32,000
Competitiveness Policy Council					
Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	503,000	.....	-1,000,000	-503,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses	233,000,000	268,000,000	233,000,000	.....	-35,000,000
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses	185,232,000	223,600,000	185,232,000	.....	-38,368,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	.....	.....
Direct appropriation	68,832,000	107,200,000	68,832,000	.....	-38,368,000
Federal Maritime Commission					
Salaries and expenses	18,569,000	18,947,000	15,000,000	-3,569,000	-3,947,000
Offsetting fee collections	.....	-2,228,000	.....	.....	+2,228,000
Direct appropriation	18,569,000	16,719,000	15,000,000	-3,569,000	-1,719,000
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	98,928,000	107,873,000	98,928,000	.....	-8,945,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-4,500,000	.....	-16,000,000	-11,500,000	-16,000,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-39,640,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,622,000	.....
Direct appropriation	54,788,000	59,611,000	34,666,000	-20,122,000	-24,945,000
Japan - United States Friendship Commission					
Japan - United States Friendship Trust Fund	1,247,000	1,250,000	1,247,000	.....	-3,000
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	.....	.....
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	400,000,000	440,000,000	278,000,000	-122,000,000	-162,000,000
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,384,000	1,425,000	1,000,000	-384,000	-425,000
Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission					
Salaries and expenses	300,000	350,000	250,000	-50,000	-100,000
Ounce of Prevention Council					
Crime trust fund 4/	.....	14,700,000	.....	.....	-14,700,000
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses	297,405,000	342,922,000	297,405,000	.....	-45,517,000
Offsetting fee collections	-192,000,000	.....	-184,293,000	+7,707,000	-184,293,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,549,000	.....	-9,667,000	+20,882,000	-9,667,000
Investment adviser fee - offsetting collection	(-8,595,000)	.....	.....	(+8,595,000)	.....
Direct appropriation	74,856,000	342,922,000	103,445,000	+28,589,000	-239,477,000
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses	251,504,000	242,831,000	221,247,000	-30,257,000	-21,584,000
Offsetting fee collections	-9,350,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	+6,050,000	.....
Direct appropriation	242,154,000	239,531,000	217,947,000	-24,207,000	-21,584,000
Office of Inspector General	8,500,000	9,200,000	8,750,000	+250,000	-450,000
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	9,596,000	12,426,000	5,000,000	-4,596,000	-7,426,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy 5/	274,439,000	50,835,000	145,010,000	-129,429,000	+94,175,000
Micro loan guarantees	1,216,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	+484,000	.....
Section 503. prepayment	30,000,000	.....	.....	-30,000,000	.....
Administrative expenses	97,000,000	99,910,000	97,000,000	.....	-2,910,000
Total, Business loans program account	412,251,000	164,873,000	248,710,000	-163,541,000	+83,837,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy 5/	52,153,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	-17,721,000	
Administrative expenses	78,000,000	80,340,000	78,000,000		-2,340,000
Contingency fund (emergency)	125,000,000	100,000,000		-125,000,000	-100,000,000
Total, Disaster loans program account	255,153,000	214,772,000	112,432,000	-142,721,000	-102,340,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	5,369,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	-2,839,000	
Total, Small Business Administration	923,427,000	630,906,000	590,369,000	-333,058,000	-40,537,000
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses 6/	13,550,000	13,550,000		-13,550,000	-13,550,000
Crime trust fund		600,000			-600,000
Total, State Justice Institute	13,550,000	14,150,000		-13,550,000	-14,150,000
Total, title V, Related agencies	1,897,883,000	2,221,997,000	1,454,582,000	-443,301,000	-767,415,000
Appropriations	(2,055,883,000)	(2,206,697,000)	(1,454,582,000)	(-601,301,000)	(-752,115,000)
Rescission	(-158,000,000)			(+158,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,300,000)			(-15,300,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Procurement: General Provisions 7/	-11,769,000			+11,769,000	
Total, title VI, general provisions	-11,769,000			+11,769,000	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	26,860,050,000	31,158,679,000	27,585,240,000	+725,190,000	-3,573,439,000
Appropriations	(24,673,050,000)	(27,148,479,000)	(23,903,253,000)	(-1,069,797,000)	(-3,545,226,000)
Rescission	(-158,000,000)			(+158,000,000)	
Crime trust fund	(2,345,000,000)	(4,010,200,000)	(3,981,987,000)	(+1,636,987,000)	(-28,213,000)
(By transfer)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)		
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)		

1/ 1995 "Salaries and expenses" funds were used for "Administrative review and appeals".

2/ Includes budget amendment of -$3,265,000 related to privatization of portions of the National Weather Service. Legislation will be proposed to offset this account from the Marine Navigation Trust Fund.

3/ The 1996 request and recommendation include funding for Radio Free Asia and Broadcasting to Cuba. In 1995, these activities were funded separately.

4/ Funding of $1,500,000 was provided under Office of Justice Programs in FY 1995.

5/ Assumes legislation to lower the subsidy for these accounts through new fees and increases in interest rates.

6/ The State Justice Institute is authorized to submit its budget directly to Congress. The President's request includes $7,000,000 for the institute.

7/ The FY 1995 budget authority amount reflects the unspread balance.

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

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

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak about the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary, and related agencies fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. I want to again congratulate Chairman HAL ROGERS on his first bill as subcommittee Chair.

Mr. ROGERS has done an absolutely excellent job this year as the new chairman of our subcommittee. His performance is all the more impressive in light of the personal tragedy he has recently faced. I cannot imagine how difficult it must have been to have performed his professional duties so well in the face of those circumstances yet HAL ROGERS' courage shines through. The people of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky are fortunate to have HAL ROGERS as their Representative. And we are fortunate to have him as our colleague and chairman of this subcommittee.

He has handled this bill with great skill—beginning with very exhaustive hearings which explored the detail of the agency budgets under our jurisdiction. Hal did not waste time chasing simplistic solutions. Instead he pursued the course of a responsible legislator, following a sound, measured approach in writing this bill.

He has been assisted by a very capable and dedicated staff, as have I. And I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the professionalism and talent of the staffs on both sides of the aisle for this subcommittee.

While I do not agree with every funding level in this bill, there are many areas where the chairman and I see eye to eye:

Crime fighting is a top priority for the Nation and this bill is as generous as possible in assisting the Department of Justice in this regard. We have been able to fund new FBI and DEA positions which we added in the bill last year, and for which Chairman ROGERS fought so hard.

In addition, the bill includes an extremely generous immigration initiative. The approach the chairman has taken attacks the illegal alien program on all fronts—700 new border patrol agents, 400 new inspectors, 945 new detention personnel, and 750 new investigators.

Further, funds provided in this bill will allow INS to continue its automation initiatives so that INS agents can perform their duties in a modern world.

And, of course, we are all happy that the Byrne Law Enforcement Grant Program is funded. I will be offering an amendment to increase funds for the Byrne Grant Program because it is such an effective tool for local law enforcement.

This bill also funds the State Department at levels consistent with proposals to reinvent government.

And, finally, I am pleased the subcommittee funded U.S. contributions to the U.N. and international organizations.

Having said this, there are areas of this bill where I have grave concerns. In this regard, the budget realities facing the chairman should not go unmentioned. The shortage in this subcommittee's 602–B allocation is directly related to the recently passed budget resolution.

The budget resolution is the blueprint for a budget cutting frenzy which is dangerous for our Nation. During Budget Committee considerations I was very distressed to see Members carelessly propose drastic cuts to programs that meant a lot to people, often the less fortunate. They did so without a full analysis of the effect of these cuts on the American people.

And these budget resolution guidelines have dictated chairman ROGERS' allocation in the appropriations process. So I stand here very uncomfortable about the premise under which we are operating: one that forces our Nation's crime-fighting initiatives, our competitiveness agenda, and our diplomatic functions to compete in less than a zero sums game.

And who has been the hardest hit by this exercise? The Commerce Department. Chairman ROGERS has acted responsibly by not dismantling the Department in the appropriations process as some illconceived proposals would recommend.

However, I do have concerns with cuts in civilian technology programs at NIST and the Fisheries and Ocean Programs at NOAA. I will be offering two amendments to address these important policy issues.

Another area of special concern is in the Crime Trust Fund. This bill does not fund the highly effective COPS Program and prevention programs. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. This bill does not fund the COPS Program. We have over 20,000 new police officers, in virtually every congressional district in this country, to whom the Federal Government has committed multiyear funding. The problem is that there is not one red cent in this bill for the COPS Program. Instead, it funds a block grant program which is not even authorized. Nor will it likely be authorized, since the President, Congress, and the American people have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the COPS Program which is already out there getting police onto the streets. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is irresponsible to stop this program midstream—in effect throwing our investment away. I will be offering an amendment to fund the COPS Program in place of the block grant program.

Other areas which concern me are: The restriction of funds to exclude postconviction defender organization; The slashed funding and restrictions imposed on the Legal Services Corporation; the conditions placed on the President regarding UN peacekeeping; the cut in funding for international broadcasting; and the large State criminal alien assistance increases, which is a concern I probably hold in the minority in this body.

But, as I have stated, the chairman has done well in such an austere context. I offer my personal congratulations to him. And I look forward to working with him to strengthen this bill through the remainder of the appropriations process.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member for the work that both they and their staffs have done. Let me highlight a couple of points that I would like to make about the bill.

First, from my area of representing a border area, I am very pleased with the funding that we have in here for immigration enforcement officers and the outright rejection of a border crossing fee. That is an issue that has raised its ugly head in the other body and is continuing to do so. I hope with our action here, and in the Senate appropriations, that we will lay that issue to rest.

I am very pleased with the emphasis that we place in this legislation on the flexibility for local and State law enforcement. I think it is extraordinarily important that we given that kind of flexibility. I would have preferred to see great cuts in the Commerce Department. There are some areas that I think we should have cut more deeply, but that issue is going to be one that we are going to be dealing with as we get into the authorization issue of what we do with the Commerce Department.

Finally, let me just say, Mr. Chairman, this bill is good evidence of a shrinking pot of discretionary funding that is available. I congratulate the chairman, the staff, and the other Members for the job that they have done in putting together a reasonable bill under the circumstances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] on the job they have done in bringing this very important bill to the floor, but I also rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia on the COPS Program, which will be the first amendment discussed this evening.

The goal was simple when we passed the crime bill, and it is very simple today: Put more cops on the beat, crime rates will fall, and our families will be safer. The Mollohan amendment will help us meet that goal by providing continued funding for programs like COPS FAST, programs that help police departments hire new officers and develop innovative community policing programs.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues intend to abolish these programs and replace them with open-ended block grants. I think they miss the point. The Republican block grant proposal does not guarantee more cops on our streets. In fact, under the Republican proposal, grant money could be used for anything from street lighting to road construction.

The COPS Program guarantees more cops on the street, and I challenge the Republicans to make the same guarantee. They cannot. COPS grants flow straight from the Justice Department to the local law enforcement agencies. We cut down on administrative overhead by streamlining the application process and taking other steps to reduce red tape.

□ 1815

The COPS Program empowers local communities to take responsibility for community safety by putting more police officers where they are needed the most. It does not mandate a Federal solution to problems that are often unique to neighborhoods and communities. The COPS Program succeeds because it empowers community police departments to find innovative, new strategies to combat crime and make the best use of available resources.

Neighborhood officers work with volunteers to keep our streets safe and our communities informed. Crime fighting experts and officers on the beat agree that community policing works. The COPS Program is a nonbureaucratic solution to a terrible problem, and the result is a marked decrease in crime, in theft, in burglary, and other more serious crime.

In Sacramento, citizens are involved in this effort, working with local law enforcement and injecting in their efforts a new spirit of cooperation and teamwork.

I want to talk about how this program has worked in communities in my district because it really provides an example of how successful this program can be and how, with some support, we can begin to address fundamental problems with local solutions, not Washington answers. In Sacramento County, CA, several groups of volunteers and local law enforcement officers have joined hands to establish sheriff's community service centers.

In North Highlands, part of my district in the unincorporated part of Sacramento County, we have put together, without fanfare, with tireless devotion, I might add, a group of volunteers and deputies who have made a tremendous contribution to community safety. This photo to my right shows our sheriff, Glenn Craig, and others at the dedication of this community center. With an all-volunteer staff and a roster of deputies paid through a COPS grant and county matching funds, the North Highlands center is both a thriving community center, and an indispensable component of the county law enforcement team.

Volunteers work side by side with deputies, helping out with many of the day-to-day responsibilities that keep the wheels of justice turning, taking crime reports, providing a safe haven for neighborhood kids, helping others navigate through the sometimes confusing world of law enforcement and county services.

Since January of this year, these volunteers and others have logged 4,000 crime reports. Many of these volunteers spent 40 hours a week at the center. As one volunteer put it, a real sense of pride in their contribution to the neighborhood motivates their involvement.

The spirit of community involvement extends well beyond the walls of this North Highlands center. The office space is donated, so is the furniture, right down to the carpet.

Deputies like Willy Nix have found new ways to approach old problems. Deputy Nix, a patrol cop before coming to work with the North Highlands staff, talked to me just the other day about the advantages of community policing. An officer on patrol usually has just enough time to drive to a location, take a report, and drive away. Now, he said, ''I can work with local agencies, the neighbors, the landlords, and all the people in the community to attack crime from every angle.''

In some areas, drug dealers have literally trashed the community. Deputy Nix works with community members and service center volunteers to address this problem from the branches down to the roots, towing abandoned cars, cleaning up yards strewn with garbage, and returning the streets to law-abiding citizens. Yes, Deputy Nix is busy. He sets time aside to work with local schoolchildren. Because center volunteers have worked hard to establish after-school programs, many of these kids have more than just a uniform to turn to, they have an entire network of support, from reading and arts programs to safe recreational facilities in the evening.

What may seem like a commonsense solution is only possible if other communities can afford to hire officers like Willy Nix. In cities and towns around the country, volunteers are committed to breaking down barriers and developing a community commitment to law enforcement which will rise to the challenge, but only if given the opportunity.

The Mollohan amendment gives them that opportunity, and I urge its adoption by the Members here this afternoon.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member. In the face of a very difficult challenge and very high-priority programs, they have achieved a $1.1 billion reduction over the 1995 number and at the same time maintained the high-priority items.

Certainly, this bill fights crime, and that is the No. 1 priority with the American people, and all the programs that will impact on crime prevention are fully funded and in some cases extra money has been put in.

Second, in Legal Services, which it is controversial, it has been reined in. The criteria have been established that ensure that money expended for Legal Services will be directed to helping people with their personal problems. I call it ''Legal Medicare'' because it does allow the poor to have access to legal representation and avoids the political activities that have happened in the past.

Third, it puts a strong management focus on the Commerce Department. It has features in this bill that will ensure that Commerce does just what that name implies, and that is further the commerce of the United States. We are the world's largest exporter. Commerce is very important to the people of this Nation, both from the standpoint of jobs as well as access to the goods and services that they find highly desirable.

The last feature that I would like to emphasize is that it does fund the International Trade Administration in the Commerce Department. This ITA is very important because it enforces the trade laws. It ensures the playing field will be level. We have just observed this in the issue between ourselves and Japan, and particularly enforces the two features in the trade laws that are very important for the protection of American jobs, anti-dumping and countervailing. It stops injury to U.S. industries, saves U.S. jobs, I think, a very important feature of the bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], for a fine job on a tough bill.

I am here tonight during this general debate because I really take exception to the local law enforcement block grant that the majority party has put in here. They have gutted the Clinton COPS Program. They have put it all into this local law enforcement block grant and funded it with $3.2 billion. The problem is they called it local law enforcement block grant, but in their bill not one police officer is hired. We have no guarantee of any police officers working the street.

Having been a city police officer, having been a State trooper, the best

crime fighting we have is a police officer on the street working with the communities, working with the citizens they should serve.

We have 20,400 police officers under the Clinton COPS Program. We have none under the $3.2 billion law enforcement block grant proposed.

What does your application look like? Your administrative costs, you admit in your own report, are going to be about 2.5 percent. The other body says it is going to be 15 percent. You are going to have to fill out paperwork after paperwork in order to get a grant for, hopefully, a police officer or a police car.

How much money is being awarded underneath your program will depend upon the crime index. The Department of Justice has done their analysis. They said how much a city will get will depend upon their crime index. The more crime you have underneath your proposal, the more money the jurisdiction will get. The next year, if the crime comes down, as crime is coming down now, they will lose money. Having been a police officer, you have got to fight crime more than 12 months.

Take the city of New York, which has a 31 percent decrease in murders for 1995. Will they get 31 percent less money next year? You cannot have an effective program if every 12 months you are going to renew the amount of money you are going to give them. If they are effective, we should reward them for effective law enforcement and reducing crime, not punish them by taking away money.

When you take a look at it, we have had the Clinton COPS Program for about 8 months. The Police Executive Research Forum actually did an analysis, contacted their members, 220 of them around the country, and said, ''What do you like, do you like this proposed local block grant that the Republican Party is putting forth, or would you keep the Clinton program, the Clinton COPS program?'' Of those 220 police executives who responded, only 5 percent, 5 percent support a block grant, discretionary block grant that you propose. The rest of them support the Clinton COPS programs.

I am just not up here talking about this because of my 12 years in law enforcement, but every major police organization in the country opposes what you are trying to do in this bill. The FOP, Fraternal Order of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, Police Executive Research Forum, National Troopers Coalition, National Sheriffs' Association, National Black Police Officers' Association, major city chiefs, U.S. Conference of Mayors, they are opposed to what you are doing with this block grant because they know what happened in the 1960's and 1970's when so much money was wasted on airplanes, on tanks, on real estate, on consultants on studies, and nothing ever went to fighting crime.

So while the bill overall is a good bill, this local block grant that does not guarantee one police officer, that only 5 percent of the police executives in this country support, cannot win over my support and, therefore, we have asked, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has brought forth an amendment. It is going to be the first one up tonight to take $2 billion and put it back to guaranteed police officers across this Nation with the Clinton COPS program.

Support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the very distinguished member of the subcommittee, in fact, the vice chairman of the subcommittee who has helped us a great deal this year, especially.

(Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank, first of all, our chairman and the hard-working staff on both sides of the aisle and our minority ranking member for the work in putting this bill together.

Our chairman has spent a lot of hours, and this is his first time at this, and very trying time, and I especially appreciate the good job that he has done.

Now, there is no bill that is perfect. I, in fact, would like myself to have seen the Legal Services zeroed out, but it was cut, and we moved it in the right direction.

In the area of the police program, and I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and respect him a great deal for what he was saying, that many of the police organizations may question block grants, this is going to give local law enforcement officers a chance to put the money where they will. I talked with a Democrat sheriff now, but he was former president of the National Sheriff's Organization, and he pointed out that the 100,000 COPS Program was a myth.

First of all, you have got a few dollars to start, maybe 10,000, 15,000 police all across the country. Then after each year, money was taken away until after, I think, the third year it was down to zero. He said, ''If we had the money to put more people on the force now, we would have already done it. A program that withdraws the dollars quickly from us is no help at all,'' and he would not, as a past president of the National Sheriff's Organization, even participate in the so-called 100,000 police program.

We will take monitoring from Congress. We have to work with our local governments, but I think the block grant can be of enormous benefit to individual police departments.

I cannot go back to the 1960's and debate what the gentleman said about areas where there might have been waste. But we can have, with local governments and local forces trying to utilize these funds rather than Washington bureaucrats dictating, we can, I think, get a law enforcement program that will be far more secure, demanding the kind of accountability and giving people what they want, which is a lower crime rate.

I hope that we will support the block grant program and support this bill, and again I thank our chairman and our staff for the work.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER].

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the Legal Services Corporation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the vital work of Legal Services Programs across the country.

My distinguished colleague, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, worked long and hard as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee to achieve the recommendation before us. It was a difficult decision that strikes a balance between the demand by our constituents for fiscal austerity and the basic needs of the poor for legal help with their everyday civil legal problems.

Legal Services Programs have a proud record of accomplishment in Kentucky and in my district. Central Kentucky Legal Services has been working since 1977 with low-income residents of central Kentucky, serving an estimated poverty population of 58,000. This program is known for its creative partnerships with other community agencies, such as the law care program it sponsors jointly with the Fayette County Bar Association. Law care, which provides pro bono help to county residents, is a model program for donated legal services in Kentucky and in areas of similar size nationally.

Another collaboration, with the Bluegrass Area Development District Area Agency on Aging, resulted in the long-term care ombudsman program. This program has won national recognition for its success in providing services to elderly citizens in nursing homes.

In addition, Central Kentucky Legal Services has been instrumental in helping low-income parents get improved child support collection services. Over the years it has helped literally thousands of abused women get protection and support for themselves and their children.

Our vote today unfortunately will decrease rather than increase Legal Services' resources. In typifies the harsh budget climate for most federally funded programs. But it will enable the Legal Services Corporation to maintain basic services to the poor and to keep alive the basic American promise of equal justice for all.

□ 1830

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for his excellent work on this bill.

As Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, which authorizes and has oversight responsibility for many of the items in this bill, I can attest to the fact that our committee has worked closely with the gentleman from Kentucky since the beginning of the year.

The bill produced by the gentleman's appropriations subcommittee conforms in most important respects with the House decisions on funding made as part of its consideration and passage of the American Overseas Interests Act, H.R. 1561.

Just as H.R. 1561 was within budget, this bill is also within budget.

Some Members may prefer to cut these programs further.

But when the full House, based on the recommendation of the authorizing committee, has made an authorization decision, and when that decision has been ratified by the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee, based on its own expertise, then our colleagues should refrain from overturning those decisions here on the floor.

Accordingly, with the exception of an important item related to restricting spending on our Nation's diplomatic establishment in Vietnam, which I will address at some length later, I intend to support Chairman ROGERS on this appropriations bill.

I strongly urge our colleagues to join me in that support.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Mollohan amendment. It is in my view a probusiness and proenvironment amendment, and I want to speak on behalf of the oldest industry in this country, our commercial fishing industry. That industry contributes more than $111 billion annually and provides jobs for 1.5 million Americans.

There are hundreds of communities across America that depend on a healthy fishery for their economic well-being. In recent years many of these communities have spent millions of dollars to help bring back their long-depleted fish populations. The Mollohan amendment corrects this bill's attack on that commitment between Government and communities to restore the local economy.

The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations wrote to me recently along with the Northwest sport fishing industry. They both support the Mollohan amendment. Together they represent over 5,000 businesses and 200,000 jobs on the Pacific coast. According to them these very important groups say fishery management cannot happen unless fishery research and conservation are fully funded, and this bill, they say, cuts at the heart of many important ongoing efforts. It makes no economic sense, and they go on to say on behalf of the men and women who provide jobs for fishing communities, food for America's tables, and high-quality products for export, we urge you to support the Mollohan amendment and restore these funds.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from the State of Oregon, the coastal management program, which says that the Governor of Oregon supports the Mollohan amendment saying it would greatly help national coastal zone management programs which would be hurt by this bill if the Mollohan amendment is not adopted. We cannot, we must not, turn our backs on this important sector of our Nation's economy. It is probusiness, and it makes common sense to support the Mollohan amendment.

I urge my colleagues to do that and to be probusiness.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the hard-working chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to congratulate him and the distinguished ranking minority member for their outstanding work on a very important and very difficult bill, and I applaud their efforts and the efforts of all of their staff toward perfecting this bill, and I look forward to its passage, hopefully tonight.

I know that the subcommittee chairman has carefully deliberated the issue of providing initial funding for what would be necessary to fund the first year of the maritime security program. I appreciate the assurances provided by him and the committee in the committee report. I also appreciate the assurances from the chairman that this issue will be revisited once the authorization committee, led by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], takes action on this issue in the full House. I just wanted to assure myself that the gentleman does intend to readdress this once the authorization committee has had an opportunity to take a look at it.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. I assure my full committee chairman that I will look at this program again as the authorization moves toward enactment into law.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] on this important issue to our U.S.-flag merchant marine.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, in America, profits are soaring, wages are decreasing, and consumer demand is declining.

And, what does the majority want this Congress to do? They want us to retreat, to cut and run.

In light of these conditions, the magazine Business Week recently asked the question—are we headed for trouble?

This appropriations bill reflects an attitude of defeat.

Instead of competing in the global marketplace—where jobs can be found—the bill proposes to cut the Department of Commerce by 17 percent.

Instead of encouraging more small business development and self-sufficiency-the bill cuts the SBA by 36 percent; cuts the Minority Business Development Agency by 27 percent; and cuts the Economic Development Agency by 21 percent.

Instead of providing access to legal services for all Americans, regardless of income—this bill cuts the Legal Services Corporation by 31 percent.

This bill even provides $35 million less than the President requested for the equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has been made strong because, traditionally we have lifted up our citizens.

We have been able to export democracy by showcasing the values and benefits of our way of life and our standard of living.

This bill puts citizens down, this bill promotes an attitude of isolation from the world marketplace. This bill does not adequately promote competition by small businesses. This bill is a withdrawal from the proud tradition of America and from the very principles that gives the Nation power.

This bill ignores all these valuable economic and social values. Again this is a mindless march to a balanced budget without regards to the merits of the program.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2076.

H.R. 2076 provides for a 25-percent increase in funding of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—a generous increase in a time of budget cutting.

The resources provided in H.R. 2076 will go a long way in assisting INS in securing our borders. Given the size of its mission, INS has been underfunded for many years. I am happy to see that changing.

The resources made available in H.R. 2076 support the enforcement provisions in my immigration bill, H.R. 1915. It adds 1,000 additional border patrol agents next year—plus support personnel—and increases new technology for the Border Patrol and for enforcement initiatives.

H.R. 2076 adds to INS's capability to detain and remove deportable aliens, especially criminal aliens. It includes additional detention space, additional investigators and detention and deportation officers, and provides for the expansion of deportation procedures so that criminal aliens can be deported immediately upon release from prisons.

Additionally, H.R. 2076 increases the resources available for enforcement of employer sanctions, another important tool in controlling illegal immigration.

H.R. 2076 adds additional inspectors so that U.S. ports of entry can run more efficiently and smoothly, facilitating legal entries and prohibiting illegal entries by fraudulent documents.

I strongly support H.R. 2076 and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have mixed feelings about this bill, as so many of us do. But I first want to take a moment to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], our ranking member, and our terrific staff for the work that they have put in on what's really an impossible task. We basically have a 4 by 4 that we are trying to squeeze into about a 2 by 2 slot. I just hope that the beam that we fashion in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is going to be strong enough to hold up the house that we have got to support.

The task to fully fund this nation's law enforcement, research activities, diplomatic activities, judiciary activities, has really been made impossible by the inadequate funding allowed under the budget resolution. We have done a pretty good job by way of law enforcement and immigration efforts, but I am very concerned about what this bill will do in reducing several important areas of research, technology development, science, and the programs that also are our responsibility in connection with legal services.

This bill, for instance, eliminates the advanced technology program, I think a very promising one, of the Commerce Department to help us further cutting edge technologies that are really going to be key to the economic well-being in this country in the long haul. We have reduced, although considerably less, the International Trade Administration, which has played an instrumental role in promoting exports, accounting for many hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs that depend upon our international trade. All of this is coming at a time when we face unprecedented challenges in terms of international competitiveness.

I also want to speak for a moment about the important science and research work that goes on at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. They, too, contribute to the productivity of this country, as well as to our health and safety and our understanding, very important to our long-term economic success, our understanding of the planet that we live on, its climate, and the changes in that climate. That is why I am disappointed in the cuts to those programs.

Finally I cannot conclude without commenting and expressing my great concern about the restrictions that are being imposed on the Legal Services Corporation. These restrictions will make it very difficult for Legal Services' lawyers adequately to represent their clients, and these restrictions apply not just to Government funds, but even to moneys raised privately. I think that is a grave mistake.

I just wanted to go on record with these reservations about a bill that has been, as I said, terribly difficult to fashion as responsibly as the chairman of the committee has.

I have mixed feelings about this bill. I must first commend Chairman ROGERS, ranking member Mr. MOLLOHAN and the staff of the subcommittee for their untiring efforts in the face of the impossible task placed before them. That task, to fully fund our Nation's important research, technology, crime fighting, and judiciary activities, has been made impossible by the inadequate funding allowed under the new budget resolution.

In the bill we are considering, H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, and State Departments appropriations bill, the chairman has been able to provide generous funding for the overall Federal law enforcement effort. However, I am very concerned by the reductions in several of the research and technology development programs contained in the bill, as well as the costs to legal services.

This bill eliminates funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's [NIST] Advanced Technology Program [ATP]. The ATP program provides a private industry-Government partnership to nurture cutting edge industrial technology that is either too high risk or too broad based for a single private company alone to afford to develop. It provides small, competitive grants to companies of all sizes for development of preproduct technology. These grants are matched by private funds and motivate private industry to take risks in product and technology development that otherwise would not occur, not because they lack merit or profitmaking potential, but because the payback in the short term is too problematic for purely private capital. This program promotes America's long-term economic interests and should be supported.

While the International Trade Administration [ITA] has been spared large cuts in this bill, it too is reduced from current funding levels. Commerce export initiatives like those provided under ITA, alone have helped win almost $50 billion in overseas sales, including $25 billion in direct American exports. That translates to 300,000 jobs.

These cuts come at a time when our industries face a global challenge as great as at any time in our history. They come at a time when we are finally beginning to win key battles in the war for global competitiveness. And they come at a time when every industrialized nation in the world is working to develop new technologies that would give them a competitive edge. It is important to our Nation's economic future that we continue programs like ATP to encourage and develop new technology and like ITA to support U.S. exports.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also reduces funding for many of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's [NOAA] programs. NOAA's work contributes to a more productive and competitive nation. NOAA's mission is to protect life, property, marine and fisheries resources, and our Nation's coasts and oceans. It accomplishes its mission through research and monitoring of the condition of the atmosphere, oceans, and Great Lakes. NOAA predicts the weather, climate, and fisheries' productivity. In addition to the obvious importance of NOAA to the health of industries tied to coastal and marine life conditions, the work at NOAA is important to agribusiness, industries that have an impact on air quality, and the transportation and communications industries.

In particular, NOAA's Environmental Research Laboratories [ERL] have documented damage to the ozone layer, determined its cause, and worked with industry to find alternatives to the compounds that caused the damage. ERL labs developed doppler radar and designed more accurate hurricane tracking systems to increase warning time to the public, which saves lives and give property owners more time to protect their property. This is valuable research that the private sector won't necessarily do.

This is why I am disappointed in this bill's cuts funding for the Climate and Global Change Program which conducts research to develop long-term climate observation and prediction techniques, particularly for North America. This program also examines the role of ocean conditions on long-term climate changes and provides information to base important policy choices about the necessity or results of environmental and industry regulation.

Mr. Chairman, the women and men at NOAA and NIST work hard and strive for excellence and deserve our full support. Their efforts have helped keep our Nation at the forefront in important areas of research and technology development.

Finally, I can't conclude without mentioning my great concern about the burdensome restrictions placed on the Legal Services Corporation. What these restrictions do is make it difficult for LSC lawyers to fully represent their low-income clients. These restrictions include a prohibition on participating in any administrative rulemaking; on filing suits against any government, no matter how outrageously the government acts toward a client; on representing prisoners, no matter what their legal problems; and a requirement that all LSC services be bid out immediately, which will ultimately cause problems for the poor clients of LSC as legal services are shifted from low bidder to low bidder. These are just a few of the restrictions placed on LSC's ability to represent low-income people and the restrictions should be removed. And, to make matters worse, these restrictions will apply to services paid for with private contributions, if a legal services program takes any Federal funds.

While I believe the chairman should be commended for his diligent efforts in such a difficult budgetary environment, I must say that I have reservations about several parts of this bill.

□ 1845

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman to yield for a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the U.S. Supreme Court recently upheld a lower court decision declaring the 11th Congressional District of Georgia unconstitutional.

This ruling found that Georgia's 11th District violated the Equal Protection Clause because race was the primary factor in its creation.

Mr. Chairman, the district plan that was approved by the Department of Justice, and most recently found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court, was in fact the third redistricting plan submitted to the Department of Justice for approval.

The first of three plans was created during a special session of the Georgia General Assembly in 1991, costing taxpayers over $1 million. This plan was rejected by the Department of Justice. The second redistricting plan was drawn during a regular session of Georgia's General Assembly in 1992. It was also rejected by the Department of Justice. The third district was created in 1992, according to the specific direction and guidelines offered by the Department, and was consequently approved by Justice officials.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we must once again return to the drawing board, in yet another costly special session of the Georgia General assembly and come up with a fourth redistricting plan that will both meet the approval of the Department of Justice and meet the constitutionality test. This special session, currently scheduled for August 14 of this year, will cost the State of Georgia thousands per day. Depending on how long the session lasts, costs will again approach the million dollar mark for Georgians.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would require the Department of Justice to reimburse a State for the costs associated with holding a special session of the State legislature in order to redraw district lines that have been previously approved by the Department of Justice, but found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that my amendment requiring the Department of Justice to provide $2 million from its general administration account for the purpose of reimbursing States for the costs of special legislative sessions is not in order at this point.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the opportunity to work with you, and our counterparts in the other body, so that we can address this issue in the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I insert for the RECORD the text of my amendment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2076, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Page 28, after line 19, insert the following:

REIMBURSEMENT FOR SPECIAL SESSIONS OF STATE LEGISLATURES

For reimbursement by the Attorney General of States for costs associated with special sessions of State legislatures where the State is required to redraw congressional districts that have been previously approved by the Department of Justice but subsequently found unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court, $2,000,000.

Page 2, line 7, strike ''$74,282,000'' and insert ''$72,282,000''.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised an important issue regarding actions taken by the Justice Department. I agree that this is an issue that warrants further discussion. I will be glad to work with the gentleman to develop the best approach to address that problem.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman I rise today in opposition to this bill, H.R. 2076. The American people have cried out for a real war on crime. Recently, in 1994, we listened to their concerns and we passed a 1994 Crime Act, which promised 100,000 additional officers and funding for real law enforcement. Already over 20,000 additional police officers have been put on our streets as a result of the 1994 crime bill.

Yet, today, H.R. 2076 does not guarantee one additional police officer to help our communities combat crime. Instead, this bill appropriates funding for a program that is not even authorized. The bill does eliminate the COPS program. I consider that a real mistake. COPS, Community Oriented Policing Services, works. It provides local communities with funds for law enforcement.

Instead, this bill would waste $2 billion of taxpayer money with no specific goals. Proponents try to tell you it is a block grant approach. In my opinion, it is a block headed approach.

Police departments will have to compete with every other agency that has any far-reaching relationship to public safety. Street lighting would be considered for funds. Street lights are nice, walkie-talkies are nice, roads leading to prisons are nice. But the COPS program establishes a clear priority, neighborhood police.

County programs provide neighborhood police for apartment complexes in high crime neighborhoods, small towns would get additional police, where one or two police officers makes all the difference in the world.

The program is working. My Congressional district alone has received 76 additional police officers to help fight crime in my district. Why should we defund a program that works? The COPS program provides neighborhood police to local communities. It sets a clear priority.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need to talk about roads and lights and walkie-talkies and orange jackets. We need to talk about neighborhoods police. Congress should keep its promise to the American people. The 1994 Crime Act is a superior bill. Community policing works. Let us let local communities have local law enforcement personnel.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage the distinguished chairman of the House Commerce, Justice Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the proposed language contained in the committee report on H.R. 2076 regarding the hiring and placement of INS investigation, detention, and border patrol agents.

While I strongly support the subcommittee's goal to increase the number of INS personnel along the southern border of the United States, I am concerned that the language of the Committee Report may result in the further weakening of an already inadequate INS and border patrol presence in the Nation's interior agricultural areas.

In my own Fourth Congressional District of Washington, the illegal immigration problem has forced the INS office in Yakima to shut down its telephone service. A local newspaper recently reported that during a raid in the Yakima Valley this spring, the border patrol found that 23 out of 25 migrant workers were illegal immigrants, and 12 of them were using someone else's social security number.

In addition, Franklin county jail estimates that in 1994, an average of 50 percent of its inmate population consisted of illegal aliens, many of whom remained in the county jail at taxpayer expense simply because there were not enough border patrol agents to transfer them for deportation.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation must not only protect its borders from the influx of illegal immigration, but it must also seek to control document fraud and remove those illegal aliens already here. To do that, we need to maintain a strong INS presence in the interior as well as along the southern border.

I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if interior congressional districts may be assured that Members and INS regional directors will be consulted before final INS hiring and relocating decisions are made?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation for the transfer of border patrol agents from interior locations assumes that these personnel will be backfilled with INS investigators to ensure that document fraud and the removal of illegal aliens that are already here continues to be addressed.

I can assure you that Members will be consulted before allocation of any new positions or the relocation of any current INS personnel occurs. I will also work with the Commissioner of INS to ensure that the INS regional directors are involved in this process, and that criteria such as detained illegal aliens are used in these decisions.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking Member for yielding time. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking Member for their hard work under difficult conditions, but I must oppose H.R. 2076. There are so many things wrong with this bill that I believe the President is right to say that this bill is dead on arrival if it gets to his desk in this form.

Mr. Chairman, why do the Republicans eliminate the Advanced Technology Program established by President Bush? ATP provides assistance to U.S. businesses to promote commercial use of cutting edge technology. ATP is designed to increase U.S. competitiveness. Every major industrialized country has private sector government cooperative programs designed to increase their country's competitiveness in this world economy. Incredibly, this bill terminates our own program. That is like unilateral disarmament in the midst of a war.

Mr. Chairman, this bill eliminates funding for the Office of Advocacy in the SBA, which represents the interests of small businesses within the Federal Government. Just this year, just months ago, 415 Members of Congress voted to strengthen the Office of Advocacy's role as a small business ombudsman in the regulatory process. Now, just a few months later, the promise becomes a joke if this bill is passed.

Mr. Chairman, at least the Legal Services Corporation is not eliminated; it is merely cut by 30 percent. But this bill would prohibit for the first time ever the Corporation from spending private funds it raises on activities for which it currently cannot spend funds.

I know how unpopular legal services is to some. It is quite all right to ignore the unconscionable waste that goes on in military contracting, and it is okay for billionaires to renounce their homeland to avoid paying taxes. But Republicans are more than willing to attack a program that dares to help the poor obtain justice in this country.

Women from all walks of life are victims of the violence done to them in this appropriations bill. The Violence Against Women Act was approved by the House last Congress by a vote of 421 to zero. Now, how can all those Republicans, Members who voted yes last year, justify what they are doing less than a year later? Appropriators with mock sincerity say they are actually spending more to combat violence against women than last year. Well, how nice. But this bill appropriates less than one-third of the funding authorized for battered women shelters, rape prevention, child abuse prosecution, and other domestic violence programs.

Finally, this bill defunds the very successful community cops policing program established by last year's crime bill. It instead redirects these funds to a block grant program that is not even law. This again underscores the hypocrisy of the policies being pushed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, community policing works. Communities big and small want community cops. They like what they have seen with community policing. What the Republicans are doing is simply partisan politics.

Mr. Chairman, I urge fellow Members to vote against this bill so that the appropriators can do the right thing. We can do that now, or we can do that in October or November when we most certainly will have to after the veto.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the very distinguished and hard working chairman of the Committee on Science.

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

I want to begin by congratulating the gentleman for the work he has done here. He has worked very closely with the Committee on Science on this commerce appropriations bill. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for his full and complete consultation, and hold him up as an example of someone who is responsible for making the process work, and also make it work right.

Although it is a tough and thankless mission, HAL ROGERS has made the cuts to start balancing the budget, and he has made them, in my view, in a very wise way.

The NOAA appropriations largely track H.R. 1815, the fiscal year 1996 NOAA authorization bill passed by the Committee on Science last month. The appropriation bill includes $1.69 billion of budget authority for the NOAA operations research and facilities account, which funds almost all of NOAA's programs. That is exactly the level that was authorized.

With a few exceptions, including funding for modernizing the NOAA fleet, the Sea Grant Program, and the lack of funding for the Coastal Oceans Program, the bill is consistent with the authorization to the amounts that were put into H.R. 1815.

Specifically, H.R. 1815 and H.R. 2076 both include $472 million for the operations of the National Weather Service, $132 million for the National Weather Service systems acquisition, $435 million for NOAA's satellite programs, $36 million for the satellite data management, and $128 million for program support.

While the bill includes some increases over H.R. 1815 in both the oceanic and atmospheric research in the national ocean service accounts, the overall appropriation for NOAA is the same, and ensures that NOAA's priority core missions receive continued funding, while NOAA's overall budget is decreased from its 1995 level.

Today, for the first time, we have before us an appropriation for NOAA which is largely consistent with the NOAA authorization. Perhaps, most importantly in this particular bill, the Commerce appropriations bill terminates a targeted $500 million program. H.R. 2076 zeros out all of the advanced technology program, which is an ill-advised industrial policy program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts made the point a moment ago that it was something done during the Bush administration. That is right. We are willing to take on programs, even some of those created by Republicans. This House is doing so much more for commercial product and technology development through things like tax cuts, regulation reform, and product liability reform, than any amount of government subsidy of a program like ATP could ever do.

At the same time, the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, funds the core research program at the National Institute of Standards and Technologies as a priority, and I think that also is the kind of thing that helps us increase our competitiveness.

Once again, I would like to thank and compliment the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for his good work, and urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2076.

□ 1900

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATOURETTE].

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and also in favor of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

The Great Lakes Fishery Commission, which was established under the 1955 U.S. Canadian Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries, plays a critical role in protecting the health of the Great Lakes' $4 billion fishery industry.

The commission consists of eight commissioners, four appointed by the President and four by the Prime Minister of Canada. It is funded through a 69-percent to 31-percent cost share agreement between the United States and Canada respectively. The benefits of this commission are enjoyed by the United States, Canada, and the tribes.

Because the commission coordinates effective fishery management strategies throughout the region and coordinates binational natural resources in the Great Lakes region, it is imperative that the Great Lakes Fishery Commission continue to be funded through the State Department. We have spent many years cultivating a good relationship between nations and tribes.

Although the Great Lakes have definite boundaries on paper, taken as a whole, this is

one massive region used and shared by many. Hence, if there is a problem in the Great Lakes in Canada, it becomes the problem of the Great Lakes in the United States.

It was just such a crossing-all-borders problem that actually spurred the formation of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

The ''problem'' of which I speak, Mr. Chairman, has been described as slimy, ruthless, unsightly, heinous, scum-sucking and parasitic, words which ironically have all been used at least a time or two to describe certain members of Congress. But I assure you Mr. Speaker, these words in this instance are reserved for an ell-like species that is wreaking havoc on the Great Lakes—the sea lamprey.

For those who are not familiar with the sea lamprey, let me assure you this is not something you'd want in your backyard. In the Great Lakes we have seen an invasion of this eel-like, nonindigenous species. And, in addition to being just a hideous looking thing, the sea lamprey is parasitic and can destroy 10 to 40 pounds of fish during its parasitic period.

This slimy eel-like thing just clamps onto its prey and devours it. If you've ever had the misfortune of seeing footage of the lamprey in action, suffice it to say you should just be thankful it doesn't do to people what it does to fish.

It's the kind of creature you'd expect Steven Spielberg to invent to scare the bejeepers out of us in theaters. It is so vicious, so deadly and leaves behind so horrid carnage that if you made a movie about it, it'd make ''Jaws'' look like ''Free Willy'' and ''Jurassic Park'' look like ''Barney.'' But unfortunately, the sea lamprey is no Hollywood special effects creation, it's real. And it also is a very real threat to the health and future of the Great Lakes.

Before the creation of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, the sea lamprey virtually destroyed the entire region's prosperous recreational and commercial fisheries. It practically wiped it out. However, through the use of lampricide to control larval lamprey in streams, the commission has been able to reduce the lamprey population to 10 percent of historical abundance.

Furthermore, the commission also is examining several nonchemical methods for controlling the sea lamprey, such as sterilization of the male lamprey. Lamprey research, like our fishery management plan, is something best handled jointly between the United States, Canada and tribes.

We cannot backslide on these efforts, as the future health and growth of the Great Lakes' fisheries is dependent upon our efforts to control, and hopefully one day, eradicate forces like the sea lamprey and zebra mussel.

For this reason, and the many other strategies employed by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, I urge that the funding be maintained through the State Department.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the chairman and to the ranking member that you two gentlemen are one reason why America is starting to get control of our borders, because a couple of years ago you started increasing the Border Patrol. And you did it in a difficult time. You did it at times over the objection of the administration. And because of that, you have started this trend of taking border patrol men, who are presently stationed in the interior, moving them to the border, forward deploying them, which is one thing the studies done by Los Alamos Laboratory said we should do, one thing the studies by GAO said we should do.

Additionally, this year you are adding some 700 new border patrol agents, those are used in the smugglers corridor between San Diego and Tijuana, the most prolific smugglers corridor in America, who greatly appreciate your attention to the border.

We have 12 smugglers corridors across the Southwest, from San Diego to Tijuana, all the way to Brownsville, Texas, to Matamoros, Mexico.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for this attention to the border, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. Because of you we are finally starting to get control of the border, and those of us in California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona will work with you very closely to see to it that we finish this job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the Congressional Record. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H.R. 2076

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, $74,282,000; including not to exceed $3,317,000 for the Facilities Program 2000, and including $5,000,000 for management and oversight of Immigration and Naturalization Service activities, both sums to remain available until expended.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, $26,898,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City or any domestic or international terrorist incident, (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities, and (3) the costs of conducting a terrorism threat assessment of Federal agencies and their facilities: *Provided,* That funds provided under this section shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, $39,736,000.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For activities authorized by sections 130005 and 130007 of Public Law 103–322, $47,780,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $30,484,000; including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of motor vehicles without regard to the general purchase price limitation.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, $5,446,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including activities authorized by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; $401,929,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed $22,618,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through ''Salaries and Expenses'', General Administration: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1342, the Attorney General may accept on behalf of the United States and credit to this appropriation, gifts of money, personal property and services, for the purpose of hosting the International Criminal Police Organization's (INTERPOL) American Regional Conference in the United States during fiscal year 1996.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $4,028,000, to be appropriated from the

Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, as authorized by section 6601 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, 1989, as amended by Public Law 101–512 (104 Stat. 1289).

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For the expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, as authorized by section 130005 of Public Law 103–322, $7,591,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $69,143,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $48,262,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further,* That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $20,881,000: *Provided further,* That any fees received in excess of $48,262,000 in fiscal year 1996, shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental agreements, $896,825,000, of which not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 1997 for the purposes of (1) providing training of personnel of the Department of Justice in debt collection, (2) providing services to the Department of Justice related to locating debtors and their property, such as title searches, debtor skiptracing, asset searches, credit reports and other investigations, (3) paying the costs of the Department of Justice for the sale of property not covered by the sale proceeds, such as auctioneers' fees and expenses, maintenance and protection of property and businesses, advertising and title search and surveying costs, and (4) paying the costs of processing and tracking debts owed to the United States Government: *Provided,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $10,000,000 of those funds available for automated litigation support contracts and $4,000,000 for security equipment shall remain available until expended.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For activities authorized by sections 190001(d), 40114 and 130005 of Public Law 103–322, $14,731,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $5,000,000 shall be available to help meet increased demands for litigation and related activities, $500,000 to implement a program to appoint additional Federal Victim's Counselors, and $9,231,000 for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For the necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, $101,596,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), to remain available until expended, for activities authorized by section 115 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–554), which shall be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided,* That deposits to the Fund are available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $44,191,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to section 589a(f) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further,* That the $101,596,000 herein appropriated from the United States Trustee System Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from such Fund estimated at not more than $57,405,000: *Provided further,* That any of the aforementioned fees collected in excess of $44,191,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $830,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service; including the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of vehicles and aircraft, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; $418,973,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For activities authorized by section 190001(b) of Public Law 103–322, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, but not including expenses otherwise provided for in appropriations available to the Attorney General; $250,331,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), to remain available until expended.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diems of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, including advances, $85,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $4,750,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses; and of which not to exceed $4,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation and maintenance of a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(A)(ii), (B), (C), (F), and (G), as amended, $35,000,000 to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses in accordance with the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, $2,655,000.

PAYMENT TO RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

For payments to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund, $16,264,000, to become available on October 1, 1996.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the detection, investigation, and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking not otherwise provided for, to include intergovernmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $374,943,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation: *Provided further,* That any unobligated balances remaining available at the end of the fiscal year shall revert to the Attorney General for reallocation among participating organizations in succeeding fiscal years, subject to the reprogramming procedures described in section 605 of this Act.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 1,815 passenger motor vehicles of which 1,300 will be for replacement only, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; $2,251,481,000, of which not to exceed $50,000,000 for automated data processing and telecommunications and technical investigative equipment and $1,000,000 for undercover operations shall remain available until September 30, 1997; of which not to exceed $14,000,000 for research and development related to investigative activities shall remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making payments or advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, and drug investigations; and of which $1,500,000 shall be available to maintain an independent program office dedicated solely to the relocation of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division and the automation of fingerprint identification services: *Provided,* That not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That $50,000,000 for expenses related to digital telephony shall be available for obligation only upon enactment of authorization legislation.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by Public Law 103–322, $80,600,000, to remain available until

expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $35,000,000 shall be for activities authorized by section 190001(c); $27,800,000 for activities authorized by section 190001(b); $4,000,000 for Training and Investigative Assistance authorized by section 210501(c)(2); $8,300,000 for training facility improvements at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy at Quantico, Virginia authorized by section 210501(c)(3); and $5,500,000 for establishing DNA quality assurance and proficiency testing standards, establishing an index to facilitate law enforcement exchange of DNA identification information, and related activities authorized by section 210306.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; $98,400,000, to remain available until expended.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs; purchase of not to exceed 1,208 passenger motor vehicles, of which 1,178 will be for replacement only, for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; $781,488,000, of which not to exceed $1,800,000 for research and $15,000,000 for transfer to the Drug Diversion Control Fee Account for operating expenses shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $4,000,000 for purchase of evidence and payments for information, not to exceed $4,000,000 for contracting for ADP and telecommunications equipment, and not to exceed $2,000,000 for technical and laboratory equipment shall remain available until September 30, 1997, and of which not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For Drug Enforcement Administration agents authorized by section 180104 of Public Law 103–322, $12,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including not to exceed $50,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; purchase for police-type use (not to exceed 813 of which 177 are for replacement only) without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance and operation of aircraft; and research related to immigration enforcement; $1,421,481,000, of which not to exceed $400,000 for research shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed $10,000,000 shall be available for costs associated with the training program for basic officer training: *Provided,* That none of the funds available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for administrative expenses to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of $25,000 during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1996: *Provided further,* That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That the Attorney General may transfer to the Department of Labor and the Social Security Administration not to exceed $30,000,000 for programs to verify the immigration status of persons seeking employment in the United States: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to operate the Border Patrol traffic checkpoints located in San Clemente, California, at interstate highway 5 and in Temecula, California, at interstate highway 15.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by sections 130005, 130006, 130007, and 190001(b) of Public Law 103–322, $303,542,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which $44,089,000 shall be for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, $218,800,000 for improving border controls, $35,153,000 for expanded special deportation proceedings, and $5,500,000 for border patrol equipment.

CONSTRUCTION

For planning, construction, renovation, equipping and maintenance of buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, not otherwise provided for, $11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 853, of which 559 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles; and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments; $2,574,578,000: *Provided,* That there may be transferred to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further,* That the Director of the Federal Prison System (FPS), where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the FPS, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the FPS: *Provided further,* That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $50,000,000 for the activation of new facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided further,* That of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For substance abuse treatment in Federal prisons as authorized by section 32001(e) of Public Law 103–322, $13,500,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; leasing the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Facility; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; $323,728,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $14,074,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided,* That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated to ''Buildings and Facilities'' in this Act or any other Act may be transferred to ''Salaries and Expenses,'' Federal Prison System upon notification by the Attorney General to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in compliance with provisions set forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further,* That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $22,351,000 shall be available for the renovation and construction of United States Marshals Service prisoner holding facilities.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase of (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed $3,559,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the

Missing Children's Assistance Act, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and with the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, as amended, $97,977,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by Public Law 102–534 (106 Stat. 3524).

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103–322 (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (''the 1968 Act''); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended (''the 1990 Act''), $102,400,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which $6,000,000 shall be for the Court Appointed Special Advocate Program, as authorized by section 218 of the 1990 Act; $750,000 for Child Abuse Training Programs for Judicial Personnel and Practitioners, as authorized by section 224 of the 1990 Act; $32,750,000 for Grants to Combat Violence Against Women, as authorized by section 1001(a)(18) of the 1968 Act; $28,000,000 for Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies, as authorized by section 1001(a)(19) of the 1968 Act; $7,000,000 for Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement Assistance Grants, as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act; $27,000,000 for grants for Residential Substance Abuse Treatment For State Prisoners, as authorized by section 1001(a)(17) of the 1968 Act; and $900,000 for the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, as authorized by section 240001(d) of the 1994 Act: *Provided further,* That any balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for State and Local Narcotics Control and Justice Assistance Improvements, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102–534 (106 Stat. 3524), which shall be available only to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs: *Provided further,* That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103–322 (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended (''the 1968 Act''); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended (''the 1990 Act''), $3,333,343,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which $2,000,000,000 shall be for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, pursuant to H.R. 728 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995; $25,000,000 for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized by section 106(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, as amended, and section 4(b) of the National Child Protection Act of 1993; $475,000,000 as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the 1968 Act, which shall be available to carry out the provisions of subpart 1, part E of title I of the 1968 Act, notwithstanding section 511 of said Act, for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs; $300,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, as amended; $19,643,000 for Youthful Offender Incarceration Grants, as authorized by section 1001(a)(16) of the 1968 Act; $500,000,000 for Truth in Sentencing Grants pursuant to section 101 of H.R. 667 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 10, 1995 of which not to exceed $200,000,000 is available for payments to States for incarceration of criminal aliens pursuant to section 508 as proposed by such section 101; $1,000,000 for grants to States and units of local government for projects to improve DNA analysis, as authorized by section 1001(a)(22) of the 1968 Act; $10,000,000 for Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants, as authorized by section 210501(c)(1) of the 1994 Act; $200,000 for grants to assist in establishing and operating programs for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment and follow-up care of tuberculosis among inmates of correctional institutions, as authorized by section 32201(c)(3) of the 1994 Act; $1,500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 220002(h) of the 1994 Act; $1,000,000 for Gang Investigation Coordination and Information Collection, as authorized by section 150006 of the 1994 Act: *Provided,* That funds made available in fiscal year 1996 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions: *Provided further,* That any 1995 balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

For necessary expenses, including salaries and related expenses of the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, to implement ''Weed and Seed'' program activities, $23,500,000, of which $13,500,000 shall be derived from discretionary grants provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs and $10,000,000 shall be derived from discretionary grants provided under part C of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, to remain available until expended for intergovernmental agreements, including grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts, with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes and drug offenses in ''Weed and Seed'' designated communities, and for either reimbursements or transfers to appropriation accounts of the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies which shall be specified by the Attorney General to execute the ''Weed and Seed'' program strategy: *Provided,* That funds designated by Congress through language for other Department of Justice appropriation accounts for ''Weed and Seed'' program activities shall be managed and executed by the Attorney General through the Executive Office for Weed and Seed: *Provided further,* That the Attorney General may direct the use of other Department of Justice funds and personnel in support of ''Weed and Seed'' program activities only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, $144,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 299 of part I of title II and section 506 of title V of the Act, as amended by Public Law 102–586, of which: (1) $100,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by parts A, B, and C of title II of the Act; (2) $10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by sections 281 and 282 of part D of title II of the Act for prevention and treatment programs relating to juvenile gangs; (3) $10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 285 of part E of title II of the Act; (4) $4,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by part G of title II of the Act for juvenile mentoring programs; and (5) $20,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by title V of the Act for incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended, $4,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 214B, of the Act: *Provided,* That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

For payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796), as amended, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100–690 (102 Stat. 4339–4340), and, in addition, $2,134,000, to remain available until expended, for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of said Act.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed $45,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations established by the Attorney General.

SEC. 102. Subject to section 102(b) of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, as amended by section 112 of this Act, authorities contained in Public Law 96–132, ''The Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1980,'' shall remain in effect until the termination date of this Act or until the effective date of a Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: *Provided,* That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any

person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 105. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided,* That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 104 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $10,000,000 of the funds made available in the Act may be used to pay rewards and shall not be subject to spending limitations contained in sections 3059 and 3072 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided,* That any reward of $100,000 or more, up to a maximum of $2,000,000, may not be made without the personal approval of the President or the Attorney General and such approval may not be delegated.

SEC. 107. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act, including those derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to any appropriation made available in title I of this Act under the heading, ''Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance'': *Provided further,* That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 108. For fiscal year 1996 and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts in the Federal Prison System's Commissary Fund, Federal Prisons, which are not currently needed for operations, shall be kept on deposit or invested in obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States and all earnings on such investments shall be deposited in the Commissary Fund.

SEC. 109. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding subparagraph (E), as follows:

''(E) Subject to the notification procedures contained in section 605 of Public Law 103–121, and after satisfying the transfer requirement in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, any excess unobligated balance remaining in the Fund on September 30, 1995 shall be available to the Attorney General, without fiscal year limitation, for any Federal law enforcement, litigative/prosecutive, and correctional activities, or any other authorized purpose of the Department of Justice. Any amounts provided pursuant to this subparagraph may be used under authorities available to the organization receiving the funds.''.

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no transfers may be made from Department of Justice accounts other than those authorized in this Act, or in previous or subsequent appropriations Acts for the Department of Justice, or in part II of title 28 of the United States Code, or in section 10601 of title 42 of the United States Code; and

(2) no appropriation account within the Department of Justice shall have its allocation of funds controlled by other than an apportionment issued by the Office of Management and Budget or an allotment advice issued by the Department of Justice.

SEC. 111. (a) Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a plan is confirmed or''.

(b) Section 589a(b)(5) of such title is amended by striking '';'' and inserting, ''until a reorganization plan is confirmed;''.

(c) Section 589a(f) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking ''.'' and inserting, ''until a reorganization plan is confirmed;'', and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

''(3) 100 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of this title after a reorganization plan is confirmed.''.

SEC. 112. Public Law 102–395, section 102 is amended as follows: (1) in subsection (b)(1) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''; (2) in subsection (b)(1)(C) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''; and (3) in subsection (b)(5)(A) strike ''years 1993, 1994, and 1995'' and insert ''year 1996''.

SEC. 113. Public Law 101–515 (104 Stat. 2112; 28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by inserting ''and criminal justice information'' after ''for the automation of fingerprint identification''.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1996''.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 24, line 6 strike, ''$2,000,000,000'', and all that follows through ''1995'' on line 9, and insert the following:

''1,767,000,000 shall be for Public Safety and Community Policing Grants authorized by section 10003 of the 1994 Act; and $233,000,000 shall be for carrying out the crime prevention programs authorized under sections 30202, 30307, 30702, 31904, 31921, 32101, 40102, and 50001 of the 1994 Act.''

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

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

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

First, I would like to comment on the appreciation expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and myself for our efforts with regard to INS and our funding last year and this year to enhance border enforcement and to work to try to secure our border. We certainly have worked in that regard.

Mr. HUNTER last year was very much in the forefront of that. I appreciate his kind of remarks, and we appreciate his efforts in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title I of H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 appropriate bill for the Department of Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, this amendment is not the amendment that I wanted to offer at this time. At the full committee, it became apparent, it became apparent in subcommittee, as we were marking it up, but we were not going to put any money on the COPS program, the program that is out there right now working for America, the program that has brought approximately 20,000 police officers to local communities virtually in every congressional district in this country, that is doing a good job, by all accounts, both administratively and substantially in fighting crime on the streets. It became apparent in subcommittee that we were not going to fund the COPS program. Although we had passed it in the crime bill last year. Although the Justice Department has implemented it by any account in a very efficient, effective way, although many communities are relying on it, have spent time, filed their grants, and expect for those grants to be funded for the next three years because they had been granted by the Federal Government, we are not funding it in this bill.

So today as it stands, tonight, throughout the country, as the law enforcement community looks at our efforts here, looks at this appropriation bill, looks at title I, the Justice funding, they do not see any funding next year for the COPS program.

Recognizing that we were not doing that in subcommittee, I thought about that. How do we posture this so that we take into consideration the interests of the majority now, we take into consideration the fact that earlier in the year they passed a crime bill which repealed in effect the COPS program and substituted a block grant program but also which takes into consideration that block grant program is not law; the COPS program is. How do we handle that?

So I came up with an amendment in the alternative, a funding in the alternative. I offered that in full committee. The amendment simply said that we will fund the block program as it is contained in the subcommittee's mark, if the block program becomes law. Because if it becomes law, it in effect replaces the COPS program. But if the block program does not become law, then we will take that same amount of money and fund the COPS program and $233 million out of the fund prevention programs so that police officers and the law enforcement community and the American people would not have to be in this state of insecurity about Federal funding for community policing.

That was a reasonable amendment. I almost thought it was bipartisan. I thought it might be accepted, but it was not. It was opposed on a partisan

basis and defeated in the full committee.

I went to the Committee on Rules, made the same appeal. Let us fund block grants, if they become law, but let us not not fund the COPS Program in the event that the block program does not become law. Let us tell the police community out there, the American people, let us tell them that we are going to keep this program going in some form.

We were denied at the Committee on Rules. Therefore, we are left with the only alternative and that is to strike the funding for the block grant program in this bill and offer an amendment in substitute of that to fund the COPS Program and to fund $233 million in prevention programs.

That is where we are tonight. I hope that we pass this amendment, because if we do not go the other way, funding in the alternative, then surely we should let the communities across this country know that this very effective COPS Program is going to be funded into the outyears, that our promise to police agencies, law enforcement across the country, our promise that we are going to fund this COPS Program for 3 years, that that promise is kept.

Let me take a moment to speak to the success of the COPS Program, which obviously is the substance, it is the reason it merits continuing funding.

The COPS Program was first funded last year in the Commerce, Justice Committee, was funded at $1.3 billion. This funding passes through a variety of grant programs, and jurisdictions of all sizes participated in it.

There is the COPS Ahead Program that helps fund officers in larger jurisdictions. There is the COPS Fast Program, that directs funds towards smaller jurisdictions, and there is even a program Troops to Cops that provides funds to jurisdictions which hire former members of our armed services, which ought to be very attractive, particularly when we are downsizing the military.

Thus far, Mr. Chairman, we have 20,473 more officers funded under this program that have been authorized by COPS that are out there on the beat. And Mr. Chairman, soon, I believe tomorrow, the Department of Justice will be announcing 3,434 more cops on the beat.

I want to assure my colleagues that we are right on schedule with this program. We will see 100,000 more police officers on the beat by the year 2000, if we just fund the program. But the numbers do not tell the whole story.

COPS is a popular program. It is popular with chiefs and sheriffs and mayors, as well as rank-and-file officers. COPS grant applications are short; they are simple. They are easy to fill out, one page in many instances. It is virtually an unparalleled administrative success program in the Federal Government.

Let us talk about the impact of the COPS Program on crime. During the first half of 1995, homicide rates in America's largest cities, including New York, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, have dropped. That is certainly welcome news. Is it all because of the COPS Program? I do not know. But it is certainly making its contribution. And if it were rising, those who are critics of the COPS Program would probably say, Look, it is failing the crime rate is going up. But the crime rate is not going up. It is going down. The COPS Program is contributing to that. That is a wonderful success, and it is welcome news.

In combination with community-based initiatives, this is a terrific program having a terrific impact.

A recent article in the Washington Times detailed the successes of community policing efforts in Fort Worth, TX. The article states that since community policing began in Fort Worth, burglaries have gone down by 51 percent, and they started their community policing 4 years ago, grand thefts by 38-percent down, auto thefts by 60-percent down, robberies by 31 percent and aggravated assaults by 56 percent. Mr. Chairman, community policing works.

If you vote against this amendment here tonight, there is no guarantee that the COPS program will continue. There is no guarantee that one new officer will make it to the streets of this Nation. If you vote for my amendment, you will ensure that the COPS program continues, that this proven work goes on.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about prevention programs, Mr. Chairman. As H.R. 2706 stands, our bill zeros out funds for a number of important prevention programs such as drug courts and assistance for delinquent and at-risk youth.

While some of these programs may be eligible for funding under the $2 million local law enforcement block grant, my amendment reserves $233 million specifically for these prevention programs, for these intervention programs. And they are working across the nation. Intervention and community policing, it is a nice combination, Mr. Chairman.

By specifically reserving a pool of funds for these programs, I am preventing these programs from having to compete with COPS or other programs for funding.

Let me remind my colleagues that there is a large teenage population coming up into crime-prone age, late in this century and early in the next century. Our best defense is to focus right on them, and prevention programs do that, focusing on drug awareness, education programs, and at-risk youth.

□ 1915

Mr. Chairman, who knows what we will get for $2 billion on the local law enforcement block grant programs. We will get some good, but in the meantime we will undermine a proven program, one out there that America is depending upon and one out there that is playing its part in reducing crime across this Nation. Let us support this amendment.

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

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

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about this. The bill includes almost $2 billion for local law enforcement block grant applications. It replaces the President's COPS program. The President's COPS program is a top-down Washington based program. It requires local communities the first year to put up 25 percent of the cost, the second year 50 percent of the cost, the third year 75 percent of the cost, and the fourth year 100 percent.

Local communities say, if I had 25 percent to match, I would hire a cop today on my own. I would not need the Federal match. Our program, Mr. Chairman, only requires the local communities to put up 10 percent, and they can use the money not just for cops but for cop cars and cop radios and cop supplies and other needs of the local law enforcement community. Whatever they say they need. That is the beauty of this program.

The Mollohan amendment puts its money on the Washington-based crime fighting strategy of the President. We put our trust in local communities' abilities to decide on their own where and how they want to spend the money to fight crime. I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that midnight basketball is back if the Mollohan amendment passes along with other Washington prescribed crime prevention programs.

I received a letter yesterday, Mr. Chairman, from the National League of Cities. It is signed by the current Democratic president, Carolyn Long Banks, and the incoming Republican president, Gregory Lashutka. It is a bipartisan response to the local law enforcement block grant program. Here is what it says. ''We are writing on behalf of 135,000 municipal elected leaders from cities and towns across the Nation to express our strong support for provisions in the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill requesting $2 billion to fund the House passed LNC supported local law enforcement block grant.'' They say, We urge all Members to vote in support of your efforts to fund a strengthened Federal local anticrime partnership.'' They go on to say, ''The types of crimes and violence and the appropriate responses to them vary from city to city. We know that no one-size-fits-all approach directed by Washington could work nearly as effectively and efficiently as providing local discretion and responsibility to local elected officials.''

That is the quote, Mr. Chairman, from the president of the National League of Cities, Carolyn Long Banks,

who happens to be a member of Mr. MOLLOHAN's party, but it is also signed by the Republican incoming president, and so this is bipartisan support for the local law enforcement assistance grants.

I would put my money and we are putting our money in this bill on local communities any time, day or night, over providing the President his prescription from Washington for how local communities should act to fight crime in their community. We put our faith in local communities, in local elected officials, in local law enforcement people. The Mollohan amendment puts its faith in the White House.

I strongly urge our Members to vote ''no'' on the Mollohan amendment and I hope that the Members will stay with us on the bill, because we provide almost $2 billion for local law enforcement, not Washington-local law enforcement.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to preserve the funding for community policing grants and prevention programs as prescribed by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

Last year the Congress passed a crime control bill that adopted a balanced approach of prevention to stop crime before it starts; prisons to punish criminals; and police to enforce the laws on our streets. This approach is working, and particularly with regard to police.

For example, the Justice Department has been extremely successful in awarding thousands of grants to small towns, medium-size towns, and to our Nation's cities. Nearly 17,000 new police officers are or will be hired—over 150 in my home State of Connecticut alone. These new police officers are welcome relief in my hometown of Hartford, where new officers on the street will fight the gangs and drugs that have become so commonplace there.

Funding in this appropriations bill assumes enactment into law of H.R. 728, and funds $2 billion for the Law Enforcement Grant program. But it does not continue the successful COPS program; in fact, it does not guarantee that one additional police officer will be placed on the street. We can try criminals, we can put them in prison, but without additional police we do not have the resources to arrest them and start the judicial process.

In addition, the bill provides no funding for any of the prevention programs like drug courts, that were enacted into law as part of last year's crime bill. Without funding for prevention programs we will not have the chance to keep our young people off the streets, and away from the temptations of crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for police and prevention programs. Let's continue the intelligent approach enacted to reduce crime across the Nation. Support a balanced approach to fighting crime in our counties, and support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the very able gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I come tonight to rise in strong support of the provisions in this bill that have law enforcement block grants.

Funding this initiative represents a vital step in my judgment in this Congress to keep one of the pledges in the Contract With America that we made as we came to office on this side of the aisle this past November, and a pledge that we took a large step in keeping when we passed a bill earlier this year, in January, H.R. 728, where we rejected the Washington-knows-best concept that is embodied in the Mollohan amendment.

The reason I like what is in the underlying bill and do not like Mollohan is the same reason we debated out here back in January. We talked about the fact that at that time we had a situation where a bill that had been passed in the last Congress devoted a specific amount of money to Cops on the Streets Program, a very large sum, and another very large sum to a bunch of prevention programs that many of us thought was more social welfare. In order to be able to get any of this money, you had to comply with the specific restrictions in that legislation which was passed last year in the last Congress.

What we found in the Cops on the Streets Program as it has been unearthed and developed out there is that some communities, particularly those that were going to hire cops, anyway, think those programs are terrific in a sense because the money that is given to them by the Federal Government subsidizes a program of hiring that they were already planning on doing anyhow. In a few cases you are getting a few new cops on the streets in places you would not otherwise have, but there are hundreds, and I would say thousands of local communities around this country who have rejected the idea of these new cops under this program already. Many of them have contacted many of the Members of this Congress and this House in particular to express those rejections and the reasons why. The reasons were clear to us then as they are clear to us now. That is, because especially in smaller communities, there is simply not the ability to fund the additional amount for the police officer.

As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] explained a minute ago, what happens in this COPS Program right now as it exists is that the police officers can be hired provided you put up a certain amount of funding at the beginning, and the Federal Government puts up about 75 percent, I guess, at the beginning. But that goes all the way down, in 3 years, all the way down to zero. After that you have the total responsibility of paying the entire cost of a police officer if you are going to keep them after that time, and most of that cost at the end of the first year.

The fact of the matter is that what the Federal Government pays, too, is not the full cost of the first time out, even the first year, because it does not take into full account the cost of equipping and training that new officer to go out on the street or perhaps the new police car he has got to have to have him.

What we also had with the prevention programs in the actual grants, not block grants but the regular grants they have out there now, is a limited amount of choices. You had certain programs specifically fixed, many of them designed to prefer in a sense some of the larger cities like New York City that would like to get specific money for a particular program. None of that, the American public thought, was a very good idea.

So what came out in the bill that passed this House, the crime bill earlier this year and what is embodied in this appropriations bill today was a complete change in that, a movement to a block grant program for the local communities to take all of this money that can be available, which is made available under this bill tonight, and instead of having somebody tell them that they have to hire a police officer in order to get the money or that they have to meet a certain program standard of a particular program we have dreamed up up here, the local communities, based upon the highest crime rates around the country, and based on their populations, will get the moneys in their communities for the county and city governments to decide how to spend that money to fight crime, with no other restriction except that it has to be used to fight crime and that it cannot be used to substitute for moneys that otherwise already would be there to hire the existing police or whatever.

In other words, the block grant money concept that we have, that we are going to be voting on in a couple of minutes tonight that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to do away with with his amendment would allow the cities and the counties of this country to decide how to spend the Federal money that is available in a way that they individually believe best fights crime in their communities. If they want to hire a new police officer or two, they are perfectly capable of doing that, spending every penny of their money on it. If they want to bid a new police car instead or another piece of equipment,

they could use it for that instead. If they want to put the money into drug prevention programs or into midnight basketball, they could do that. That would be their choice at the local level rather than Washington telling them how to do it as exists in the present law and as exists in what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to return to with this money.

We do not want, on our side of the aisle, to be dictating to the cities and the counties of this Nation how this money is to be spent. We want to let them decide, because we think local governments know best how to fight crime in their communities.

This block grant approach is supported by a lot of groups around the country. These groups include the National League of Cities, the National Association of Chiefs of Police, the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, the Memphis Police Association, the Southern States Police Benevolent Association, the American Federation of Police, the Police Superior Officers Association and numerous lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police.

It is also significant of note that the police chief of Washington, D.C. recently testified before Congress and voiced his strong support for the block grant approach giving him the flexibility of getting equipment and doing other things rather than having to have a cop or doing one of the prevention programs specifically dictated in the bill that passed last year or would exist under the approach of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. Washington, D.C. lacks the resources and the ability to take advantage of the COPS program just like a lot of communities around this country lack that ability.

What the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to do does not make sense. He is turning back the clock to the old Democrat version of how we ought to do it, with Washington knows best.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' against the Mollohan amendment, embrace the local community block grant program in the underlying bill. Let the cities and the counties of this Nation decide who knows best what is good for them because what is good in Eugene, Oregon for fighting crime is not necessarily good in Jacksonville, Florida.

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

I would like to reply to the distinguished gentleman from Florida for just 1 minute. He got into at the end of his remarks a little bit of hyperbole about the old way of doing business and all that.

Actually the COPS program is very modern, it is very new, it is good thinking. It is an efficient operation, creating efficient relationships between the Federal Government and localities and States across this Nation. It does it in a very direct way, focusing on a very real problem and getting a directly focused program, cops out there on the beat.

The gentleman from Florida mentioned organizations who were supporting the community block grant program. Perhaps they are supporting it in the abstract, as a possibility. There are a number of fraternal organizations who support the COPS program and support it strongly. Just to mention a few and not take up very much time, the Fraternal Order of Police support COPS, I say to the distinguished gentleman. The National Association of Police Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the International Union of Police Associations, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Troopers Coalition. The list goes on. I have only gone down through about half of it. There is considerable support out there for this very successful program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for the COPS community policing and prevention programs.

The amendment provides $1.8 billion in community policing grants so that States and local governments can hire more police officers. It also restores $233 million for much-needed crime prevention programs. The Mollohan amendment would make sure that community policing and prevention programs are funded, instead of leaving these vital initiatives to chance under the local law enforcement block grants. Despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, these block grants do not guarantee that even one new police officer would be on the beat or that children and families would benefit from needed crime prevention initiatives.

Streets are becoming safer because we are putting more police officers on the beat and are improving programs that give young people a positive alternative to the streets.

In 1990, my hometown of New Haven, CT, had the unfortunate distinction of having the highest crime rate of any city in Connecticut. Then police and community leaders came together and implemented a community policing program. Three years later, New Haven has a much prouder distinction—crime was reduced by 7 percent in the first year of the program and by 10 percent in the second year. In fact, New Haven's community policing program has become a model for the Nation.

We need to keep the pledge made in the 1994 crime bill to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets by the year 2000. In my district, 32 new police officers are already on the job in 10 municipalities. And the results are in. According to the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Reports for the first 3 months of 1995, aggravated assault is down by 40 percent, robbery is down by 21 percent, and murder is down by 5 percent.

I urge my colleagues to support our police and communities by keeping our commitment to the COPS and prevention programs in the 1994 crime bills. These programs are making our streets and our people safer.

Take a stand in support of our cities, our police, our families, and our youth: support the Mollohan amendment.

□ 1930

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I appreciate being recognized to speak about this very important provision.

Listening to the comments on the other side, I am reminded of an author, and I must admit I do not know whether it was Shakespeare or Tom Clancy that said, in response to somebody protesting about something else, ''Methinks y'all doth protest too much.'' Translated to those of us out in the real world, that means, ''What are y'all scared of?''

Mr. Chairman, we have a program here that takes taxpayer dollars and goes to our communities, our county commissioners, your city councilmen, your police, your cops, your sheriffs and says: Would you rather have these moneys coming for your community going back to your community? Would you rather have them controlled by Washington, as benevolent as Washington may be, or would you rather have control of those moneys in your community to use for purposes that you know are best in your communities?

Yes, the COPS program may be a good program, but why be wedded to a program that can be improved? This program can be improved.

If the gentlewoman from Connecticut needs police officers in her community, needs a cop on the beat in the neighborhoods, this proposal in this bill says, Go for it. Go to it, if that is what you need.

It gives ultimate flexibility to our law enforcement officers, our county commissioners, our city council people. that is it where the power should be, because that is where the power is coming from. We are returning it to the people. We are returning it to the people and to our officers, and what they need is what we ought to give them.

Mr. Chairman, they do not need redtape. They do not need forms. They need the funds to do what they believe in their community needs to be done to protect our citizens. This bill does it; this amendment takes it away.

I ask this amendment be defeated and the bill supported.

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

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the gentleman's closing remarks that this

amendment takes it away, this amendment indeed takes nothing away; this amendment preserves the COPS program. It keeps the funding going as the Government promised it would keep it going into the outyears.

Actually, the bill language takes it away, changes the program in midstream and creates a lot of instability out there. This amendment restores that and keeps the COPS program going.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] for his leadership on this bill, and I feel more deeply about it, as somebody who authored the COPS program.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia asked the question a minute ago; he said, ''What are you afraid of?'' Let me tell you what we are afraid of. We are afraid of local and State politicians taking this money and wasting it, not putting it for cops on the beat, but for doing whatever they darn choose.

We are afraid of them doing what they did in the 1970s, spending money on a tank or, like the Governor of Indiana, spending it on an airplane that he used to fly around saying he was protecting law enforcement. Or in other ways we are afraid of the LEA program, spending billions of dollars and wasting as they did in the 1970s.

There is a simple choice here, my colleagues. Who do you want to get the money? The police, as in the Mollohan amendment, or the politicians, as in the Republican bill?

We have this myth here, the Federal politicians will waste the money, but the State and local politicians will use it wisely. Well, I have seen more State and local politicians waste money. If my colleagues would just look at each of their local newspapers, there will be a story day by day. Ask this question: Why are all the major rank-and-file police organizations supporting the Mollohan bill; FOP and the NAPO, the hard-working policemen and women who walk those beats and whose lives are in danger? Because they know that our amendment says: Put the money for cops on the beat, not for whatever some little local politician decides he or she wants. It is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues were to ask my constituents, hard-working people in the outer boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, what they want more than anything else from their government, it is the cop walking the beat.

Our bill provides them that. The Republican bill, the proposal, does not. It allows the local mayor, county commissioner, or whoever else, to spend the money on any kind of frivolous scheme they want.

Vote for the police. Vote for safety. Vote for the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a former assistant district attorney of Pennsylvania and a Town Watch organizer, I can tell you that the existing 1995 crime bill earmarks $10.2 billion for crime prevention programs and police programs.

Whether it is police officers or a drug corps, a Town Watch, police vehicles or police training, this existing bill does everything we need, including having more police officers, and the 1994 existing grants for police officers are fully protected.

In my view, the Federal Government, which is $4 trillion in debt, does not handle its funds well, but local government knows what it wants. Leave the discretion, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] says, to local law enforcement initiatives by our local communities, and we will take care of the law enforcement with the police officers and the public safety initiatives.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the majority party's response at this point to the COPS program? It is a cop-out. A block grant. A block grant that assures no more cops on the beat; not a single additional cop guaranteed.

The issue is not about flexibility. This bill provides a lot of flexibility. I say this to the gentleman from Florida, it is about priorities. There is a national priority in terms of more police in local communities. And the gentleman mentions about small and large. I do not understand why small communities in his district, and in others represented here, have not taken advantage of this program.

The local communities in the 12th District, small and large, have. Center Line has an application. It has a small population; less than 10,000. We have a letter, on the other hand, from Warren from the city police chief, 145,000. He says, ''Save this program. It has added six police in the community and now we hope to obtain more.''

The same is true of Berkley and Huntington Woods, small communities in the 12th District. And the bill, the COPS bill, allows communities to combine together, under an amendment that I proposed, to have regional task forces to get at the needs within those communities.

Mr. Chairman, what does the majority proposal at this point suggest? Throw it to the winds. There is no accountability. I am proud to stand here and say there is a national priority and that is more police in our communities; flexibility for communities to use it as they want.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying Washington knows best, but what I am saying is, listen to the local communities who have applied and who support this program. The formula of the majority party is going to hurt suburban communities like I represent. They have an ingredient in there that is going to hurt suburban communities like I represent.

The COPS program is working; their program is a cop-out. I am glad for the Mollohan amendment. Let us go across partisan lines for once and support it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has just called every sheriff, every police official, every mayor in this country, a little local politician, when he said that the Members of this body, that the Members of the U.S. Congress, know more about fighting crime than local sheriffs, and that is a lie.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a letter from Donny Gasparini, a Democrat, who is the sheriff of Winnebago County, one of only 32 counties in the entire United States to be accredited by the Commission of Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. He is saying this: We need flexibility in this program. Sure it is good to have money for cops on the beat, but each new officer accounts for an average of 15 arrests per month.

He sent a letter to President Clinton saying, Give the sheriffs of this country flexibility. Do not box us in, because we need money not only to hire cops if we need them, but for drug courts, day reporting centers, community-based drug rehab programs, work release options.

Mr. Chairman, this is a professional law enforcement officer. He is the head of the Illinois Sheriffs Association. He knows more than the U.S. Congress. He is the one saying give the local police enforcement agencies the flexibility to spend the money to develop the tools that they know best in order to fight crime. Take power away from Congress and give it back to the local communities. That is why the block grants is the best program.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF,
WINNEBAGO COUNTY,
Rockford, IL, June 15, 1995.

Hon. DONALD MANZULLO,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I am sending to President Clinton regarding the difficulties with appropriations for the Crime Bill.

Can you suggest any additional steps we in corrections should be taking to assist with the decision-making process?

This matter is of grave concern to our community. We have invested much time and money in trying to jump through the federal hoops for funding assistance, only to have the rules change in mid-jump.

Can you help?

Sincerely,

DONALD J. GASPARINI,
Sheriff.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF,
WINNEBAGO COUNTY,
Rockford, IL, June 15, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: This letter is to call your attention to certain aspects of the ''Crime Bill'' that I'm sure you recognize need to be addressed.

The situation in county corrections is at crisis proportion. Everyday we face overwhelming stress on our system. We have desperately needed alternatives to incarceration, and some very good programs have been developed (i.e. drug courts, day-reporting centers, community-based drug rehab programs, work-relase options), but the problems are escalating with such speed that we can't afford to fund the alternatives.

We had great hopes of receiving federal assistance in the form of grants, but many of the alternatives-to-incarceration grant programs we were eligible to apply for, have had their funds pulled to support the Community Policing Grant program. We have submitted a Drug Court Grant application, which now awaits some sort of decision on appropriations, following the recision bill veto.

I fully support the concept of more law enforcement on the streets as a deterrent to crime, but each new officer accounts for an average of 15 arrests per month, adding to the dangerously high crowding in our jails, and the premature release of dangerous criminals back onto the streets to be arrested again. The criminal justice system is like a line of dominoes; adjustment of one affects the rest. There must be a more comprehensive approach.

Daily in Winnebago County, we face the problem of a jail packed like a tin of sardines, averaging 387 inmates in space built for 226. Many days, especially following a weekend of arrests, we number well over 450 in that same space.

Believing that the public would support the badly needed expansion of our facility, we presented a referendum to the community on the November 1993 ballot. This referendum covered all four affected areas within the criminal justice system—state's attorneys and public defenders, courts, probation, and incarceration—allowing us to begin clearing up the large number of inmates awaiting trial and to put teeth into sentencing by providing the necessary jail space. The referendum was defeated three-to-one, by a public who said they will not approve any additional property tax.

We are accountable to the communities we serve, and in our efforts to maintain an efficient and precisely run Agency, we have recently successfully completed the onerous and rigorous process of Accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). We are proudly one of only 32 accredited Sheriff's Departments in the nation. What this really means is that in spite of the budget restrictions, increasing crime, and reduced pesonnel levels, we have maintained above average solve rates, achieved the highest honors our industry can bestow, and reinforced public confidence in the job we do best.

The reason for this lengthy explanation of our situation is to add our voice to the many communities across Illinois and the nation who are in the same frustrating position. Our hope is that this information will strengthen your argument for more emphasis on funding for local rehabilitation and meaningful sanctions that will return credibility to law enforcement, whether it is in the form of federal grants, or block grants to states, that would allow for more local considerations.

Personally I would like to see Crime Bill funding returned intact for this fiscal year, and gradually phase in the minimally restrictive block grants that would complete the intent of the Crime Bill over a three-to-five year period.

Please let me know if there are any steps we can be taking at the local level that would expedite this possibility.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD J. GASPARINI,
Sheriff.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the base bill is a reduction in local law enforcement. The Mollohan amendment restores that reduction.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] had it right. If we want to help your city councilmen, and we want to help your county commissioners, and we want to help your mayors, go with the block grant. If we want this money to go into local law enforcement, matched by local dollars to get the biggest bang for the buck, if Members are sick and tired of the threats to public safety, the depressant on people's psychology, the hindrance it poses to economic recovery in any major urban area, and they want to get more cops on the street, the Cops on the Beat Program is the best way to do it.

□ 1945

Every councilman has had a different idea of what is good for public safety. This is not money that goes to local law enforcement, it goes to local government. The Cops on the Beat Program is a local law enforcement program. It expands Cops on the Beat. This has a thousand different diversions without any local match with a reduced local effort.

This works against the President's goal, the administration's goal, of more Cops on the Beat. It works against the interests of Los Angeles. It works against the interests, I suggest, of almost every major urban area in the country,

I urge an ''aye'' vote on the amendment.

I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore $1.8 billion for the highly effective COPS program. At a time when violent crime and its consequences for our quality of life is of great concern to us all, it defies logic that we would decimate our most effective means of addressing this scourge.

The COPS Program works. It has already resulted in the assignment of 20,000 additional police officers in neighborhoods around the country in the first 12 months of the program.

By way of contrast, the block grant funding provided in the bill can be used for any purpose that would enhance public safety. I can envision some mighty creative uses to which such unrestricted funding can be put—uses that do not guarantee a single additional officer on our streets.

I am appalled by the rising rate of violent crime. Our parks have become off-limits, increasing numbers of the elderly are afraid to venture out of their homes, women find their freedom restricted, and children—and their parents—can no longer enjoy peace of mind about the safety of our schools.

I am convinced that the single most effective step we have taken to confront this problem is to put more cops on the beat in our communities through the COPS Program

What is more, I can personally vouch for the flexibility and efficiency of that program. I have met with Director Brann and his staff, and have the greatest admiration for the lengths to which they have gone to accommodate local needs and circumstances, but at all times making certain that the acid test is met: will the funds sought by the locality result in putting more cops on the beat?

With the funding appropriated thus far, we have made a splendid start on our commitment to put 100,000 additional cops to work in our neighborhoods and streets. Let's not renege on that commitment.

The first obligation of government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. By returning tax dollars to our communities not in the form of an ill-defined block grant but for the explicit purpose of hiring an additional 100,000 police officers, we are making a major stride toward ending the scourge of crime in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Mollohan amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat something that I said at the beginning of this debate. The bill language that we have now provides nearly $2 billion for a local law enforcement block grant program to replace the President's COPS Program. The COPS Program is Washington based—Washington telling the local community what they can or cannot do with their money.

The COPS Program requires local communities in the first year to provide 25 percent of the cost, 50 percent the second year, 75 percent the third year, and 100 percent in the fourth year. Local communities simply cannot afford that.

The funds under the COPS Program can only be used to employ police men and women. It cannot be used for police cars or radios or equipment or perhaps another program that the local community thinks is more important than adding another policeman or policewoman.

We say we are giving local communities, whether it be the police force or the county commissioners or the city council, the mayor or the county executive, we are giving them a local option. You might even call this a coption program; they can use the money for cops, if they want, and other options, their options, not ours.

If you vote for the Mollohan amendment, you are putting a Washington straitjacket on local communities, cops only, and you have got to pay for it all after 3 years.

If you vote for the program that is in the bill, your share is only 10 percent, local community, and we are going to let you decide how you want to use it.

We are going to keep track of it; no longer will you be able to use this money in a wasteful or inefficient manner, and yet you have the local option to decide what program or programs work best for you.

I urge our Members to continue to oppose the Mollohan amendment. Give the local communities a break. Give them the option. Do not let Washington again impose its will on local communities.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the COPS program and the Mollohan amendment.

Earlier today I showed the faces of county policing in Sacramento County, CA. We showed the people and the sheriffs' deputies in North Highlands, one of the unincorporated areas in our community, who work together, filing 4,000 crime reports that probably otherwise would not have been filed. Those crime reports allow those sheriffs' deputies to concentrate their fire, their effort, their activity in areas where it can do the most good.

It is the epitome of what we are talking about when we say let us put the cops out there on the street, on the beat, in the communities, in the storefronts, where they can do the most good.

The sheriff of Sacramento County understood this. He came, applied and received, and community policing occurred. We are talking about a 1-page application. This is not the traditional Federal bureaucracy run amok. This is a streamlined process that puts an emphasis on giving the communities the opportunity to put very small sums into the investment of an application with big returns in the fight against crime.

Please, support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the subcommittee chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentleman, I think we ought to be clear what is going on here because I think, frankly, what we are witnessing is a very cynical effort on the part of the administration and their allies in the Congress to save political face.

What I would like to do is sort of reconstruct the sequence of events, if you will. Earlier this year, this session of Congress, during the first 100 days, we passed the local government law enforcement block grant with strong bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. Shortly thereafter, the President threatened a veto of the bill. Then we flash forward a few more months. Then what do we have? Lo and behold, the President, through his reelection campaign, is making a $2.7 million TV advertising buy to portray the President as a born-again crime fighter.

Tonight we have the Mollohan amendment out on the floor. The gentleman from West Virginia is simply saying, ''Look, we ought to go forward with the COPS program because our alternative, what I feel is a vastly superior alternative, the local government, the law enforcement block grants, has not yet become law. Let us call a spade a spade, there are real problems with the Cops on the Beat program. Part of it is the cost. We debated that the other day in the Committee on Appropriations.

At $60,000 to $80,000 to hire a new police officer, the funding the gentleman proposes would come up far short of the 100,000 new Cops on the Beat we heard about. Many of us have heard from local government jurisdictions in our congressional districts complaining about the local match requirements, and those local match requirements have prevented those financially strapped local governments from participating in the Cops on the Beat program.

Lastly, with our approach, what we have tried to do is frankly acknowledge that crime is first and foremost a local concern. We are trying to give local jurisdictions the flexibility to combat crime in local communities.

I have heard from jurisdictions in my congressional district that have said, ''We do not want more money to hire additional police officers. What we prefer instead is the flexibility you can give us under the local government law enforcement block grant to expand our DARE program in local schools, to build on community-based crime prevention programs and the like.''

So I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment. Stay with the bill. It is a vastly superior approach that recognizes that crime is, in fact, first and foremost a local concern. Our approach is to try to help those local communities to address those local crime problems.

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

Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman there is nothing cynical in our efforts at all. We have an ongoing, very successful program supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, major city chiefs, and there is nothing cynical at all about it.

As for the jurisdiction of Washington, DC, and its financial problems, it has a waiver, which there is a provision for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Philadelphia, PA [Mr. FOGLIETTA], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Mollohan amendment and to stand with police officers in my home city of Philadelphia who are fighting the problem which is most compelling for all of our constituents: crime. Crime, which is robbing us all of our very freedom to walk our neighborhood streets.

There are some cases where block grants may work. There are some instances where it could be giving more flexibility to our state and local governments. But if it ain't broken, let us not fix it, and the COPS Program is far from broken.

Community policing is working. In Philadelphia, crime is down considerably. In many of our big cities, crime is down by 4 percent and, astoundingly, New York has experienced a 30-percent drop in its murder rate. People feel safer when they see a cop walking their beat, or riding their beat in a cruiser or even on a bicycle.

The cops like this program. A survey taken last month showed that only 5 percent of police executives want a block grant. COPS is working for the cops. If other departments are looking for a way to reinvent themselves in terms of working with local governments, they should use COPS—with their one or two page applications and quick turnaround time—as their model.

On a personal note, the Attorney General was receptive to me when I pleaded for consideration for the desperately poor city of Chester in my district. The Justice Department was sensitive, expeditious and responsible. I thank you, Janet Reno.

The numbers speak for themselves. The COPS program has a slight 1.5-percent administrative cost. That means that more cops will go out on the street. A block grant program would add bureaucratic fat.

So what is going on here? I think it's clear. The President was absolutely right when he sounded the call to put 100,000 new cops on the street. And the lean and mean bureaucracy he set up to do the job is doing the job. For no other reason than brazen politics, Republicans want to steal this success away from our President.

That is dead wrong. We should not be playing politics on crime. And the American people know that. We're 20,000 towards our goal. Let us not stop until every one of those 100,000 police officers are on the streets in every community of America. Vote for the Mollohan amendment.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in opposition to this amendment and follow up on some comments that have been made earlier concerning statements by the police chief here in Washington, DC. These statements were made at a hearing that was held just a month ago, on June 22, 1995, a hearing on combatting crime in the District of Columbia. At that hearing, Mr. DAVIS asked the police chief this: ''Let me ask you this, would you prefer to put that money

into technology as opposed to new officers at this point?'' Chief Thomas responded. He said, ''Yes, I would. I think that is a better use of our dollars to improve the infrastructure of the department, buy the equipment, have money there for overtime. I think that by adding officers, we do not really get at the problem, because after we add the officers, we still have all of these antiquated processes within the department where we have manual report-taking, et cetera.''

I think we should pay some attention to what the police chief right here in Washington, DC, says.

I think we should also pay some attention to the fact that more than 200 COPS grants were rejected by local communities around this country.

What we have done with this program is create a straitjacket. Now, it may be that in many communities, perhaps a majority of communities, that is where they want the money to go, into officers on the street. We give them the flexibility to do it. But that is not the answer in every community.

We need not impose that as an answer. We need to give flexibility. We need to pay attention to law enforcement officers around this country and local governments. We do not have all the wisdom.

We need to understand the reality of fighting crime differs from community to community. We need to pay attention to that. We need to reject this amendment and continue to give flexibility to local communities through this block grant program. I believe that is a program which will allow all of the communities to meet the needs of the communities in a way that is most appropriate based on the local circumstances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida would not yield, and the other gentleman from Florida mentioned the same thing, how Washington, DC, wants your block grant program because you have admitted those with the high crime rates will get the money. Those with lower crime rates will not get it.

What happens at the end of the year when the crime rates go down? Underneath your formula, next year Washington, DC, will not get as much money, so if you are effective in fighting crime, the next year you will receive less money.

Crime cannot be on a 12-month cycle where one year you have the money, the next year you do not.

Get the facts straight. Your program is up and down. It is only funded for one year.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to a lot of this debate tonight. I think a few things need to be made clear.

First of all, the underlying bill we have here today going to a block grant program will not in any way affect those communities that already have commitments with Cops in the Streets. They have their money cordoned off under the existing system, so any of the grants already given will not be affected by continuing to support the block grant program as you would be doing tonight by voting against the Mollohan amendment, which I urge you to do.

Second, I heard a lot of folks suggest somehow or another we are not going to be able to get trust into the local communities to do what is right. I think that is just pure, unadulterated nonsense. The fact of the matter is I think anybody thinking about this understands that the local communities are going to make the best decision, not us, about what is best for their community.

The idea that if they need a police officer, they will not provide it, I just believe, as I said, is nonsense. Under the scheme we worked out, there will be a board that will have to advise the city commission and the county commission, whichever it is, and on that board will be an appropriate representative of the police and the community or the sheriff, as the case may be, also the local judiciary will be represented, the local school system will be represented, the local social work organizations that get involved with criminal justice will be represented, and so on.

□ 2000

So that in essence those decisions will be made not just simply by politicians, quote unquote. They will be made by local community representatives advising the local government leaders on what is best for their community, and, if a community wants to spend all of its money on police, and many will want to do that, there is going to be more money available under the proposal of the block grant program than there is under the existing cops on the street program or the prevention program of Mr. MOLLOHAN's program to be spent. There could conceivably be more police officers hired in this country under these programs. We want to do it the block grant route that exists under the existing program.

But in the process of looking at how this is going to work, Mr. Chairman, we ought to also understand that there are a lot of folks like the D.C. police chief who do understand that where the money should be spent is where the crime is, and there is no greater, higher rate of crime anywhere in the country, unfortunately, than the District of Columbia, and I heard the last speaker suggest that, gee whiz, if we use this formula, there may be some communities that do not get as much money as other communities because they have a higher crime rate. Well, I assure my colleagues, and I assure the gentleman, that under the formula that virtually every community, I would say every community, is not too small, gets a sum of money, a sizable sum of money, under this block grant concept all over the country, but it is true that the higher crime rate communities will get more in any given year, and they ought to get more in any given year because that is where the crime problem is, and that is what indeed is envisioned by this.

I would suggest that this is the fairest and the most responsible way to deal with fighting crime in this country and to hiring police officers, and if a community, as many do, has no desire whatsoever to hire a new police officer, and they need some new equipment of some sort, they can spend it on that, or they can spend it on drug courts, or they can spend it on drug treatment programs, or they can spend it on some new innovative program that they have created that in their local community can be tailored just to fight the crime problem in that community, and there are a lot of very original ideas out there that have never come under any of these congressionally created kinds of prevention programs that we have been seeing in the Democrat-controlled Congresses of the past and President Clinton's crime bill that passed. Let us let the local community decide.

I can guarantee my colleagues what is happening that is good for fighting crime in Texas is not necessarily going to be good in Rhode Island, or in Oregon, or wherever. The local community-based concept will work. We are not detracting a minute from this. We are not taking away from anything. We are just suggesting on the Republican side of the aisle that local government knows best. We believe in reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government as a matter of principle. We believe in divesting these decisionmaking processes out to the State and local communities, and that is what we are doing in this bill, and I would encourage a ''no'' vote on the Mollohan amendment for those reasons.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, Mr. MOLLOHAN, I applaud your efforts, and, if these young men and women could be here tonight, new law enforcement officers sworn in last Friday night in Austin, TX, they would want to applaud your efforts also because Austin, TX, has 25 new police officers on the beat tonight as a result of this cops program, and tomorrow they'll have another $600,000 available to put more officers on the beat and to provide them with some of the equipment they need under the flexibility that our Republican colleagues ignore under the Cops More Program.

Mr. Chairman, they tell us they are against redtape. They tell us they want to allow local decisionmaking. Let me tell my colleagues every one of these police officers is on the beat tonight with a grant approved in less time, in

less time, than the 45 days they are going to allow Republican Governors to comment on these applications under their program. I say to my colleagues, if you want to eliminate redtape, if you want to stand up for local law enforcement officials, you'll listen to them as the experts.

I heard the almost frivolous comments of the gentleman from Illinois suggesting that we were against local sheriffs. Well, the National Sheriffs Association, along with every other major law enforcement association, was there today standing along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] supporting the Mollohan amendment. They are supporting it because they recognize that just as the Republicans want to cut Medicare, they are cutting the commitment to 100,000 police officers.

Mr. Chairman, I am unyielding in support of my local law enforcement association and unyielding in opposing the kind of cutback in this commitment which was for 100,000 new police officers. Can my colleagues tell me things are different in Florida or in Illinois from Texas? I defy my colleagues to find a community in this country that cannot benefit from having more law enforcement officers out there to protect that community.

That is what this amendment is all about. If my colleagues believe in standing with the men and women who are willing to risk their lives for our community, they will support the Mollohan amendment and reject this kind of bureaucracy that is being proposed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few seconds. I am sorry that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee did not yield to me. I say to the gentleman, I simply wanted to make a point, BILL, that you made a comment that under the block grant program it was conceivable that you would have more policemen on the beat. That's really the problem with the block grant program. It is also conceivable that you will not have as many policemen on the beat. And the other point is that we already have this tremendous cops program out there, as Mr. DOGGETT just pointed out, that is working, and that communities have had commitments from the Federal Government that they're going to be funded for 3 years, and under the block grant program that commitment of the Federal Government is going to be undermined.

The Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, as a former mayor who started a community policing program, I strongly support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for the COPS Program. The COPS Program is responsible for 95 new cops and the redeployment of 44 other cops in my congressional district along.

But as I understand it, this bill guts the COPS Program and instead appropriates $2 billion for a law enforcement program that does not even exist.

That's right, it does not even exist. The fact is that, H.R. 728, the Local Governments Law Enforcement Block Grant Act, which this bill provides $2 billion for, has not even been considered in the Senate Judiciary Committee nor does the committee even have plans to hold hearings on H.R. 728.

But let me tell you what this fictional law enforcement program would do. It would allow communities to use their funding for nonlaw enforcement purposes, including hiring secretaries and purchasing new uniforms or new cruisers. Secretaries, uniforms, and cruisers that will not lower the crime rate in your district or mine.

The Mollohan amendment restores funding to put more cops on the streets of every congressional district, Democratic and Republican, and to make those districts safer. The COPS Program works. How do I know? I know because their are 139 more cops on the streets of my district and I know because in communities nationwide, these cops are walking their beat protecting our homes, protecting our schools, and protecting our children.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished minority leader is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I urge Members to vote for this Mollohan amendment.

What we passed in the crime bill just a few months ago is working. It is working. We said we wanted 100,000 new police on the streets. Just 25 percent of those police are on the streets today. So a fourth of our goal only has been realized in terms of putting blue shirts on the streets.

Mr. Chairman, I have been out with my community police that were hired under this program in the city of St. Louis. I have walked the precinct with them, I have seen the work that they are doing to prevent crime, to stop crime before it happens, which is what community policing is about, and guess what has happened in my city of St. Louis? The crime rate? Down by 2 percent. The murder rate? Down by 24 percent in St. Louis. The violent crime rate? Down by 11 percent in St. Louis with just a few months of this activity on the ground.

I visited with the chiefs of police from all over the country in St. Louis last week, and they said to me, ''Surely, with the results that we're getting, the Congress is not going to take this money away that is targeted at police,'' and then they said, ''You know what will happen if we have a block grant. It will go to all kinds of things. It will get subverted by mayors and by other departments in city government and will be taken for things that don't count as much as the stoppage of crime that comes from police.''

Then we hear that in 25 cities across the country the violent-crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, the crime rate is down. Why in the world, with these statistics and these correlations that we are seeing, would we now stop what has already begun to work and go back to funding tanks, and funding bazookas and funding all kinds of crazy things?

My colleagues, vote for this Mollohan amendment. Keep the money in blue shirts and keep the people of this country safe and secure.

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

A moment ago, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] held a picture up of the 25 new police officers hired, he said, under the COPS Program in Austin, TX. I have got a better deal. Those 25 officers cost Austin, TX, and its taxpayers some 25 percent of the total cost. We are going to give it to them for 10 percent in our bill. That is all we require in the local law enforcement block grant program, which they can use for cops, if they want. It only costs 10 percent. Now next year those 25 cops in Austin are going to cost Austin taxpayers 50 percent of the cost. The third year it is going to cost them 75 percent of the cost, and after 3 years it is going to cost Austin taxpayers all of their salaries. In this bill, we will do it for 10 percent from here on, and they have the option to hire cops. If they need cop cars, they can use it for cop cars. And if they are out of radios, we will let them use it for radios. We will let them use it for whatever they want to do within reason.

Now the Mollohan amendment also provides, and I want to emphasize this, also provides $230 million for those old programs I thought we got rid of when we adopted the House-passed bill in February. Remember midnight basketball and all of those crazy things we heard about? We voted those out in February by a large margin in the House-passed crime bill which we are funding tonight in this bill. Under the Mollohan amendment those programs are back upon us, midnight basketball and all. I urge the Members to vote as they voted in February. As a matter of fact, it was February 14, 1995, that a great majority of this body voted to pass the crime bill that supplanted the COPS Program.

Our people back home told us we do not want those crazy programs. We cannot afford the local cost share for COPS. We want the local option on how we use our money. We want our sheriff, our police force, our mayor, our county executive, our local city council—we want them deciding where the money goes, not some bureaucrat in Washington, and especially the Congress of the United States, and the White House.

So I urge the Members to vote as they did in February. My colleagues are on record as supporting an alternative to the COPS Program. Tonight we fund the alternative to the COPS

Program, the local block grant for law enforcement officials to do the job of fighting crime in our communities recognizing the diversity of these towns and cities that we represent. What works in New York City may not work in Burnside, KY. In fact, I guarantee it will not work there. Give us the option of using the money as we need it in our local communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment.

The goal was simple when we passed the crime bill, and it's simple today. Put more cops on the beat, crime rates will fall, and our families will be safer.

The Mollohan Amendment will help us meet this goal by providing continued funding for programs like COPS–FAST—programs that help police departments hire new officers and develop innovative, community policing programs.

My Republican colleagues intend to abolish these programs and replace them with open-ended block grants. They miss the point.

The Republican block grant proposal does not guarantee more cops on our streets. In fact, under the Republican proposal, grant money could be used for anything from street lights to road construction.

The COPS Program guarantees more cops on the street. I challenge the Republicans to make the same guarantee. They cannot.

COPS grants flow straight from the Justice Department to local law enforcement agencies. We have cut down on administrative overhead by streamlining the application process, and taken other steps to reduce redtape.

The COPS Program empowers local communities to take responsibility for community safety by putting more police officers where they need them most. It doesn't mandate a Federal solution to problems that are often unique to neighborhoods and communities. The COPS Program succeeds because it empowers community police departments to try innovative new strategies to combat crime and make the best use of available resources.

Neighborhood officers work with volunteers to keep our streets safe and our communities informed. Crimefighting experts and officers on the beat agree that community policing works.

The COPS Program is a non-bureaucratic solution to a terrible problem. And the result is a marked decrease in crime: in theft, burglary, and other more serious crimes.

In Sacramento, citizens are involved in this effort, working with local law enforcement and injecting—in their efforts—a new spirit of cooperation and teamwork.

I want to talk about how this program has worked in communities in my district because it really provides an example of how successful this program can be, and how, with some support, we can begin to address fundamental problems with local solutions, not Washington solutions.

In Sacramento County, California several groups of volunteers and local law enforcement officers have joined hands to establish Sheriff's Community Service Centers. One of the first was in my district in North Highlands, an unincorporated area of the county.

Without fanfare, but with tireless devotion, this group of volunteers and deputies have made a tremendous contribution to community safety.

With an all-volunteer staff and a roster of deputies paid through a COPS grant and county matching funds, the North Highlands center is both a thriving community center and an indispensable component of the Sacramento County law enforcement team.

Volunteers work side-by-side with deputies, helping out with many of the day-to-day responsibilities that keep the wheels of justice turning: taking crime reports, providing a safe haven for neighborhood kids, and helping others navigate through the sometimes confusing world of law enforcement and county services.

Since January of this year, volunteers have logged 4000 crime reports. Many of these volunteers spend 40 hours a week at the center, motivated—as one volunteer put it—by ''a real sense of pride in their contribution to the neighborhood.''

The spirit of community involvement extends well beyond the walls of the North Highlands Center. The office space is donated. So is the furnitue—right down to the carpet.

Deputies like Willie Nix have found new ways to approach old programs. Deputy Nix—a patrol cop before coming to work with the North Highlands staff—talked just the other day about the advantages of community policing.

An officer on patrol usually has just enough time to drive to a location, take a report, and drive away. ''Now,'' he said, ''I can work with local agencies, neighbors, landlords, and the community to attack crime from every angle.''

In some areas, drug dealers have literally trashed the community. Deputy Nix works with community members and service center volunteers to address this problem from the branches down to the roots: towing abandoned cars, cleaning up yards soiled with garbage, and returning the street to law abiding citizens.

Deputy Nix is busy, but he sets time aside to work with local schoolchildren. Because center volunteers have worked hard to establish after-school programs, many of these kids have more than just a uniform to turn to—they have an entire network of support, from reading and arts programs to safe recreational facilities in the evening.

What may seem like a common sense solution is only possible if other communities can afford to hire officers like Willie Nix. In cities and towns around the country, volunteers who are committed to breaking down barriers and developing a community commitment to law enforcement will rise to the challenge—but only if they are given the opportunity.

Just today, I learned that other communities in my area will get that opportunity. A grant to the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department will free 22 deputies from administrative duties and redeploy them into community policing.

And police departments in Colusa, Davis, Glen County, Gridley, Red Bluff, Rio Vista, Sutter County, West Sacramento, Willows, Williams, Winters, Woodland, Yolo County, and Yuba City have already received grants that will allow them to put additional officers on the street.

If we pass the Mollohan amendment, and if we continue our commitment to the COPS Program, we can duplicate the efforts of the North Highlands Community Service Center a hundred-thousand times over, and make our streets, our neighborhoods, and our communities a whole lot safer.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to rise today in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to H.R. 2076, the fiscal year Commerce, Justice, State & Judiciary Appropriations Act, and the COPS Program.

The Mollohan amendment would restore crucial funding for COPS Program, or the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which has been highly successful in Buffalo and throughout Western New York.

Since the program was first authorized in the Crime Bill of 1994, law enforcement authorities throughout Western New York already have received funding to hire 28 additional officers.

Nationwide, the COPS Program has authorized funding for 18,159 community policing officers. This is in addition to the 2,080 new officers funded under the 1994 Police Hiring Supplement (PHS) Program, bringing the total to 20,239 more officers on the beat across the country. In 1993, the Buffalo Police Department received funding to hire more than twenty officers under the PHS Program.

One of the COPS Programs' most successful programs is COPS MORE. MORE puts additional officers on the street by funding equipment, technology, hiring of civilians and overtime.

Last summer, the Commissioner of the Buffalo Police Department requested the flexibility to use grant funding where it is most needed. Under COPS MORE, the Buffalo Police Department recently received $1.3 million. The funding has enabled the Department to get cops out of the precinct and back onto the street where they belong.

Like you, I am appalled by the following statistics: A murder occurs every 21 minutes; a rape every 5 minutes a robbery every 46 seconds; an aggravated assault every 29 seconds; a burglary every 20 seconds; and a larceny theft every 4 seconds.

If we keep those alarming facts in mind, this vote is very simple. More copes on the street, means more hoodlums behind bars. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Mollohan amendment in order to restore necessary funding so that the successful COPS Program may continue.

Ms. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment to H.R. 2076, to preserve a program that is a success in communities such as my own, and throughout the land.

Community policing programs are supported by policy professionals and public officials of both parties. Cops on the beat enables communities to combat crime in a cost effective way.

For people living in the grip of fear, for people peering out barred windows into once-friendly streets, community policing offers results. The familiar figure of a neighborhood officer, who knows the residents and cares about them and for them on a personal level, is the best tool we can employ in our fight against crime.

Many communities in my district, including Kansas City, Blue Springs, Lee's Summit, and Raytown, have filled out the 1-page application and joined the Federal Government in a partnership to fight crime. They have come to the Justice Department with innovative community policing plans and have been rewarded. But these cops on the beat are just the beginning in our efforts to take back the streets. Eventually, the President plans to place 100,000 police officers on America's streets. That means even more police on the streets of the communities I represent.

We need targeted programs with the set mission of preventing crime; community policing is a proven program that reduces crime. With the will of this body, it can continue to be a cost-effective crime buster. Please join me in supporting our cops on the beat: support the Mollohan amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Mollohan amendment. This amendment is probusiness and proenvironment. There are hundreds of communities across American that depend on healthy fisheries for their economic well-being. In recent years, many of these communities have spent millions of dollars to help bring back their long-depleted fish populations. The Mollohan amendment will correct this bill's attack on the commitment between the government and communities to restore their local economies.

The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association, along with the Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association, both support the Mollohan amendment. They represent over 5,000 businesses and over 200,000 jobs all along the Pacific Coast. According to these two important groups, ''Fishery management cannot happen unless fishery research and conservation are properly funded . . . [the bill] cuts at the heart of many important ongoing research efforts that help our industry be more effective and protects our industry's economic future . . . It makes no economic sense to eliminate them.''

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 232, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

AYES—184

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefner
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Tucker
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

NOES—232

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

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus
Bateman
Collins (MI)
Dooley
Flanagan
Forbes
Hilliard
Hunter
Jefferson
Martinez
Moakley
Myers
Reynolds
Rose
Saxton
Stark
Volkmer
Yates

☐ 2032

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Bachus against.

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Forbes against.

Messrs. TAUZIN, HORN, and DAVIS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLANAGAN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 571, I was unavoidably delayed by an urgent matter concerning my district.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOYER: Page 25, line 13, strike ''$1,500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 220002(h) of the 1994 Act'' and insert ''$1,000,000 for Law Enforcement Family Support Programs, as authorized by section 1001(a)(21) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 as added by section 210201 of the 1994 Act; $500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 220002(h) of the 1994 Act''.

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply provides $1 million in funding for the Law Enforcement Family Support Program. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman, who has had the opportunity to review this. I understand it is acceptable to him.

I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia in working with me to fashion this so it could be effected.

Mr. Chairman, under the Law Enforcement Family Support Program, the Attorney General makes grants to States and local law enforcement agencies and law enforcement organizations to provide family support services to law enforcement personnel. This important program was authorized by the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. These grants will allow local law enforcement agencies to provide counseling for law enforcement families, stress reduction programs,

post shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses. Law enforcement family services and counseling for families of police killed in the line of duty.

The pervasive nature of job related stress in law enforcement was highlighted in 1986 when a nationwide assessment of law enforcement training needs found that State and local officers in all types and sizes of agencies ranked the need for training in personal stress management as the highest priority.

The law enforcement family support programs places heavy emphasis on family well-being.

All to often, the work of the law enforcement community is overlooked. Everyday, they risk their lives to keep our neighborhoods safe. Everyday, they struggle to uphold justice fairly and equitably. Every day, they work vigorously to remove those who work to terrorize our communities. This hard work places a heavy personal burden on them and their families.

Law enforcement is the single most stressful and dangerous occupation, requiring life and death decision all in a days work. Last year, nearly 160 officers were killed in the line of duty and another 300 took their own lives.

Our police dedicate their lives to and serving our communities. We must do what we can to aid these brave citizens and their families who sacrifice so much for us.

My amendment is fairly funded by reducing the Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Program to the level it was funded in fiscal year 1995. The committee had zero-funded the family law enforcement programs and I believe this is a more equitable distribution of funds in this time of fiscal constraints. I appreciate the support of the chairman and the ranking member for this amendment and hope my colleagues will join us in aiding the families of our Nation's police.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. If the gentleman will yield, we have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TOBACCO AND AMERICA'S YOUTH

[Additional statements to Mr. WAXMAN's Testimony, in the RECORD of Monday, July 24, 1995.]

January 8, 1969.

OBJECTIVES AND PLANS—1600

[By Dr. P.A. Eichorn and W.L. Dunn, Jr.]

OBJECTIVE 1

To establish different thresholds for menthol level in cigarettes and identify optimum menthol level or levels.

Plan

Complete study already initiated by April 1.

OBJECTIVE 2

Attempt to develop research addressed to following questions:

(a) How much reduction in TPM delivery can we expect the typical smoker to tolerate over the next five years?

(b) Can we forecast the stabilization level in the percentage of the U.S. population who smoke cigarettes?

(c) Is there any product that can potentially replace the cigarette in need-gratification?

Plan

Non-schedulable. The task is one of problem solution in research design.

OBJECTIVE 3

To develop instrumentation and procedures for monitoring the psychophysiological state and responsivity of the free-roaming human and apply this technology to a study of the psychophysiological state and/or responsivity of cigarette smokers relative to non-smokers.

Plan

(1) Instrument acquisition and calibration by May 1, 1969.

(2) Hard-line preliminary runs with human subjects completed by December 31, 1969.

OBJECTION 4

To attempt to teach a rat to seek the inhalation of cigarette smoke.

Plan

An informal small-scale (no budget) exploration in which principles of operant conditioning will be applied to teaching the rat to inhale smoke first through reinforcement of the act by food or shock avoidant reward and ultimately through the reinforcing effect of the psychopharmacological effects of the inhaled smoke. No definite conclusion anticipated in 1969.

To: Dr. H. Wakeham
From: W. L. Dunn, Jr.
Date: August 1, 1969
Subject: A Trip Report—Discussions with Prof. Lazarsfeld on the Study of Discontinuing Smokers

I spent six hours with Dr. Paul Lazarsfeld on Wednesday. Following lunch together, I sat with him in his office in the Sociology Dept. of Columbia University, later attending as his guest a status conference on the on-going drug addiction study for New York State. The conference was held in the off-campus building housing the Bureau of Applied Social Research. I met several of his doctoral staff members and observed the graduate student interviewing staff as they participated in the conference proceedings. I was favorably impressed.

We have made great strides towards initiating the exploratory study of the experiences of smokers in their efforts to discontinue the habit. The agreed upon calendar of events calls for Dr. Lazarsfeld to submit a proposal to P.M. R&D prior to August 15. In turn I agreed to make immediately available to him copies of pertinent articles from the R&D Smoking and Health library, to be followed by a background bibliography of broader scope. Thereafter, pending acceptance of his proposal, dialogue between P.M. R&D and BASR staff will be addressed to the development of interview format and content.

I anticipate that his proposal will consist of a study of recidivists and cohort groups of abstainers, the latter consisting of one month, three-month, six-month and one-year abstainers. Subjects will be selected on a post-hoc basis, that is, their efforts to abstain will precede their entry into the study. Interviews will be retrospective probings into their daily lives during the period from the date of discontinuation to the date of the interview. The initial interviews will be loosely structured, with subsequent waves increasingly structured and focused. The progressive sharpening of the interview is to the achieved through Prof. Lazarsfeld's characteristic research style; a series of conferences in which interview material from new batches of interviews is studied in great detail for clues to pay-dirt, with subsequent interviews altered accordingly. I saw this approach in operation in the drug-addiction conference. In its current application it appears to be highly effective. I can see no reason why It should not be as effective for the proposed study.

We also discussed the idea of a steering committee. We noted the various forms this might take:

1. An unstructured group of consultants to Prof. Lazarsfeld as principle investigator.
2. A formally structured advisory group to the project.
3. The Board of the Stress Institute (in this case the Stress Institute would likely be the sponsor of the project).

He seemed equally amenable to all three, though expressing fascination with the third alternative. He pointed out that the task of creating an institute would require heavy commitment of time on someone's part over a period of many months.

As men of repute to advise, he is agreeable to Hans Selye (whom he does not know) and he suggested Prof. Stanley Schacter, a social psychologist of Columbia University who has recently been studying the effects of adrenalin on perceptual processes. We further agreed upon the wisdom of an additional psychologist closer to the physiological front. I named Dr. Frank Finger of the University of Virginia, widely known among psychologists and active in various governing bodies of the American Psychological Association. Another prospect that just occurred to me is Joseph D. Matarazzo, Chairman, Dept. of Medical Psychology, University of Oregon Medical School and writer of the source review of smoking psychology in 1960.

He displayed pleased surprise at our interest in the development of theory, although at this point it would be difficult to say whether this was diplomacy or genuine interest.

I also met and spoke briefly with George Brooks, his staff man formerly with Elmo Roper, confidante of Jet Lincoln, and key man in the series of smoker attitude surveys conducted in the early '60's by Roper for Philip Morris.

RYAN/DUNN ALTERNATE—THIRD VERSION OF BOARD PRESENTATION—DELIVERED WITH ONLY MINOR CHANGES (FALL 1969)

Gentlemen of the Board and guests:

Once again it is my pleasure to appear before you and to make this traditional annual presentation of Philip Morris Research Center activities. Before talking about that particular aspect of the program that I have selected for this year's presentation, let me