report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2016) ''An Act making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. NADLER:

At the end of title V, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. 516. (a) No funds made available under this Act may be used under title XI, XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act to pay any insurer if such insurer—

(1) offers monetary rewards or penalties, or other inducements to a licensed health care professional to influence his or her decision as to what constitutes medically necessary and appropriate treatments, tests, procedures, or services; or

(2) conditions initial or continued participation of the health care professional in a health insurance plan on the basis of the health care professional's decisions as to what constitutes medically necessary and appropriate treatments, tests, procedures, or services.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term ''insurer'' means an insurance company, insurance service, or insurance organization licensed to engage in the business of insurance in a State, a health maintenance organization, a preferred provider organization, and a provider sponsored organization.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term ''health care professional'' means a physician or other health care practitioner licensed, accredited, or certified to perform specified health services consistent with State law.

At the end of title V, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following section:

SEC. 516. (a) No funds made available under this Act may be used under title XI, XVIII or XIX of the Social Security Act to pay any insurer unless under health care coverage provided by such insurer—

(1) the determination of what is medically necessary and appropriate within the meaning of the insurance contract is made only by the treating health care professional in consultation with the patient; and

(2) the insurer covers the full cost of all treatment, tests, procedures, and services deemed to be medically necessary and appropriate by the treating health care professional in consultation with the patient, subject to any deductibles, co-payments, or percentage limitations provided in the insurance contract.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the term ''insurer'' means an insurance company, insurance service, or insurance organization licensed to engage in the business of insurance in a State, a health maintenance organization, a preferred provider organization, and a provider sponsored organization.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term ''treating health care professional'' means a physician or other health care practitioner licensed, accredited, or certified to perform specified health services consistent with State law, who is directly involved in the care of said patient.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring the provision of coverage for benefits not otherwise covered.

Mr. NADLER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Without objection, the amendments are considered en bloc and considered as read.

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, we all know that there have been many, many complaints and horror stories about the conduct of some health maintenance organizations or HMO's. It is news to no one that HMO cost-cutting measures are fast becoming an issue of vital concern and often life and death to many of our constituents.

We witnessed the subordination of health to profits just last year during the debate over the so-called drive-through deliveries, and some Members have introduced legislation dealing with drive-through mastectomies. It would certainly be silly for Congress to attempt to deal with this problem procedure-by-procedure, to have one bill for mastectomies and another for tonsillectomies, and so forth and so on.

Many of the States have enacted legislation to deal with this problem, but the State legislation cannot impact Medicare and Medicaid, and for that matter, is barred from dealing with employer insurance where it is self-insured because of ERISA.

These two amendments would protect HMO patients on two fronts. One amendment would simply say that most insurance contracts say that they will have a list of covered services, and say they will pay for any of those covered services, whether it be a gall bladder operation or whatever, if it is determined that that service is medically appropriate and necessary.

This amendment says it is the doctor, the health care professional dealing with the patient, who makes the determination whether it is medically necessary and appropriate, and that no funds can be spent to reimburse an HMO unless their procedures say that the doctor makes that determination, not a utility reviewer sitting thousands of miles away at a computer console. We all have heard complaints from doctors saying that they spend two-thirds of their time arguing with people who have never seen the patient about whether the patient needs a CAT scan or to see a specialist or needs an operation. This amendment simply says the doctor dealing with the patient determines what is medically necessary and appropriate and not someone else.

The second amendment says that when the doctor or the nurse or the physical therapist determines whether a service is medically necessary and appropriate, that decision should be made on the basis of medical necessity, not on the basis of cost. This amendment says that one cannot fund an HMO if the procedures of that HMO give an incentive to the doctor to effect that decision. One cannot say to the doctor, ''If you determine too many people need CAT scans, too many people need to see a specialist, we will pay you less money or we will knock you out of the plan; if you determine that very few people need expensive services, we will pay you more money.'' That sets up an institutionalized conflict of interest.

If someone came to a Member of the House and said, ''We will pay you if you vote this way or that way,'' that would be called bribery, it is a crime. But if someone comes to a doctor, if the HMO comes to a doctor and says, ''We will pay you more money if you decide that Mr. Smith and Mrs. Jones together do not need certain services,'' that sets up an institutionalized conflict of interest between the doctor's medical judgment and his pocketbook, and we should have no such conflicts of interest.

These two practices of someone other than the doctor saying why is it medically necessary, someone who has never seen the patient, and offering the doctor monetary incentives to make cheaper decisions and penalties if he makes more expensive decisions, put cost ahead of health, and they must be stopped.

So these two amendments say Medicare and Medicaid cannot pay for HMO services unless those procedures are changed so that the doctor makes the decision of what is medically necessary and appropriate, not the insurance company, and so that doctors are not pressured by financial incentives to decide what medical procedure is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have not gotten a waiver for these amendments from the Committee on Rules and that they will be ruled out of order, but I thought it important to air this on the House floor, and I will not request a vote on the amendments. I will save the gentleman the trouble of making his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendments?

Mr. NADLER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RIGGS

Mr. RIGGS. 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. RIGGS:

Page 102, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 516. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMISSIONS PREFERENCES IN PUBLIC EDUCATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Education to withhold any financial assistance, or to impose, administer, or enforce any other penalty, sanction, or remedy, for the refusal or failure of a Federal grant recipient to enforce a preference or affirmative action plan based on race, sex, color ethnicity, or national origin for admissions to public educational institutions.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The limitation established in subsection (a) shall apply only to Federal grant recipients located in a State in which the enforcement of such preference or plan is prohibited by the laws of the State or by an order of a Federal court.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this is a very controversial and I hope serious amendment, deserving far more debate than time will permit on the House floor today, so I want to indicate to the Chairman and to my colleagues at the outset that it is my intent, respecting obviously the reservation of a point of order which has been lodged against my amendment, to withdraw my amendment at the conclusion of my remarks or at the conclusion of the remarks of anyone who wishes to speak on the amendment.

However, I hope this is just the beginning of a congressional and national debate on the whole issue of gender and racial preferences in governmental hiring policies, in governmental contracting policies, and in college admissions. As most of my colleagues I believe probably know by now, the people of California spoke loud and clear last November when they approved by a 54 percent margin Proposition 209, otherwise known as the California Civil Rights Initiative, which prohibits race and sex references in affirmative action programs in State and local government, education, employment, and contracting.

As our Gov. Pete Wilson, the primary proponent of Proposition 209, said, and I quote, ''This brings us one step closer to a colorblind society, to ending unfair racial preferences, and to judging people based upon the content of their character rather than the color of their skin.''

As we prepare to enter the new decade, the new century, the new millennium, I cannot think of anything better than when that big ball drops on Time Square, that it really does signify the beginning of a new decade, a new era when people really will be judged on the content of their character rather than the color of their skin.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, is intended to prevent the U.S. Department of Education, through their office of civil rights, from pursuing any sort of legal remedies using funding under this spending bill against a State such as California where the voters have, by a statewide referendum, a statewide ballot initiative, prohibited granting racial or gender preferences in college admissions. Of course, this initiative or these voter sentiments would apply to the California State university system and the very august and distinguished University of California system.

It is interesting also to note, I say to my colleagues, that a Federal appeals court recently upheld the constitutionality of Proposition 209, which has been subject to legal and constitutional challenges almost from the day the California voters voted for its enactment.

Now, my concern, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, is that there is some preliminary indication that the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education disagrees with the people of California and may very well attempt to investigate, should the constitutionality and legality of Proposition 209 ultimately be upheld by the highest court of the land, may intend to pursue some sort of investigation that could lead to sanctions against any of the California universities and colleges that fall under the provisions of Proposition 209.

In fact, I am quoting now from a letter sent to me on May 1 of this year by Norma Cantu, the Assistant Secretary in the Department of Education who heads up the Office of Civil Rights, and she says, and I quote now, ''It is the position of the Department of Education that outside the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, the Department believes it is permissible for an educational institution that receives Federal funding to consider race or national origin in an appropriate manner in either its admissions or financial aid programs in order to achieve a diverse student body, consistent with Justice Powell's opinion in the landmark Supreme Court case of the Regents of the University of California v. Bakke.''

Well, the problem with that, colleagues, is that Proposition 209 effectively reversed, it overturned the Bakke decision, at least as it applies to admissions policies at the University of California.

She goes on to say, ''In addition, outside the 5th Circuit, we believe it is permissible for a State institution to consider race or national origin in an appropriate manner in admissions or financial aid programs in order to remedy past discrimination in State educational systems.''

Well, the problem with that, of course, is it not only flies in the face of what California voters wanted, but we now know in California that these well-intentioned affirmative action policies actually result in discrimination against other minority groups.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, in fact it has been well documented that the existing admissions policies at the University of California discriminate against the minority group Asian-Americans. So what we are trying to do here is make sure that the Department of Education, through my amendment, is not able to withhold Federal funding or pursue other sanctions against California universities if they eliminate, as they are required to do by Proposition 209 and the people of California, race-based preferences in college admissions.

My amendment would prevent State universities from being caught in this odd position of either defying a Federal court or losing millions of dollars, potentially losing millions of dollars in Federal funding. My amendment would, as I said, prohibit the Department of Education from withholding funds from schools, from colleges and universities located in States that have a law or a court order prohibiting affirmative action, like California, again through Proposition 209, the California Civil Rights Initiative.

I just want to clarify one other thing for my colleagues. There are claims now that the repeal of race-based preferences or affirmative action admissions in California have had an effect on applications and admissions at the postgraduate schools at the University of California, the professional schools.

□ 1230

So far the results have been very mixed in California. Boalt Hall, which is the University of California at Berkeley's prestigious law school, the incoming class, as has been reported in the news media, contains only one African-American student. That came after black admissions dropped 81 percent, and the 14 individuals who got into the University of California Berkeley law school, Boalt Hall, decided to go elsewhere.

But at the University of California's five medical schools, although the number of minority applicants dropped, the American public enrollment will be about the same, 69 versus 73 students.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. RIGGS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, so this has occurred in the aftermath of Proposition 209. There has not been this chilling effect, at least at the University of California medical schools, that some people have suggested as a result of California voters expressing their will and passing Proposition 209.

So, Mr. Chairman, I realize, again, that the time is inadequate today to

properly debate this issue. I know there are people of sincere good will on both sides of this issue who would like to engage in this debate. So let me signal to my colleagues that I intend, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, to raise this issue again later this fall or early next year when we bring the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act before the committee and ultimately before the House.

I hope that we can have a debate that will go to the heart of Federal preferences based on race and gender in Government contracting policies as well as in college admissions, and I hope ultimately we will be able to eliminate affirmative action quotas in the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] continue to reserve his objection?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my objection, and I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed that the gentleman has offered an amendment that would undermine our country's civil rights enforcement. This amendment would bar the Department of Education's enforcement authority from seeking remedial action where there has been discrimination in admissions by a college, university, or school.

In truth, this amendment turns the clock back on civil rights enforcements to the pre-Civil War concept of interposition and nullification, where States decided that the Federal law would apply. This amendment weakens the Department's civil rights enforcement. It would create a chaotic patchwork of civil rights protections.

The Department's Office of Civil Rights has never attempted to take enforcement action against a school's refusal to implement affirmative action that was not necessary to remedy discrimination. Schools or colleges may be required to use affirmative action only if a court or the Office of Civil Rights has determined a school violated civil rights laws, and that affirmative action was necessary to remedy discrimination.

In fact, the Department has not charged that Proposition 209 violates the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The complaints made against the California schools only challenge whether the current admissions policies of the schools violate civil rights laws. The Department of Education has made no threats to cut off aid. It does not and never has required quotas or affirmative action for diversity purposes.

The author of this amendment has no evidence to substantiate the allegations he has made regarding the Department. This is a poorly conceived, poorly drafted measure that is without purpose, other than to play to racial fears. I urge its rejection.

Mr. Chairman, continuing to reserve my point of order, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in his opposition to this amendment. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that despite the drastic school resegregation that is taking place in both California and Texas, that we are considering an amendment that would encourage the resegregation of other schools around the country.

Mr. Chairman, the University of Texas Law School, which had no blacks until ordered by the Federal courts, will have no African-Americans in this year's first year class. The University of California at Berkeley Law School will only have one African-American in its first year law school. Medical schools have also registered drops in African-American enrollment of 80 and 90 percent, numbers which are the lowest since the 1960's.

Instead of being appalled by the resegregation of our schools in Texas and California, this amendment applauds turning back the clock and encourages other States to follow suit. It prevents the Federal authorities from determining whether the absence of blacks is mere coincidence or an intentional result of an invidious discrimination, and it prevents the Federal Government from remedying illegal discrimination.

The provision of this amendment which gives the States the ability to opt out of civil rights enforcement is particularly egregious. It suggests a bizarre interpretation of Federalism in which a State can exempt itself from Federal enforcement of civil rights laws simply by passing a statute, even if that statute is not enforced.

Mr. Chairman, the State institutions who receive Federal funds have the responsibility of ensuring that those funds are being disbursed in a manner that does not discriminate against minorities and women. But if they fail in that responsibility, then the Federal authorities must vigorously enforce title XI and title IX of the Civil Rights Act.

Mr. Chairman, Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, writing for the majority in the Adarand decision, stated, and I quote, ''The unhappy persistence of both the practice and lingering effects of racial discrimination against minority groups in this country is an unfortunate reality, and government is not disqualified from acting in response to it.''

This amendment would effectively disqualify us from acting responsibly to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to become productive members of our society.

I therefore urge the Members of this body to support diversity in education, oppose the resegregation of America's schools, and vote ''no'' on this amendment.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there other amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOEKSTRA

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOEKSTRA:

Page 102, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 516. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act for the Department of Education are revised by reducing the amount made available for ''Education Reform'', increasing the amount made available for ''School Improvement Programs'' (and the amount specified under such heading to become available on July 1, 1998), reducing the amount made available for Eisenhower professional development State grants under the heading ''School Improvement Programs'', increasing the amount made available for innovative education program strategies State grants under the heading ''School Improvement Programs'', reducing the amount made available for ''Bilingual and Immigrant Education'', reducing the amount made available for ''Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement'', and reducing the amount made available for ''Departmental Management—Program Administration'', by $1,022,165,000, $1,734,274,000, $310,000,000, $2,791,662,000, $354,000,000, $322,600,000, and $35,509,000, respectively.

Mr. HOEKSTRA (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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, and that the time be divided between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], 20 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], 10 minutes, and myself, 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today, I want to talk about what the Hoekstra block grant amendment would do. What we are focusing on here is moving the emphasis on where decisionmaking is in education from Washington to our children. This is a step toward moving decisionmaking back to parents and moving dollars to the classroom. This is about providing flexibility at the State level.

The status quo today in Washington is 760 programs, 100 billion dollars' worth of spending. What we are proposing to do is to take 28 programs and

about $2.7 billion of spending and put it into a single block grant, or move it into chapter II of funding, so we give maximum flexibility to the States to do what they believe is most appropriate for the students, the children, and the parents in their State.

Over the past year, year and a half, we have gone around the country taking a look at what works and what is wasted in education. What we are finding is very exciting. What is working in education is the reform and innovation that is going on at the State level. Whether we are in Cleveland, whether we are in New York City, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, Phoenix, Louisville, there are exciting things going on in education. Education is actually turning around, and we are getting the kinds of results we would like to have.

As we talk to parents, as we talk to children, as we talk to educators and administrators, the message is very clear: They are turning around their educational system and getting positive results because of the impact and the decisions they are making at the local level, not because of what we are doing in Washington.

As a matter of fact, too often we find that Washington is a hindrance in driving the kind of reform and change we need at the local level. States will tell us, we get 6 percent of our money from Washington, we get 50 percent of our paperwork. We get all kinds of mandates that inhibit the kind of change that we would like to be making.

We cannot defend that type of status quo, where Washington is standing in the way of reform at the State and local level for a resource as precious as our children. What we see today is, in this area, we see 28 different programs where the directions and decisions about how those dollars are spent and what happens in the classroom are made by people here in Washington; where the local level has to look not to parents for what they want to do, but they have to look to bureaucrats and rules and regulations in Washington.

Here is just one example. These are the forms, not the completed forms, the forms, rules, and regulations that the State of Michigan has to fill out to get their money from Washington. This is what the State fills out, and this is duplicated thousands of times as we go around the State, as we go to individual schools and educational districts. That is not value-added.

We had testimony here in Washington where one of the administrators from a school district in Pennsylvania said, you know, 25 percent of the money that I get from Washington never gets to the classroom, never gets to the kids. I need to spend 25 percent of the Washington money just to fill out the Washington paperwork. That is not value-added.

We need not a Washington-based program that delivers us these kinds of programs and this kind of complexity. We need to move to an approach that does not focus on bureaucracy and goes through thousands of bureaucrats to get to a student. We need the focus to be on the student, on the child, where teachers can look at the child, not at the bureaucrats; where parents can focus on the children, and not the bureaucrats, so that we really are driving the dollars to the classroom where we have the leverage.

It is time to take another look at education. It is time to have true reform and move decisionmaking back to the local level, back to the parents, and away from bureaucrats in Washington. The exciting thing, as I said, is the change and improvements we are seeing in education at the local level: Real progress, real innovation, and real movement away from what one of our administrators described as the three B's, when she dealt with Washington and her local bureaucracy.

□ 1245

Mr. Chairman, the administrator said, Miss Yvonne Chan said, ''When I focused, and before I started running the charter school, I focused on the three B's.'' We said, ''What are the 3 B's?'' She said, ''I had to focus on bussing, on budget and the buts. And the 'but' was, every time I had a good idea, I got the answer back from the local administrators or from Federal rules and regulations that said, 'That is a great idea, but you cannot do that. If we let you do that, but then we would have to let everybody else do it.'' She said, ''I had great ideas on how I could help my kids in my school but the rules and the regulations got in the way.''

She has now been freed up from many of the State's regulations. What we now want to do is free her up from the Federal regulations.

This is the beginning of the debate. Later on I will ask permission to withdraw this amendment, because this will continue and this is going to be a process. But this process and this dialog has to take place and it has to take place on this amendment, because what is happening is there is a different way to help our kids than the model that is currently in place.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], the ranking member of the appropriate committee of jurisdiction.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I first of all want to thank the gentleman for yielding me this time; second, I oppose this irresponsible amendment because it would tear the heart out of critical education programs. It would subject programs such as school-to-work grants, safe and drug-free schools, bilingual education and magnet schools to the whims and fancy of 50 different Governors.

These programs have been vigorously supported by parents, teachers, local and State officials who attest to their great success. There is absolutely no justification other than crass political motives to gut these important initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, more troubling, many of the programs affected by this amendment are targeted to school districts and children most in need. This disastrous amendment would increase instead of decrease the disparity of resources in our public schools. I do not believe anyone who has seriously looked at the needs of our schools believes writing a blank check is the way to improve those schools.

This amendment also plays havoc with the amount of funding State and local educational agencies would receive. Louisiana would lose $6 million in funding, or a 16-percent decrease; Mississippi would lose $4 million; and New York State would lose $46 million. At the local level, some education agencies would lose significant funding.

This amendment would also cause mass disruption in existing services to our students. It is incredibly ironic that the sponsor of this amendment claims to want to send more dollars to the classroom and yet this amendment would have the perverse effect of moving dollars out of the classroom and into State bureaucracies. Title I now only allows 1 percent of the money to be used for administration. Under this amendment, State bureaucracies could claim up to 15 percent of the funds.

Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that the majority in this Congress thinks it is smart politics to attack teachers, to bash public education, and to promote school vouchers. I do not think so, and I urge Republicans to stop playing politics with America's schools. I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a superficially very alluring amendment. It seemingly would consolidate many programs and reduce redtape. The problem is, when analyzed further, the amendment is in a sense, a pernicious one, based, I think, upon a faulty premise. I do not think it would work the way the authors would expect and it would disrupt State and local funding for education.

This amendment and the Gorton amendment in the Senate, which it attempts to mimic, is a form, in my judgment, of revenue sharing, a policy that was adopted, tried, and ultimately rejected by the Congress and the American people many years ago. Revenue sharing was based on the premise that the progressive income tax would forever create increasing revenues and would not serve as a drag on the economy. We now know better. Revenue sharing was based on the premise that it was good for one level of government to collect money and provide it as a general subsidy to another level of government. We now know better.

We learned that States and localities never felt these funds were a secure source and, thus, used the money for one-time projects or low-priority programs. The very nature of the funding

source turned it into a categorical grant that localities would use only for programs that could be terminated if funding ceased, and few of these programs exist in education. Experience indicates that localities would view the money made available in this amendment, perhaps, in the same way.

The amendment would consolidate funding for programs such as safe and drug-free schools and technology programs. Mr. Chairman, this amendment creates massive winners and losers with little, if any, policy justification.

I requested an analysis by the Congressional Research Service of the distribution of funds. They were able in a very short time to provide the current distribution for $1.7 billion of the over $2.5 billion in what I believed to be the most recent version of the Hoekstra amendment. Now there has been a more recent version than that.

The remaining amounts are in small discretionary programs. If we look at the analysis, and we cannot put specific figures on the distribution of funds at this time because the amendment has changed so recently, but it appears very clearly that California, for example, would lose substantial funds; Louisiana would lose money; Mississippi, a particularly poor State, would lose funding; New York would lose substantial amounts of funds; Oklahoma would lose money; Texas would lose money.

Conversely, States such as Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, Iowa, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and others would receive large increases. While these are, in some cases, needy States, as all States are in a sense, they are hardly States with the greatest numbers of needy students.

This amendment would terminate funding for a number of small programs that many Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed support for, both to me personally and to the subcommittee. These include Very Special Arts, Education for Homeless Children and Youth, the Close-Up Program, International Education Exchange, Civics Education, which supports We The People Program, the National Writing Project, the Javits Gifted and Talented Program.

The committee bill itself, Mr. Chairman, increases the title VI block grant by $40 million, an increase of 13 percent, and we have continually worked to increase the funding level of this program. When we started in 1996, the program was funded at $250 million, it is now $340 million in the bill before the House.

But that does not mean that we should increase it by billions of dollars, because the assumption then is that a State block grant program, and this is a State block grant program, can assure the best decisions. In my judgment, we have to be very careful that we not substitute State bureaucracy for Federal bureaucracy.

It was said before that a lot of money is siphoned off by the Department in respect to programs that it administers. In rough figures, the Department administers about $50 billion in Federal funds through discretionary funds, mandatory funds, and off-budget spending and the overhead costs of those are about $800 million, or about 4 percent. Ninety-six percent of the money goes either to the States or to the local government or to students that are in need or are provided for under Federal programs.

I think the effect of this amendment politically would be very clear. It would destroy the bipartisan support for the bill and increase rather than decrease the leverage of President Clinton, since ultimate passage of the bill, if it occurs, will be with a narrow majority, I believe.

So I think the authors of this amendment are very wise. They have indicated to me that they will withdraw the amendment. I think that is a very wise decision. On the other hand, I strongly agree with them that a good debate on this subject, looking at all the facts involved and looking for the formation of better policies in the future, is all to the benefit of this body.

I believe that this amendment would not do what the proponents believe that it would do; that its impact on the distribution of funds has no policy justification and that would hurt some States while helping others. We ought to look very, very hard before an amendment that moves this massive amount of money from programs that have been tried, tested, and found working to a simple block grant administered by State bureaucracies.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MARTINEZ], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, once again, we have those on the other side of the aisle attempting to score political points at the cost of our Nation's children and the educational system which provides for them.

The Hoekstra amendment, which will essentially gut the provisions of numerous Federal education programs intended to ensure educational excellence and equality, is an ill-conceived and destructive policy statement that no Member in this House should support.

As the body knows, a similar, but not identical amendment was passed by the Senate during their consideration of the Labor/HHS appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, my fellow Education Committee colleague, Mr. HOEKSTRA, has latched onto the message of the Gorton amendment and is now attempting to break what, for the most part, has been a careful bipartisan balance on this bill. Fortunately, the President has realized the complete lack of a policy basis for such an amendment and has issued a statement saying he would veto any bill which contained either the Gorton amendment or a similar provision. Ladies and gentlemen, the Hoekstra amendment meets the President's criteria for a veto. This amendment will gut the existing focus of excellence and equality in present Federal programs. Consider some of the programs which this amendment will transfer funds away from: title I, safe and drug-free schools, education technology, Eisenhower Professional Development, magnet schools assistance, bilingual education, and school-to-work, just to name a few. All of these programs focus heavily on providing Federal assistance to States, local education agencies, and schools which are in need of additional funding.

The loss of funding for these programs will take the largely poverty emphasis away from Federal funding efforts in education. Unfortunately, the program to which all of these funds are being transferred to has little if any requirement that poverty be a factor in distribution.

In addition to the very real concern of losing our existing poverty focus if this amendment were to become law, Members should consider how their individual school districts will be impacted.

Those Members who would support this amendment should realize that the current funding streams which are going to their districts could be jeopardized. For example, those States and locals who were recently awarded technology grants by the Department of Education should be aware that the funding for these grants would be absorbed into the title VI block grant—and not distributed as currently envisioned. As a Member whose local school districts have received such a grant, I am especially concerned about the impact of this amendment.

Lastly, members should realize that the vital provisions ensuring accountability in the programs which Mr. HOEKSTRA is seeking to defund will be lost. Gone will be the ability of both Congress and the Department to ensure that Federal tax dollars are being spent in an effective manner. In a time when educational resources are consistently growing scarce, now is not the time to nullify these important provisions.

I urge Members to vote against this ill-conceived and baseless amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for the reasons enunciated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, who both spoke eloquently and effectively to the merits.

I want to say to my friend from Michigan, Mr. HOEKSTRA, that I have a bill in and it is called the Family Services Improvement Act. It seeks to make it easier for local LEA's and States and counties and cities to apply for Federal funds, and seeks to put the burden on the Federal Government, not on the local entities, to coordinate their resources to make it easier to access, to help the children that the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Michigan and myself, and everybody on this floor, in fact, want to help.

So although I oppose the gentleman's amendment, I think that the idea that the gentleman expresses in terms of maximizing resources so that children can be better educated, families can be better served, is an objective in a time of fiscal constraint that we need to pursue with vigor.

Mr. Chairman, there is a 7-year-old with a learning disability in my district. This second grader receives special assistance from her school so she can keep up with her class. But because of the financial constraints of her school district, the little girl only receives help because the school district receives specifically designated Federal education funds. And so today, I want to make sure that my colleagues understand just what a drastic effect this amendment would have on all of the children throughout this country who need our help.

The Hoekstra amendment would block grant Federal K through 12 education funding as general education aid without addressing Federal priorities or providing for any program accountability. Mr. Chairman, program accountability must not be overlooked. The Federal programs that this amendment would consolidate have strong accountability requirements that focus on program effectiveness, a crucial requirement for any Federal program.

A vote in favor of this amendment would eliminate the specific national purposes of the Federal investment in education. Under this amendment, Federal funds would not have to be used for their intended purpose. Local education agencies would have an unlimited discretion to spend Federal K through 12 education funds for any purpose they deem appropriate, including noneducational purposes. The current formulas provide funding on the basis of need.

The amendment would drastically reduce the targeting of Federal funds to the most disadvantaged students and neediest school districts. The purpose of Federal education funding is to ensure that school districts and disadvantaged students are not overlooked and receive the resources they so desperately need. The Hoekstra amendment would actually direct a greater percentage of Federal funds to the State educational agencies rather than directly to the school district under the current system.

And, Mr. Chairman, there is another important fact that has been overlooked by my colleagues on the other side of the isle. The Hoekstra amendment breaches the bipartisan budget agreement that this legislative body entered into earlier this year. Specifically, the agreement allowed for the President's budget request for Goals 2000, education technology, and bilingual education. This amendment effectively strips funding for all three important programs by consolidating them into title 6 block grants.

I would urge my colleagues not to overlook that 7-year-old with the learning disability who looks to us for help. She will fall through the cracks if we vote to pass this amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my colleague from Maryland, and we will take a look at that. I think we both understand and appreciate that there is a problem out there with the Federal bureaucracy and the Federal paperwork.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for the Hoekstra amendment to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. As a former math and science teacher, as the father of three children who went through the public school system in Pennsylvania, I have, for a long time, been involved with education. Since becoming a Member of Congress, I have begun to investigate the Federal Government's impact on our educational system and, frankly, I do not like some of the things I see.

We are wasting a lot of money on bureaucracy. The Hoekstra amendment would help put an end to this practice by sending billions of dollars directly to the States and local school districts and to the classrooms where they are most effective. We must shift the focus of the education debate from Washington to our local communities. We need to listen to the local folks who are trying to teach our local children.

One of my school superintendents, Dr. Charles Garris, came and testified recently before the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and he gave his district's personal experience. If I can sum it up, basically he said that at the local level 25 percent of the funds never reach the students that they are intended to serve. Again, 25 percent never reach the students.

Today, let us support the Hoekstra amendment, which draws the line in the sand, the distinction between those who want to continue the status quo and those who want to continue the education system in which 40 percent of American 8-year-olds cannot even read; those who want to empower bureaucracy and those who want to get education dollars to the classroom; those who want to give local teachers the tools they need to teach kids; those who want to empower parents. We have a choice.

It has been shown time and time again that the Federal Government has created excessive red tape, regulations, paperwork and unproven programs and that we cannot get the dollars to the classroom and to students. So in this battle I think we need to join the gentleman from Michigan to expand the flexibility of the States and give them the funds.

□ 1300

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and want to commend its author for bringing forward what I think is a very bold and vital policy for us to set forth for the national government on education. It essentially poses the choice between a child-centered program that gets money to the schools to benefit our Nation's children or a Washington-centered approach that keeps the money here, keeps the strings tied to Washington on how that money will be spent, and does not allow our teachers, our school administrators, our parents to make decisions on how to use those resources to best benefit the children and their schools.

Let me tell my colleagues that over the August break I visited several schools in my district and talked with teachers, administrators, parents and students; and the one thing that came up in schools in rural areas and schools in more suburban towns, in schools that are like the inner-city districts in many of our States, they all said that their biggest problem is that they spend time filling out paperwork that comes from Washington rather than spending time teaching children in the classroom. That has to change.

This amendment is a tremendous step forward in moving to that new approach where we say we are going to fully fund the educational needs of this country, but we are not going to attach strings coming out of Washington on how that money is spent and best used for our children. We are going to let the people who know, the teachers, the local school boards, the parents, decide how to make the most out of those funds to help children who are disabled get the extra programs they need, to help children who are gifted and talented get the extra resources they need, to help the students that are in the middle to be able to have a classroom where they learn the skills and the knowledge that they will need to be the future leaders and future citizens of this country.

So I strongly support this amendment. I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for bringing it forward, and I look forward to working with him in the future in the authorizing committee in moving this type of policy forward as we set forth the clear difference between the Washington-centered approach, which is the old way of spending education money, and this new, bold approach that is a child-centered approach that I am convinced will be the best thing for America's children.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair will advise that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] has 9½ minutes remaining, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for yielding.

As a parent and former school teacher myself I know firsthand the vital role that good schools play in our children's future. And I would like to thank my good friend from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for offering this amendment, and for bringing his committee to my district in Cincinnati and looking at education and seeing what works there firsthand. This past May his committee came there, and we had many, many programs that we looked into and found out how they work there.

The education reforms that we saw in Cincinnati were local initiatives that took root in schools only after being nourished by parents and teachers and local businesses and local folks. I want to emphasize that the Federal Department of Education played virtually no role in this at all. These were things that grew up locally and work very well.

The amendment today would block grant 28 Federal programs into one block grant and the money has to be used in the classrooms. It can be used to purchase books, computers, but not to support the Federal bureaucracy.

What this amendment does is it focuses the money and the attention on what really works in the classroom. Do we want to spent money in the classroom, or do we want to spend it on bureaucrats here in Washington? I support the Hoekstra amendment. I say let us spend money in the classroom, not on bureaucrats here in Washington.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker left, so I will reserve my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me the time.

I rise reluctantly to oppose the Hoekstra amendment, reluctantly because I think that the sponsor of the amendment has done a great job in the Committee on Education and the Workforce and sincerely has the best interests of children and education at heart. But I do not agree with the concepts of this particular amendment.

I think we really need to review the role of what the Federal Government is doing in accountability. There are, I believe, 28 programs that are affected here, all the way from Goals 2000 to Safe and Drug-Free Schools, some parts which have worked, others perhaps not worked. But these programs have been specifically created at the Federal Government level, usually to fill a need which is not being served at the local level, and are aimed at that purpose.

If we do block grant these funds, it essentially means that we turn all the money over to a local government, we remove almost all the accountability that we have now. And there may be too much paperwork, and I think those statements are correct that we should be looking at these things at the authorization level. The committee should be examining these particular areas.

But the bottom line is that the money is turned over. We do not know how the money would be expended. And clearly all these programs, it would probably in some way or another result in a lot of them may be eliminated altogether. And yet, they would all seem to have some fairly good cause.

We also do not know to whom we are always turning it over. We complain about the District of Columbia schools, and yet we would be turning the money over to that as well as to other areas. I support the goal of what is happening here. It is my judgment that we are putting the cart before the horse.

It is my judgment that the Committee on Education and the Workforce should sit down and go over this with some care and make recommendations, and then it should go to an appropriation. This is not the way we should be doing business, by having it come up in the Senate and then all of a sudden, out of blue air, have an amendment be brought up in the House of Representatives. I think it is too much, too fast. I do not think it reflects Federal priorities, and I do not think it should be included in the appropriations process.

As I said, there may be some merit to block granting these programs, but it should be through a deliberate reauthorization process. For all these reasons, I would hope we withhold and oppose the amendment at this time.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, did not invent this out of blue air. He has been working on this issue for some time, and he has always favored block granting.

It is not a question whether or not we believe there should be more emphasis on education. Those of us who are parents realize, with the possible exception of family values and strong personal values and the importance of moral values, nothing is more important than our children and education.

It is a question of who is going to make the decision regarding our children's education. Is it going to be parents, local school boards, teachers, and the State, or is it going to be the Federal Government? It is not a question of where the money goes, but who is micromanaging, how that money is used.

For example, I think as we work through some standards this fall, and the gentleman agreed to withdraw the amendment at this point, if we are going to bring tax dollars to Washington and send them out, holding people accountable is justified. But they should be minimal. When we have two different programs trying to decide how much exactly goes in a drug-free school, how much exactly goes into the arts or whatever, I think those decisions should be made back in Indiana, in my case, rather than here in Washington.

I strongly support the concept of, if we cannot get all the money in the classrooms, at least getting it 600 miles closer to my home State where those decisions are going to be made. I believe that the Hoekstra bill moves this in that direction.

We are starting a debate that is likely to go on through this fall and into next year as we all try to decide not whether our children should be educated but how. And I have more confidence in the school boards of this country, in the parents of this country, in the teachers of this country then to say the fount of all wisdom is here in Washington.

I believe in Indiana we understand that we have a drug problem and that those drug problems can be allocated to the schools where they can be treated, and that we can make them work more efficiently than the way we are currently providing. I believe that a society without arts and culture is damaging. But I do not believe that arts and culture just flow from this building or the buildings down the street in the Education Department and the White House. I believe they flow out of the local community. And that is what this amendment does.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] has given us a unique opportunity today to debate a 20-year-old Federal power grab in education. Those in Washington, who think they know best, continue their assault on local control of schools, putting the future of our students in the hands of the Washington Department of Education.

The lesson of the last 20 years of Federal education policy is clear. Having a centralized Federal authority imposes one-size-fits-all approaches to public education that just simply do not work.

Chairman Johnny Isakson of the Georgia Board of Education made the case against Federal control over education earlier this year. He noted that, and I quote,

> There are simply too many dollars scattered in far too many programs managed by far too many agencies. If the dollars spent could be concentrated, the management less disbursed, then more of the money would actually flow into education and out of administration.

We should join the gentleman from Michigan in supporting this amendment so that we may begin enacting education reforms locally that enhance basic academics, increase parental involvement, and focus attention where it belongs, on our children and on our local classrooms.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] for yielding me the time, and certainly to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and even to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

I rise today to express strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA], my colleague and friend. I think this amendment and the debate over national testing really go to the heart of a very serious question: ''What role should the Federal Government play in educating our Nation's children?''

It is mind-boggling in many ways to listen to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], talk about a power grab in education when the Federal Government spends less than 7 percent of moneys we spend on educating elementary and secondary students in this Nation.

I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS], and those on the other side of the aisle, that this is a national security issue.

When we look at schools here in this District of Columbia and throughout America that are crumbling, without air-conditioning, without proper wiring to bring technology into the classroom, these are our future workers, our future State lawmakers. Since it is clear that you all have an affinity for the State and State lawmakers, these are the future State lawmakers that you choose to devolve power to. These are the future scientists and astronauts and pastors and business people. We have an obligation here at the Federal level to reach out to teachers and to parents and to communities to ensure that they educate our young people.

Oppose this amendment. And I appeal to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK].

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

If we are for our children and students, we support this amendment. If we are for more bureaucracy and more strings attached that take the money out of the classroom, then we are against this amendment.

When this block grant program was first created in 1981, 42 programs were put into one, 350 Federal bureaucrats were no longer needed, and for each Federal bureaucrat there are scores and hundreds at the local level that are having to apply for grants, fill out application forms, do compliance reports, do extra audits, and so forth. We are talking about being able to eliminate thousands of bureaucrats who take the money that we want to go into the classroom, and enabling that money to go into the classroom instead.

The U.S. Senate went on record in favor of this last week. Last year, I sponsored a lesser scale amendment that this House supported. I applaud the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] for expanding that and saying we want to take a bold step to help students, not to be supporting bureaucrats.

It takes the taxes of nine American families for each bureaucrat in Washington, DC, and there are similar numbers for all the additional bureaucrats that our State and local governments and our schools have to hire to deal with the Washington bureaucrats and the redtape and the paperwork that flows back and forth, and it does not help the kids.

Let us support this amendment and help children, not bureaucrats.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] and applaud him for offering this amendment.

There is a great debate going on in America, and times change. There was a point in the history of our Nation when we felt the best education policy should be in Washington, DC.

□ 1315

I suggest to my colleagues that time has changed. This amendment takes a giant step in the right direction toward advancing education, improving education in the classrooms of our children. I think it is best said that the money that reaches the teacher that knows my son Stephen's name and the money that reaches the teacher that knows my daughter Courtney's name is the best money spent in education. And the ideas that the teachers and the administrators at Stephen's school and Courtney's school have are better than ideas created and imposed top down thousands of miles away in Washington, DC.

We are not increasing a program here of the Federal Government. What we are doing is embracing a concept. That concept is simple and straightforward: That the best education and the best education reform can be created not in Washington, DC, thousands of miles away from where my daughter Courtney and my son Stephen go to school, but right there at Courtney's school and Stephen's school.

This amendment is a thoughtfully considered amendment which will advance the education of our children. I urge my colleagues to support it. It will, in fact, improve education in America. I urge them to embrace the concept.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment to rip the foundation out of our public school system.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to block grant Federal education funds. This is an assault on the Federal Government's important role in education, and a serious threat to the future of our students.

The Federal role in education is critical to maintaining a nationwide effort to improve our schools. To shift virtually all funding for elementary and secondary education programs to the title VI education block grant would drastically alter the Federal, State, and local partnerships that prepare our children for the future.

The Hoekstra amendment will eliminate 26 Federal education programs, including the bilingual and immigrant education program—which provides funding to school districts throughout the country to help more than 3 million limited English proficiency students to become proficient in English and achieve high standards.

The amendment would remove all requirements that local education agencies provide services for limited-English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, Native American students, immigrant students, or gifted and talented students. Funding will be eliminated for education technology, school-to-work programs, professional development, and teacher training. Funds normally targeted for these activities could be used for any purpose, even noneducational purposes.

This block grant provides no guarantee that the maximum amount of funds will reach the classroom. The title VI grants guarantees that only 85 percent of block grant funding must go to local school districts. Under the current title I program, States can retain only 1 percent of funding for administration. The block grant allows up to 15 percent.

While there is talk that each State will receive the same amount it does currently through these programs, we know historically that block grants do not sustain these funding levels. We have not yet received sufficient data to know the precise impact on schools in our districts and in our States. We do know that States with the neediest populations will be hardest hit, because targeting Federal funds to the neediest students and districts through title I formulas will be eliminated.

The progress that has been made in school districts under these priority programs will be completely disrupted. This amendment thoroughly devastates the Federal Government's commitment to strengthen accountability, raise academic standards, and ensure that all children posses the specific skills they need to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

We worked diligently in this subcommittee with our chairman and ranking member in an attempt to keep this bill free of controversial riders. The President will veto this bill with this provision included. This is not the bill or the forum in which to debate an issue that will be so wholly disruptive to our education system. Drastic revisions of our Nation's education policy should be considered carefully through the authorization process, not haphazardly tacked on to an appropriations bill.

This amendment is a thinly veiled first step to completely dismantle the Department of

Education. It rips the heart out of the priorities for our children's education that we have taken great pains to address in this bill. I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ETHERIDGE].

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to this amendment and encourage the gentleman to withdraw it because it literally will do away with the programs that help our children in the public schools.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hoekstra amendment to eliminate the vital functions of the Education Department.

As the former two-term superintendent of North Carolina's public schools—a statewide, elected position—I know firsthand the critical importance of the partnership between the Education Department and the State of this Nation. Make no mistake about it: this amendment would do great harm to the education and well-being of America's children.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I testified in front of the House Education Committee in defense of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, in opposition to the very same block grant scheme as this amendment. I told the committee that it is crucial that we maintain Safe and Drug-Free Schools as an Education Department priority because it is an essential component of our effort to develop a safe and secure environment for learning. The principle is very simple: our children cannot learn if they are not safe. We cannot expect our children to learn geometry if they are scared to death from gunfire. We cannot expect our teachers to teach effectively when the scourge of drugs invades their classrooms. And we cannot expect our parents to have any faith in our schools as learning institutions without the faith that they are free from drugs and violence. Safe and Drug-Free Schools plays an essential role in that effort, providing support to 97 percent of all school districts in the country.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools initiative is an effective and vitally important effort to improve our Nation's schools, this House should defeat this amendment's attempt to destroy that effort.

This misguided amendment would also eliminate School-to-Work, an innovative approach to help people gain the skills they need to compete and succeed in the modern workforce. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the most economically booming regions in the country. The unemployment rate in Raleigh-Durham is less than 2 percent. Driven by the technology sector, our economy is growing so rapidly that businesses cannot find workers with the training required for these jobs. Many of these jobs do not require a college education, and Schools-to-Work is an effective tool for skills training.

The Technology Challenge Fund, Goals 2000 education standards, and Eisenhower Teacher Training are all important education initiatives that would be eliminated by the Hoekstra amendment.

During the previous Congress, I served on the front lines of the effort to educate our children. When Members of the people's House tried to abolish the Department of Education it had a devastating effect on the morale of the men and women who teach our children. I came here to fight that effort, and I call on my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this ill-advised suggestion.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated at the beginning, this is the start of a larger debate of redefining how we help our children. As I have indicated, as we have gone around the country, we have seen wonderful things. We have seen wonderful things in public education. We have seen great innovations in public education. We have seen wonderful teachers who are motivated to help our children and help our children get a better education. At the same time we have run into a constant frustration at the State and the local level about the involvement of the Federal Government in setting priorities, in setting direction at the local level.

This amendment and this debate will be about how do we move dollars to students, how do we move decision-making to parents, and how do we increase flexibility for States, because we know that when we focus on basic academics, when we focus on our young people, when we get dollars into the classroom, and when we move decision-making back to parents and back to the local level is when we are seeing success. As we withdraw this amendment, recognize that we will come back to flesh out these ideas to move the money to students, decisionmaking to parents and flexibility to States.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, why are Republicans so afraid of labor unions? The Hoekstra amendment seeks to allow corruption to play a role in the elections of the largest labor union in the Nation. This amendment would pose such an additional financial burden on the Teamsters that it would prevent the effective organization and representation of its workers.

And this is what the Republicans are really trying to do. They are trying, through any means necessary, to destroy American labor unions. Actions like this throughout this Congress reveal true motives.

Are they afraid of workers having a representative voice? Are they afraid of workers having a voice in contract negotiations? Are they afraid of workers having fair and safe working conditions?

The use of the Republican slush fund to persecute working families and their Representatives combined with the countless hearings held by the Oversight Subcommittee on Education and the Workforce are being done to destroy unions. Mr. HOEKSTRA's latest amendment shows the Republican objective is to silence the only voice of the American worker.

Our Government made an agreement with the Teamsters in the 1989 Consent Decree. Let us not break our word to hard-working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to stop this persecution of labor unions. I urge my colleagues to allow the Justice Department to do their job and to uphold prior agreements. I urge my colleagues to support the working men and women of America and to oppose the Hoekstra amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating it.

Our children will compete for jobs in a national, and even global, marketplace. We know our workers, and our economy, can be the best in the world—if we also have a world-class education system.

Our schools are not living up to our expectations. Too many schools are overcrowded and crumbling. Too many schools aren't safe, and aren't teaching kids the skills they need to learn. We have failed to hold our schools and our students accountable to the highest standards.

If you believe, as I do, that as a nation we have failed to hold schools accountable, you should be very wary of an amendment which would make it virtually impossible to ever hold them accountable. And that's precisely what this amendment would do.

We need to hold our schools more accountable, not less. We need to demand higher performance and higher standards. And we need to target poor performing schools in resource-poor areas and give them the funds they need to succeed.

In fact, this amendment goes contrary to everything which Republicans and Democrats on this subcommittee and on the Education and the Workforce Committee have been trying to do in reforming the title I and Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs. Where we have attempted to target funds to where they are most needed, this amendment would spread them around to schools whether they are needed or not.

Where the two committees have moved to tie funding to efforts to improve standards and promote better academic achievement, this amendment would spread funds around to schools whether they are taking steps to improve or not.

Where the two committees have moved to tie funding to schoolwide programs rather than scattershot fixes that research shows don't work, this amendment would spread funds around to schools whether they are reforming their practices or not.

I agree with my colleague that we have serious problems in many schools. I agree with my colleague that dramatic improvements are needed. But I disagree that a knee-jerk effort to block grant funds to the State and local level, with no accountability, is the solution. I urge my colleagues to demand accountability for high standards from our public schools. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hoekstra amendment that will eliminate 28 targeted education programs and transfer $2.75 billion in funding into the title VI of Elementary and Secondary School Act. This essential block grant is a direct hit at some of the most effective programs we have developed to encourage education reform in our communities. By terminating these programs

we are sending a message to States and localities that programs such as the Safe and Drug Free Schools, school-to-work, educational technology grants, Goals 2000, and bilingual and immigrant education are not important and do not serve our students well. It also sends the message that as congressional representatives have no knowledge of the crucial roles these programs play in our schools and communities. However, most importantly the children who will be punished by this amendment are those who rely on these programs the most. These children reside in low-income urban and rural areas.

Targeted assistance and formulas carefully crafted to ensure the equitable distribution of Federal funding to our school districts in all States will be terminated by the passage of this amendment. This will result in millions of children to be underserved by one of the only vehicles available to them to improve their lives—our education system. Passage of this amendment will be a true crime against low-income children in this country and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Hoekstra amendment. Thank you.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Hoekstra education block grant amendment to H.R. 2264. There is not a shred of doubt in my mind that this amendment is nothing more than what the Republicans wanted to do with the Department of Education in the last Congress—to abolish it. This is nothing more than a piecemeal attempt by Mr. HOEKSTRA to cut Federal funding for our Nation's educational programs; to cut funding of Federal educational programs that the Republicans have been attacking for years.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have previously sought cuts in such programs as Safe and Drug Free Schools, school-to-work, Goals 2000 School Reform, Eisenhower teacher training, and bilingual and immigrant education. Now, by the subterfuge of this amendment, by creating block grants, Republicans can succeed in ending these programs.

As we all know, block granting funds for education eliminates all accountability for the use of Federal education funds. If this amendment passes, all education funds could be diverted for noneducational purposes. With the limited amount of Federal funds being spent on education, it is absolutely necessary that funds that are intended by Congress to be spent on specific educational programs, are, in fact, spent on those programs. Congress has identified education as a national priority and without the focus of these programs, funds would not be targeted to the neediest schools and districts.

This arbitrary consolidation of Federal funds into block grants has to be stopped, lest we rob our most needy students of the programs that have proven themselves in the past. We must reject any attempts to undo 40 years of bipartisan Federal investment in our children's future. We must not back away from our commitment to education now, in its time of vital need.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Hoekstra amendment that would merge a majority of the current Federal education programs into block grants to local school districts.

This amendment would essentially eliminate all accountability for the use of Federal funds in our public education system. I, too, believe in driving dollars to the classroom, and I believe that local education agencies must be afforded a certain amount of flexibility to use Federal funds in accordance with the needs of the local education community. Under this amendment, however, the Federal Government would hand over funds to local school systems and indicate that they may use the money in any way they please, without any standards of accountability.

I believe that the education of our children should be a top priority. An investment in education is essential to our Nation's future. Under the Hoekstra amendment Federal education funds could be used by local agencies for noneducation purposes. The amount that we appropriate for education is always short of what is needed to be fully effective. The Federal Government contributes only 6 percent to elementary and secondary education. As the Washington Post pointed out this week, Federal funds fill in the gaps and provide programs for lower income students who would be underserved without Federal efforts. We simply cannot afford to allow the small amount of money that we appropriate for education to be used for other purposes.

This amendment would unravel years of progress that we have made in providing equality of education for girls and minorities. It would remove all of the Federal civil rights protections for race, gender, and disabilities contained in the elementary and secondary education laws. All of the hard work by the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues during the 103d Congress to incorporate gender equity through the funding of elementary and secondary education programs would be undone. These programs have made our schools more gender-neutral, which improves education for all students.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues in the House to reject this effort to put at-risk four decades of bipartisan efforts to develop and define the Federal role in public education. I urge a no vote on the Hoekstra amendment.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHADEGG:

Page 102, after line 24, insert the following new section:

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with a person or entity that is the subject of a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding commenced by the Federal Government and alleging fraud.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The amendment would require the agencies funded in this bill to undertake new duties. These agencies would be required to determine whether entities are the subject of Federal proceedings alleging fraud before any contracts could be awarded. Fraud would only have to be alleged, not proven. I do not care if the President of the United States is the person making the accusation, people are entitled to the presumption of innocence until proven guilty. Even average citizens. These departments currently do not have to make such determinations. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Arizona wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHADEGG. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding from the other side of the aisle was we had reached an agreement under which I would offer the amendment, the point of order would be reserved, and I would have a chance to explain why I feel the amendment is appropriate, and then at the conclusion of that I would withdraw the amendment. That does not appear to be what has happened, so let me make my arguments with regard to the amendment.

What the amendment says is that the funds appropriated under this bill shall not be used to enter into or pay for either a contract or salary to a person or an entity which is the subject of a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding in which the Federal Government has alleged fraud. That means, Mr. Chairman, that it would only apply not where there was a mere investigation of fraud, but, rather, where there was an allegation which had been formalized by the filing of a civil or criminal or administrative complaint; and not a civil or administrative complaint by anyone, but, rather, by the Federal Government. If we cannot protect under the laws of this Nation the expenditure of taxpayer funds to entities which are currently being prosecuted for fraud, then I would say we are in deep trouble.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. The gentleman is not discussing the point of order. I do not intend to debate the amendment, and I do not expect anyone else is allowed to under the rules.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct.

Does the gentleman from Arizona have an observation pursuant to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin which claimed that the amendment violates clause 2 of rule XXI?

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it does violate it. I believe it is, in fact, consistent because it applies only to actions that have been filed, and therefore there would be no investigation required.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona would appear to

require an investigation of each person or entity entering into a contract with funds under this act as to their being the subject of a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding by the Federal Government with the specific allegation of fraud. In the absence of a citation to an existing law requiring this inquiry, the Chair believes the amendment imposes a new duty on executive officials not required by existing law in violation of clause 2, rule XXI. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The purpose of the amendment which I just offered, which I would like to address, which is of grave concern to me, is that, in fact, we have a situation under this legislation and elsewhere, but particularly under this legislation, where millions of dollars, indeed tens of millions of dollars, are spent by the Federal Government and can be paid to contractors and individuals currently subject to a fraud prosecution by the Federal Government.

It seems to me if we have a department of the Government called the Justice Department, and if we have inspectors general offices within HHS and a variety of other agencies which are charged with the duty of auditing the expenditure of carefully collected taxpayer dollars and assuring that those dollars are spent pursuant to law and spent in a proper fashion and not fraudulently, then we ought to recognize that there is no right inherent in anyone to get a Federal contract and to be paid Federal moneys under that contract. Indeed, we ought to say that, well, of course there is a presumption of innocence in the criminal law in this Nation. There is no presumption of a right to be paid Federal moneys.

Let me give my colleagues some examples. There was a foundation created in 1994 to implement school-to-work grants. It was awarded $1.05 million. Following the first year, the inspector general called into question more than 73 percent of the claimed expenses of that foundation, alleging fraud. However, even while those practices were being challenged by the inspector general, the foundation was awarded an extension of its contract and an additional $1.43 million.

It seems to me that we are indeed charged as the stewards of taxpayers' money with looking after the proper expenditure of those funds. And if we have entities such as the inspector general's Office, such as the Attorney General, to investigate fraud and to charge fraud, and we make them comply with statutes in bringing those allegations, then indeed we have a duty not to at the same time give away taxpayer dollars to them while they are accused in a civil or criminal proceeding with fraud in the action itself. For those who object to that, I wonder what their motives are. It does concern me.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we can look throughout the Federal Government. There are dozens of incidents, hundreds of incidents, thousands of incidents. Let me pick one from the Medicare field. A physician improperly billed $350,000 over a 2-year period for comprehensive physical exams of residents of a home care institution without ever seeing a single resident. He was charged with fraud. Should he have had the right under the presumption of innocence not just to contest his guilt or innocence on that question, but to get a new contract; to get yet an additional contract so we pay him more money not to see people while we litigate the issue of his fraud under the prior contract? I suggest that if we are properly stewarding the taxpayers' dollars, we should not do that.

A psychotherapist working in a nursing facility manipulated Medicare billing codes to charge for 3 hours of therapy to each resident, when, in fact, he spent only a few minutes with each resident. Again, a charge or an allegation administratively of fraud was brought, yet we renew the contract to this psychotherapist.

We have a duty to steward these moneys. We can raise points of order, we can hang ourselves on technicalities if we want, but, Mr. Chairman, I assert that we have a duty to protect taxpayers' funds. The presumption of innocence does not extend to the right to have a contract with the Federal Government to get even more money when your practices have been seriously called into question.

Some argue that this ought to go to any entity under investigation for fraud, and that was one of the issues brought to me. I rejected that proposal, because indeed if you are simply under an investigation for fraud, no formal charge has been brought, perhaps it would not be fair to turn you down, because you could have an abuse of the investigative power. But once an entity of the Federal Government, the inspector general or the Attorney General, actually charges fraud, it seems to me that taxpayers have a right to say, until that matter is resolved, we are going to suspend further contracts and further payments to that individual.

Let me conclude by saying after surfacing this amendment, individuals at each of the agencies which would have been affected under the Labor-HHS bill contacted my office and said they would love to have this kind of tool to put a cold bar in place and to ensure that where there has been a proceeding, criminal, civil, or administrative, already filed alleging fraud, they would like to be able to deny the funds.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I learned the hard way a long time ago when I was in the State legislature and the Republican floor leader of our legislature lost his seat because a Democratic attorney general falsely accused him of breaking the law. He was indicted. He was convicted. And his conviction was overturned, justifiably so, by a State supreme court. That decision taught me the hard way that no matter how high up the power is, no person ought to be able to cause another person economic injury or personal reputation injury without having it proven. That is my motivation in taking this action.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I include the following tabular material for the RECORD:

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION						
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (1)						
Grants to States:						
Adult Training	895,000	1,063,990	1,042,990	+147,990	-21,000	D
Youth Training	126,672	129,965	129,965	+3,293	---	D
Summer Youth Program (2)	871,000	871,000	871,000	---	---	D
Dislocated Worker Assistance	1,286,200	1,350,510	1,350,510	+64,310	---	D
Federally administered programs:						
Native Americans	52,502	52,502	52,502	---	---	D
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers	69,285	69,285	69,285	---	---	D
Job Corps:						
Operations	1,064,824	1,127,726	1,127,726	+62,902	---	D
Construction and Renovation (3)	88,685	118,491	118,491	+29,806	---	D
Subtotal, Job Corps	1,153,509	1,246,217	1,246,217	+92,708	---	
Veterans' employment	7,300	7,300	7,300	---	---	D

(1) Forward funded except where noted.

(2) Current funded.

(3) 3 year availability.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National activities:						
Pilots and Demonstrations	27,140	23,717	42,500	+15,360	+18,783	D
Research, Demos, evaluation	6,196	10,196	8,196	+2,000	-2,000	D
Opportunity Areas for Youth	---	250,000	---	---	-250,000	D
Opportunity for Youth, advance FY 1999	---	---	100,000	+100,000	+100,000	D
Other	13,489	10,489	13,489	---	+3,000	D
Subtotal, National activities	46,825	294,402	164,185	+117,360	-130,217	
Current year	(46,825)	(294,402)	(64,185)	(+17,360)	(-230,217)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Subtotal, Federal activities	1,329,421	1,669,706	1,539,489	+210,068	-130,217	
Current year	(1,329,421)	(1,669,706)	(1,439,489)	(+110,068)	(-230,217)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Total, Job Training Partnership Act	4,508,293	5,085,171	4,933,954	+425,661	-151,217	
Current year	(4,508,293)	(5,085,171)	(4,833,954)	(+325,661)	(-251,217)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Women in Apprenticeship (1)	610	647	647	+37	---	D
Skills Standards	7,000	7,000	7,000	---	---	D
Subtotal, National activities, TES	(54,435)	(302,049)	(171,832)	(+117,397)	(-130,217)	

(1) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
School-to-Work (1)	200,000	200,000	200,000	---	---	D
Homeless Veterans (2)	---	2,500	---	---	-2,500	D
Total, Training and Employment Services	4,715,903	5,295,318	5,141,601	+425,698	-153,717	
Current year	(4,715,903)	(5,295,318)	(5,041,601)	(+325,698)	(-253,717)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Subtotal, forward funded	(3,844,293)	(4,421,171)	(4,169,954)	(+325,661)	(-251,217)	
Community Serv. Employment Older Americans (3)	463,000	440,200	440,200	-22,800	---	D
FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES						
Trade Adjustment	276,100	304,700	304,700	+28,600	---	M
NAFTA Activities	48,400	44,300	44,300	-4,100	---	M
Total	324,500	349,000	349,000	+24,500	---	
STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS						
Unemployment Compensation (Trust Funds):						
State Operations	(2,115,125)	(2,204,125)	(2,115,125)	---	(-89,000)	TF*
National Activities	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	---	---	TF*
Year 2000 Computer conversion	---	(200,000)	(183,000)	(+183,000)	(-17,000)	TF*
Contingency	(216,333)	(216,333)	(196,333)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	TF*
Subtotal, Unemployment Comp (trust funds)	(2,341,458)	(2,630,458)	(2,504,458)	(+163,000)	(-126,000)	

(1) 15-month forward funded availability.

(2) Current funded.

(3) The budget request proposed transfer of this funding to the Administration on Aging.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Employment Service:						
Allotments to States:						
Federal Funds	23,452	23,452	23,452	---	---	D
Trust Funds	(738,283)	(738,283)	(738,283)	---	---	TF*
Subtotal	761,735	761,735	761,735	---	---	
National Activities:						
Trust Funds (1)	(62,735)	(62,735)	(62,735)	---	---	TF*
Subtotal, Employment Service	824,470	824,470	824,470	---	---	
Federal funds	23,452	23,452	23,452	---	---	
Trust funds	(801,018)	(801,018)	(801,018)	---	---	
One Stop Career Centers	150,000	150,000	150,000	---	---	D
Total, State Unemployment	3,315,928	3,604,928	3,478,928	+163,000	-126,000	
Federal Funds	173,452	173,452	173,452	---	---	
Trust Funds	(3,142,476)	(3,431,476)	(3,305,476)	(+163,000)	(-126,000)	
Advances to the UI and Other Trust Funds (2)	373,000	392,000	392,000	+19,000	---	M

(1) Includes $20 million related to the Work Opportunity Tax Credit which is unauthorized for FY98.

(2) Two year availability.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						
Adult Employment and Training	25,842	26,486	26,100	+258	-386	D
Trust Funds	(2,237)	(2,331)	(2,259)	(+22)	(-72)	TF*
Youth Employment and Training	29,607	31,871	29,903	+296	-1,968	D
Employment Security	6,081	4,601	6,142	+61	+1,541	D
Trust Funds	(37,324)	(39,807)	(37,697)	(+373)	(-2,110)	TF*
Apprenticeship Services	16,271	17,367	16,434	+163	-933	D
Executive Direction	5,672	5,889	5,729	+57	-160	D
Trust Funds	(1,316)	(1,291)	(1,329)	(+13)	(+38)	TF*
Welfare to Work	---	6,200	---	---	-6,200	D
Subtotal, Program Administration	124,350	135,843	125,593	+1,243	-10,250	
Federal funds	83,473	92,414	84,308	+835	-8,106	
Trust funds	(40,877)	(43,429)	(41,285)	(+408)	(-2,144)	
Subtotal, Employment & Training Administration	9,316,681	10,217,289	9,927,322	+610,641	-289,967	
Federal funds	6,133,328	6,742,384	6,580,561	+447,233	-161,823	
Current year	(6,133,328)	(6,742,384)	(6,480,561)	(+347,233)	(-261,823)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Trust funds	(3,183,353)	(3,474,905)	(3,346,761)	(+163,408)	(-128,144)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Enforcement and Compliance	61,476	67,463	66,100	+4,624	-1,363	D
Policy, Regulation and Public Service	11,781	13,158	12,281	+500	-877	D
Program Oversight	3,583	3,686	3,619	+36	-67	D
Subtotal, PWBA	76,840	84,307	82,000	+5,160	-2,307	
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION						
Program Administration subject to limitation (TF) (1)	(10,330)	(10,625)	(10,433)	(+103)	(-192)	TF
Termination services not subject to limitation (NA)	(125,338)	(137,376)	(137,376)	(+12,038)	---	NA
Subtotal, PBGC new BA	(10,330)	(10,625)	(10,433)	(+103)	(-192)	
Subtotal, PBGC (Program level)	(135,668)	(148,001)	(147,809)	(+12,141)	(-192)	

(1) This limitation is scored as BA in FY98; see scorekeeping summary.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Enforcement of Wage and Hour Standards	117,904	124,505	121,213	+3,309	-3,292	D
Office of Labor-Management Standards	25,489	26,382	26,709	+1,220	+327	D
Federal Contractor EEO Standards Enforcement	58,972	68,728	60,618	+1,646	-8,110	D
Federal Programs for Workers' Compensation	75,670	81,199	77,783	+2,113	-3,416	D
Trust Funds (1)	(983)	(1,760)	(993)	(+10)	(-767)	TF
Program Direction and Support	11,366	11,629	11,684	+318	+55	D
Subtotal, ESA salaries and expenses	290,384	314,203	299,000	+8,616	-15,203	
Federal funds	289,401	312,443	298,007	+8,606	-14,436	
Trust funds	(983)	(1,760)	(993)	(+10)	(-767)	
SPECIAL BENEFITS						
Federal employees compensation benefits	209,000	197,000	197,000	-12,000	---	M
Longshore and harbor workers' benefits	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---	M
Subtotal, Special Benefits	213,000	201,000	201,000	-12,000	---	

(1) This limitation is scored as BA in FY98; see scorekeeping summary.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND						
Benefit payments and interest on advances	961,665	960,650	960,650	-1,015	---	M
Employment Standards Adm. S&E	26,053	26,147	26,147	+94	---	M
Departmental Management S&E	19,621	19,551	19,551	-70	---	M
Departmental Management, Inspector General	287	296	296	+9	---	M
Subtotal, Black Lung Disablty. Trust Fund, apprn	1,007,626	1,006,644	1,006,644	-982	---	
Treasury Adm. Costs (Indefinite)	356	356	356	---	---	M
Total, Black Lung Disability Trust Fund	1,007,982	1,007,000	1,007,000	-982	---	
Total, Employment Standards Administration	1,511,366	1,522,203	1,507,000	-4,366	-15,203	
Federal funds	1,510,383	1,520,443	1,506,007	-4,376	-14,436	
Trust funds	(983)	(1,760)	(993)	(+10)	(-767)	
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Safety and Health Standards	11,971	12,566	12,091	+120	-475	D
Federal Enforcement	125,907	135,689	127,166	+1,259	-8,523	D
State Enforcement Programs	77,169	79,175	77,941	+772	-1,234	D
Technical Support	17,417	17,617	17,591	+174	-26	D
Compliance Assistance: Federal Assistance	37,351	46,285	45,725	+8,374	-560	D
State Consultation Grants	34,477	35,373	34,822	+345	-551	D
Safety and Health Statistics	14,142	14,460	14,283	+141	-177	D
Executive Direction and Administration	6,521	6,640	6,586	+65	-54	D
Total, OSHA	324,955	347,805	336,205	+11,250	-11,600	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Coal Enforcement	106,993	107,419	108,063	+1,070	+644	D
Metal/Non-Metal Enforcement	41,994	44,315	42,414	+420	-1,901	D
Standards Development	1,008	1,426	1,018	+10	-408	D
Assessments	3,497	3,578	3,532	+35	-46	D
Educational Policy and Development	14,782	14,834	14,930	+148	+96	D
Technical Support	21,268	24,870	21,481	+213	-3,389	D
Program Administration	7,645	9,362	7,721	+76	-1,641	D
Total, Mine Safety and Health Administration	197,187	205,804	199,159	+1,972	-6,645	
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Employment and Unemployment Statistics	102,169	109,955	109,955	+7,786	---	D
Labor Market Information (Trust Funds)	(52,053)	(52,848)	(52,848)	(+795)	---	TF*
Prices and Cost of Living	100,134	107,028	108,028	+7,894	+1,000	D
Compensation and Working Conditions	56,834	58,909	58,909	+2,075	---	D
Productivity and Technology	7,263	7,248	7,248	-15	---	D
Economic Growth and Employment Projections	4,640	4,728	4,728	+88	---	D
Executive Direction and Staff Services	21,584	23,311	23,311	+1,727	---	D
Consumer Price Index Revision (1)	16,145	15,430	15,430	-715	---	D
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics	360,822	379,457	380,457	+19,635	+1,000	
Federal Funds	308,769	326,609	327,609	+18,840	+1,000	
Trust Funds	(52,053)	(52,848)	(52,848)	(+795)	---	

(1) Two year availability.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						
SALARIES AND EXPENSES						
Executive Direction	20,029	19,714	18,209	-1,820	-1,505	D
Legal Services	59,911	64,813	64,813	+4,902	---	D
Trust Funds	(297)	(282)	(282)	(-15)	---	TF*
International Labor Affairs	9,465	11,095	13,095	+3,630	+2,000	D
Administration and Management	13,904	14,259	14,043	+139	-216	D
Adjudication	20,483	20,979	20,688	+205	-291	D
Promoting Employment of People with Disabilities	4,358	4,439	4,402	+44	-37	D
Women's Bureau	7,743	7,569	7,569	-174	---	D
Civil Rights Activities	4,535	4,598	4,580	+45	-18	D
Chief Financial Officer	4,394	4,930	4,800	+406	-130	D
Total, Salaries and expenses	145,119	152,678	152,481	+7,362	-197	
Federal funds	144,822	152,396	152,199	+7,377	-197	
Trust funds	(297)	(282)	(282)	(-15)	---	
VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING						
State Administration:						
Disabled Veterans Outreach Program	(81,993)	(80,040)	(80,040)	(-1,953)	---	TF*
Local Veterans Employment Program	(75,125)	(77,078)	(77,078)	(+1,953)	---	TF*
Subtotal, State Administration	(157,118)	(157,118)	(157,118)	---	---	
Federal Administration	(22,733)	(22,837)	(24,837)	(+2,104)	(+2,000)	TF*
National Veterans Training Institute	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	(-2,000)	(-2,000)	TF*
Total, Veterans Employment & Training (TF)	(181,851)	(181,955)	(181,955)	(+104)	---	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL						
Program Activities	37,480	37,345	36,345	-1,135	-1,000	D
Trust Funds	(3,543)	(3,645)	(3,645)	(+102)	---	TF*
Executive Direction and Management	5,958	5,760	5,760	-198	---	D
Total, Office of the Inspector General	46,981	46,750	45,750	-1,231	-1,000	
Federal funds	43,438	43,105	42,105	-1,333	-1,000	
Trust funds	(3,543)	(3,645)	(3,645)	(+102)	---	
Total, Departmental Management	373,951	381,383	380,186	+6,235	-1,197	
Federal funds	188,260	195,501	194,304	+6,044	-1,197	
Trust funds	(185,691)	(185,882)	(185,882)	(+191)	---	
Total, Labor Department	12,172,132	13,148,873	12,822,762	+650,630	-326,111	
Federal funds	8,739,722	9,422,853	9,225,845	+486,123	-197,008	
Current year	(8,739,722)	(9,422,853)	(9,125,845)	(+386,123)	(-297,008)	
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)	
Trust funds	(3,432,410)	(3,726,020)	(3,596,917)	(+164,507)	(-129,103)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES						
Consolidated health centers	802,009	809,868	826,000	+23,991	+16,132	D
National Health Service Corps:						
Field placements	37,244	37,244	37,244	---	---	D
Recruitment	78,166	78,166	82,756	+4,590	+4,590	D
Subtotal, National Health Service Corps	115,410	115,410	120,000	+4,590	+4,590	
Health Professions						
Grants to Communities for Scholarships	532	---	545	+13	+545	D
Health Professions data systems	236	---	241	+5	+241	D
Research on Health Professions Issues	450	---	461	+11	+461	D
Nurse loan repayment for shortage area service	2,197	---	2,251	+54	+2,251	D
Workforce Development Cluster (proposed legis.)	---	623	---	---	-623	D
Centers of excellence	24,714	---	27,300	+2,586	+27,300	D
Health careers opportunity program	26,779	---	30,000	+3,221	+30,000	D
Exceptional financial need scholarships	11,332	---	11,610	+278	+11,610	D
Faculty loan repayment	1,061	---	1,087	+26	+1,087	D
Fin. Assistance for disadvantaged HP students	6,718	---	6,883	+165	+6,883	D
Scholarships for disadvantaged students	18,673	---	21,100	+2,427	+21,100	D
Minority/Disadvantaged Cluster (proposed leg.)	---	89,277	---	---	-89,277	D
Family medicine training/departments	49,256	---	50,464	+1,208	+50,464	D
General internal medicine and pediatrics	17,618	---	18,050	+432	+18,050	D

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Physician assistants	6,376	---	6,532	+156	+6,532	D
Public health and preventive medicine	7,998	---	8,194	+196	+8,194	D
Health administration traineeships/projects	1,095	---	1,122	+27	+1,122	D
Primary Care Medicine & Pub Health Cluster (proposed)	---	7,700	---	---	-7,700	D
Area health education centers	28,490	---	29,189	+699	+29,189	D
Border health training centers	3,752	---	3,844	+92	+3,844	D
General dentistry residencies	3,785	---	3,878	+93	+3,878	D
Allied health special projects	3,832	---	3,926	+94	+3,926	D
Geriatric education centers and training	8,881	---	9,099	+218	+9,099	D
Rural interdisciplinary traineeships	4,153	---	4,255	+102	+4,255	D
Podiatric Medicine	677	---	694	+17	+694	D
Chiropractic demonstration grants	1,025	---	1,050	+25	+1,050	D
Enhanced Area Health Education Cluster (proposed)	---	24,700	---	---	-24,700	D
Advanced Nurse Education	12,467	---	12,773	+306	+12,773	D
Nurse practitioners/nurse midwives	17,586	---	18,017	+431	+18,017	D
Special projects	10,564	---	10,823	+259	+10,823	D
Nurse disadvantaged assistance	3,865	---	3,960	+95	+3,960	D
Professional nurse traineeships	15,941	---	16,332	+391	+16,332	D
Nurse anesthetists	2,765	---	2,833	+68	+2,833	D
Nurse Education / Practice Init Cluster (proposed)	---	7,700	---	---	-7,700	D
Subtotal, Health professions	292,818	130,000	306,513	+13,695	+176,513	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Other HRSA Programs:						
Hansen's Disease Services Cluster (1)	17,094	16,469	17,094	---	+625	D
Maternal & Child Health Block Grant	681,000	681,000	685,000	+4,000	+4,000	D
Healthy Start	95,982	95,982	95,982	---	---	D
Organ Transplantation	2,278	3,891	2,278	---	-1,613	D
Health Teaching Facilities Interest Subsidies	297	225	225	-72	---	D
Bone Marrow Program	15,270	15,270	15,270	---	---	D
Rural outreach grants	27,796	25,092	27,796	---	+2,704	D
Emergency medical services for children	12,493	12,000	13,000	+507	+1,000	D
Black lung clinics	4,000	1,906	5,000	+1,000	+3,094	D
Alzheimer's demonstration grants (2)	5,999	---	5,999	---	+5,999	D
Payment to Hawaii, treatment of Hansen's (1)	2,045	---	2,045	---	+2,045	D
Subtotal, Other HRSA programs	864,254	851,835	869,689	+5,435	+17,854	

(1) Proposed for consolidation.

(2) Proposed for transfer to AoA.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Ryan White AIDS Programs:						
Emergency Assistance	449,943	454,943	471,663	+21,720	+16,720	D
Comprehensive Care Programs	416,954	431,954	560,994	+144,040	+129,040	D
AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP) (NA)	167,000	167,000	299,000	+132,000	+132,000	NA
Early Intervention Program	69,568	84,568	72,928	+3,360	-11,640	D
Pediatric Demonstrations	36,000	40,000	37,720	+1,720	-2,280	D
AIDS Dental Services	7,500	7,500	7,860	+360	+360	D
Education and Training Centers	16,287	17,287	17,087	+800	-200	D
Subtotal, Ryan White AIDS programs	996,252	1,036,252	1,168,252	+172,000	+132,000	
Family Planning	198,452	203,452	194,452	-4,000	-9,000	D
Rural Health Research	8,713	8,713	8,713	---	---	D
Health Care Facilities	12,902	---	---	-12,902	---	D
Buildings and Facilities (1)	828	---	2,500	+1,672	+2,500	D
National Practitioner Data Bank	6,000	8,000	8,000	+2,000	---	D
User Fees	-6,000	-8,000	-8,000	-2,000	---	D
Program Management	112,929	110,949	110,949	-1,980	---	D
Total, Health resources and services	3,404,567	3,266,479	3,607,068	+202,501	+340,589	

(1) Proposed for consolidation.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
MEDICAL FACILITIES GUARANTEE AND LOAN FUND:						
Interest subsidy program	7,000	6,000	6,000	-1,000	---	M
HEALTH EDUCATION ASSISTANCE LOANS PROGRAM (HEAL):						
New loan subsidies	477	1,020	1,020	+543	---	M
Liquidating account (NA)	(37,608)	(29,566)	(29,566)	(-8,042)	---	NA
HEAL loan limitation (NA)	(140,000)	(85,000)	(85,000)	(-55,000)	---	NA
Program management	2,688	2,688	2,688	---	---	D
Total, HEAL	3,165	3,708	3,708	+543	---	
VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM TRUST FUND:						
Post-FY88 claims (TF)	50,476	42,448	42,448	-8,028	---	M
HRSA administration (TF)	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---	M
Subtotal, Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	53,476	45,448	45,448	-8,028	---	
VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION:						
Pre-FY89 claims (appropriation)	110,000	---	---	-110,000	---	M
Total, Vaccine injury	163,476	45,448	45,448	-118,028	---	
Total, Health Resources & Services Admin	3,578,208	3,321,635	3,662,224	+84,016	+340,589	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION						
DISEASE CONTROL, RESEARCH AND TRAINING						
Preventive Health Services Block Grant	153,994	143,940	155,000	+1,006	+11,060	D
Prevention Centers	8,099	8,099	8,099	---	---	D
Childhood immunization (1)	467,583	427,312	440,030	-27,553	+12,718	D
HCFA vaccine purchase (NA)	372,534	437,104	437,104	+64,570	---	NA
Subtotal, CDC/HCFA vaccine program level	467,583	427,312	440,030	-27,553	+12,718	
AIDS	616,790	634,266	621,790	+5,000	-12,476	D
Tuberculosis	119,294	119,236	119,236	-58	---	D
Sexually Transmitted Diseases	106,203	111,171	111,171	+4,968	---	D
Chronic and Environmental Disease Prevention	166,874	191,039	228,039	+61,165	+37,000	D
Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening	139,659	141,897	145,000	+5,341	+3,103	D
Infectious Diseases	87,720	112,428	118,000	+30,280	+5,572	D
Lead Poisoning Prevention	38,181	38,154	38,200	+19	+46	D
Injury Control	43,182	49,033	55,933	+12,751	+6,900	D
Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)	141,340	148,463	148,840	+7,500	+377	D
Mine Safety and Health	31,913	32,000	32,000	+87	---	D
Epidemic Services	69,608	69,322	69,322	-286	---	D

(1) Request includes bill language exempting from the excise tax vaccine purchased with appropriated funds; savings are estimated at $25 million.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National Center for Health Statistics:						
Program Operations	37,612	18,963	37,612	---	+18,649	D
1% evaluation funds (NA)	(48,400)	(70,063)	(48,400)	---	(-21,663)	NA
Subtotal, health statistics	(86,012)	(89,026)	(86,012)	---	(-3,014)	
Buildings and Facilities	30,553	23,007	20,000	-10,553	-3,007	D
Program Management	2,563	2,465	2,465	-98	---	D
Subtotal, Centers for Disease Control	2,261,168	2,270,795	2,350,737	+89,569	+79,942	
Crime Bill Activities:						
Rape Prevention and Education	35,000	45,000	45,000	+10,000	---	D
Domestic Violence Community Demonstrations	6,000	---	---	-6,000	---	D
Subtotal, Crime bill activities	41,000	45,000	45,000	+4,000	---	
Total, Disease Control	2,302,168	2,315,795	2,395,737	+93,569	+79,942	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH						
National Cancer Institute	2,389,065	2,217,482	2,513,020	+123,955	+295,538	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(224,256)	---	---	(-224,256)	NA
Subtotal, NCI	(2,389,065)	(2,441,738)	(2,513,020)	(+123,955)	(+71,282)	
National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute	1,431,830	1,404,770	1,513,004	+81,174	+108,234	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(62,419)	---	---	(-62,419)	NA
Subtotal, NHLBI	(1,431,830)	(1,467,189)	(1,513,004)	(+81,174)	(+45,815)	
National Institute of Dental Research	197,063	190,081	209,403	+12,340	+19,322	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(12,750)	---	---	(-12,750)	NA
Subtotal, NIDR	(197,063)	(202,831)	(209,403)	(+12,340)	(+6,572)	
National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases	813,149	821,164	874,337	+61,188	+53,173	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(12,638)	---	---	(-12,638)	NA
Subtotal, NIDDK	(813,149)	(833,802)	(874,337)	(+61,188)	(+40,535)	
National Institute of Neurological Disorders & Stroke	729,259	722,712	763,325	+34,066	+40,613	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(25,116)	---	---	(-25,116)	NA
Subtotal, NINDS	(729,259)	(747,828)	(763,325)	(+34,066)	(+15,497)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.	1,257,794	634,272	1,339,459	+81,665	+705,187	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(678,230)	---	---	(-678,230)	NA
Subtotal, NIAID.....	(1,257,794)	(1,312,502)	(1,339,459)	(+81,665)	(+26,957)	
National Institute of General Medical Sciences.....	995,471	992,032	1,047,963	+52,492	+55,931	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(28,160)	---	---	(-28,160)	NA
Subtotal, NIGMS.....	(995,471)	(1,020,192)	(1,047,963)	(+52,492)	(+27,771)	
National Institute of Child Health & Human Development	631,628	582,032	666,682	+35,054	+84,650	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(65,247)	---	---	(-65,247)	NA
Subtotal, NICHD.....	(631,628)	(647,279)	(666,682)	(+35,054)	(+19,403)	
National Eye Institute.....	331,606	330,955	354,032	+22,426	+23,077	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(9,476)	---	---	(-9,476)	NA
Subtotal, NEI.....	(331,606)	(340,431)	(354,032)	(+22,426)	(+13,601)	
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	307,562	313,583	328,583	+21,021	+15,000	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(6,324)	---	---	(-6,324)	NA
Subtotal, NIEHS.....	(307,562)	(319,907)	(328,583)	(+21,021)	(+8,676)	
National Institute on Aging.....	484,326	495,202	509,811	+25,485	+14,609	D
AIDS (NA).....	---	(1,874)	---	---	(-1,874)	NA
Subtotal, NIA.....	(484,326)	(497,076)	(509,811)	(+25,485)	(+12,735)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases	256,228	258,932	269,807	+13,579	+10,875	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(4,310)	---	---	(-4,310)	NA
Subtotal, NIAMS	(256,228)	(263,242)	(269,807)	(+13,579)	(+6,565)	
National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders	188,273	192,447	198,373	+10,100	+5,926	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(1,774)	---	---	(-1,774)	NA
Subtotal, NIDCD	(188,273)	(194,221)	(198,373)	(+10,100)	(+4,152)	
National Institute of Nursing Research	59,554	55,692	62,451	+2,897	+6,759	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(5,360)	---	---	(-5,360)	NA
Subtotal, NINR	(59,554)	(61,052)	(62,451)	(+2,897)	(+1,399)	
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism	211,254	208,112	226,205	+14,951	+18,093	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(11,234)	---	---	(-11,234)	NA
Subtotal, NIAAA	(211,254)	(219,346)	(226,205)	(+14,951)	(+6,859)	
National Institute on Drug Abuse	490,113	358,475	525,641	+35,528	+167,166	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(163,440)	---	---	(-163,440)	NA
Subtotal, NIDA	(490,113)	(521,915)	(525,641)	(+35,528)	(+3,726)	
National Institute of Mental Health	700,701	629,739	744,235	+43,534	+114,496	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(98,510)	---	---	(-98,510)	NA
Subtotal, NIMH	(700,701)	(728,249)	(744,235)	(+43,534)	(+15,986)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National Human Genome Research Institute	188,957	202,197	211,772	+22,815	+9,575	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(2,990)	---	---	(-2,990)	NA
Subtotal, NHGRI	(188,957)	(205,187)	(211,772)	(+22,815)	(+6,585)	
National Center for Research Resources	414,049	333,868	436,961	+22,912	+103,093	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(77,053)	---	---	(-77,053)	NA
Subtotal, NCRR	(414,049)	(410,921)	(436,961)	(+22,912)	(+26,040)	
John Fogarty International Center	26,504	16,755	27,620	+1,116	+10,865	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(10,413)	---	---	(-10,413)	NA
Subtotal, FIC	(26,504)	(27,168)	(27,620)	(+1,116)	(+452)	
National Library of Medicine	150,376	152,689	161,171	+10,795	+8,482	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(3,279)	---	---	(-3,279)	NA
Subtotal, NLM	(150,376)	(155,968)	(161,171)	(+10,795)	(+5,203)	
Office of the Director	286,081	234,247	298,339	+12,258	+64,092	D
AIDS (NA)	---	(35,912)	---	---	(-35,912)	NA
Subtotal, OD	(286,081)	(270,159)	(298,339)	(+12,258)	(+28,180)	
Buildings and Facilities	200,000	190,000	223,100	+23,100	+33,100	D
Office of AIDS Research	---	1,540,765	---	---	-1,540,765	D
Total N.I.H.	12,740,843	13,078,203	13,505,294	+764,451	+427,091	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
Mental Health:						
Knowledge development and application	57,964	58,032	58,032	+68	---	D
Mental Health Performance Partnership	275,420	275,420	275,420	---	---	D
Children's Mental Health	69,896	69,927	72,927	+3,031	+3,000	D
Grants to States for the Homeless (PATH)	20,000	20,000	23,000	+3,000	+3,000	D
Protection and Advocacy	21,957	21,957	21,957	---	---	D
Subtotal, mental health	445,237	445,336	451,336	+6,099	+6,000	
Substance Abuse Treatment:						
Knowledge Development and Application	155,868	156,000	159,000	+3,132	+3,000	D
Substance Abuse Performance Partnership -- (BA)	1,310,107	1,320,107	1,320,107	+10,000	---	D
P.L. 104-121 funding	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---	NA
Subtotal, Substance Abuse Treatment (BA)	1,465,975	1,476,107	1,479,107	+13,132	+3,000	
Total, Treatment program level	(1,515,975)	(1,526,107)	(1,529,107)	(+13,132)	(+3,000)	
Substance Abuse Prevention:						
Knowledge Development and Application	155,869	151,000	151,000	-4,869	---	D
Program Management and Buildings and Facilities	54,431	55,500	55,500	+1,069	---	D
Data Collection	---	28,000	15,000	+15,000	-13,000	D
Total, Substance Abuse and Mental Health (BA)	2,121,512	2,155,943	2,151,943	+30,431	-4,000	
Total, Program level	(2,171,512)	(2,205,943)	(2,201,943)	(+30,431)	(-4,000)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
RETIREMENT PAY AND MEDICAL BENEFITS FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS						
Retirement payments	139,299	149,217	149,217	+9,918	---	M
Survivors benefits	10,417	11,643	11,643	+1,226	---	M
Dependents' medical care	26,363	27,470	27,470	+1,107	---	M
Military services credits	2,556	2,409	2,409	-147	---	M
Total, Retirement pay and medical benefits	178,635	190,739	190,739	+12,104	---	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND RESEARCH						
Research on Health Care Systems Cost & Access:						
Federal Funds	35,650	17,170	35,573	-77	+18,403	D
1% evaluation funding (NA)	(8,750)	(29,515)	(11,112)	(+2,362)	(-18,403)	NA
Subtotal	(44,400)	(46,685)	(46,685)	(+2,285)	---	
Health Insurance & Expenditure Surveys:						
Federal Funds	224	10,000	---	-224	-10,000	D
1% evaluation funding (NA)	(38,662)	(26,300)	(36,300)	(-2,362)	(+10,000)	NA
Subtotal	(38,886)	(36,300)	(36,300)	(-2,586)	---	
Research on Health Care Outcomes & Quality:						
Federal Funds	57,963	57,600	63,785	+5,822	+6,185	D
1% evaluation funding (NA)	---	(6,185)	---	---	(-6,185)	NA
Subtotal	(57,963)	(63,785)	(63,785)	(+5,822)	---	
Program Support	2,230	2,230	2,230	---	---	D
Total, AHCPR	143,479	149,000	149,000	+5,521	---	
Federal Funds	96,067	87,000	101,588	+5,521	+14,588	
1% evaluation funding (non-add)	(47,412)	(62,000)	(47,412)	---	(-14,588)	
Total, Public Health Service	21,017,433	21,149,315	22,007,525	+990,092	+858,210	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
HEALTH CARE FINANCING ADMINISTRATION						
GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAID						
Medicaid current law benefits	98,210,228	99,144,000	99,144,000	+933,772	---	M
State and local administration	4,633,884	4,874,546	4,874,546	+240,662	---	M
Vaccines for Children	522,904	365,104	365,104	-157,800	---	M
Subtotal, Medicaid program level, FY 1997 / 1998	103,367,016	104,383,650	104,383,650	+1,016,634	---	
Carryover balance	-2,155,048	-4,864,228	-4,864,228	-2,709,180	---	M
Less funds advanced in prior year	-26,155,350	-27,988,993	-27,988,993	-1,833,643	---	M
Total, request, FY 1997 / 1998	75,056,618	71,530,429	71,530,429	-3,526,189	---	
New advance 1st quarter, FY 98/99	27,988,993	27,800,689	27,800,689	-188,304	---	M
PAYMENTS TO HEALTH CARE TRUST FUNDS						
Supplemental medical insurance	59,456,000	63,416,000	63,416,000	+3,960,000	---	M
Hospital insurance for the uninsured	405,000	-52,000	-52,000	-457,000	---	M
Federal uninsured payment	76,000	86,000	86,000	+10,000	---	M
Program management	142,000	131,000	131,000	-11,000	---	M
Total, Payments to Trust Funds, current law	60,079,000	63,581,000	63,581,000	+3,502,000	---	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT						
Research, demonstration, and evaluation:						
Regular Program	(44,000)	(45,000)	(49,000)	(+5,000)	(+4,000)	TF*
Medicare Contractors	(1,207,200)	(1,223,000)	(1,134,000)	(-73,200)	(-89,000)	TF*
H.R. 3103 funding (non-add)	(440,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(+60,000)	---	NA
Subtotal, Contractors program level	(1,647,200)	(1,723,000)	(1,634,000)	(-13,200)	(-89,000)	
State Survey and Certification	(158,000)	(148,000)	(148,000)	(-10,000)	---	TF*
Federal Administration	(327,173)	(360,434)	(350,369)	(+23,196)	(-10,065)	TF*
User Fees	(-1,932)	(-1,934)	(-1,934)	(-2)	---	TF*
Subtotal, Federal Administration	(325,241)	(358,500)	(348,435)	(+23,194)	(-10,065)	
Total, Program management	(1,734,441)	(1,774,500)	(1,679,435)	(-55,006)	(-95,065)	
Medicare Trust Fund Activity:						
Hospital Insurance TF (1)	(-12,800,000)	(-20,100,000)	(-20,100,000)	(-7,300,000)	---	NA
Supplemental Medical Insurance TF (2)	(4,000,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(-3,500,000)	---	NA
Total, Health Care Financing Administration	164,859,052	164,686,618	164,591,553	-267,499	-95,065	
Federal funds	163,124,611	162,912,118	162,912,118	-212,493	---	
Current year, FY 1997 / 1998	(135,135,618)	(135,111,429)	(135,111,429)	(-24,189)	---	
New advance, 1st quarter, FY 1998 / 1999	(27,988,993)	(27,800,689)	(27,800,689)	(-188,304)	---	
Trust funds	(1,734,441)	(1,774,500)	(1,679,435)	(-55,006)	(-95,065)	

(1) Intermediate estimates: page 40 of the 1997 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

(2) Intermediate estimates: page 29 of the 1997 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES						
FAMILY SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO STATES (1)						
Payments to territories	---	26,741	26,741	+26,741	---	M
Repatriation	---	1,000	1,000	+1,000	---	M
Undistributed	9,600,000	---	---	-9,600,000	---	M
Subtotal, Welfare payments	9,600,000	27,741	27,741	-9,572,259	---	
Child Support Enforcement: (2) Net welfare reform child support appropriation	2,158,000	---	---	-2,158,000	---	M
Total, Payments, FY 1997 / 1998 program level	11,758,000	27,741	27,741	-11,730,259	---	
Less funds advanced in previous years	-4,800,000	---	---	+4,800,000	---	M
Total, payments, current request, FY97/98	6,958,000	27,741	27,741	-6,930,259	---	
New advance, 1st quarter, FY98/99	607,000	660,000	660,000	+53,000	---	M

(1) Funds for these activities for FY98 are provided through permanent appropriations in the Personal Responsibility & Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The President's budget does not request funding for these programs in FY98; the Congressional justification indicates a budget amendment will be transmitted to Congress to request indefinite appropriations for these programs in FY98.

(2) Carry over funds from FY97 and the first quarter advance appropriation for FY98 are estimated to be sufficient to cover necessary costs of this program for FY98.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS)	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---	M
LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE						
Advance from prior year (NA)	---	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	---	NA
Adjustment	1,000,000	---	---	-1,000,000	---	D
FY 1997 / 1998 program level	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	---	---	
Emergency Allocation -- Advance from prior year (NA)	(300,000)	---	---	(-300,000)	---	NA
New Emergency Allocation (NA)	---	(300,000)	(300,000)	(+300,000)	---	NA
Advance funding (FY98/99)	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	---	---	D
REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE						
Transitional and Medical Services	246,502	227,138	230,698	-15,804	+3,560	D
Social Services	110,882	110,882	129,990	+19,108	+19,108	D
Preventive Health	4,835	4,835	4,835	---	---	D
Targeted Assistance	49,857	49,477	49,477	-380	---	D
Total, Refugee and entrant assistance (BA)	412,076	392,332	415,000	+2,924	+22,668	
CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT:						
Advance funding FY98/99	937,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+63,000	---	D
Forward funding provided in prior year	(934,642)	---	---	(-934,642)	---	NA
Advance funding from prior year (NA)	---	(937,000)	(937,000)	(+937,000)	---	NA
Adjustment (current funding)	19,120	63,000	---	-19,120	-63,000	D
Current year program level (FY97/98)	(953,762)	(1,000,000)	(937,000)	(-16,762)	(-63,000)	
Social Services Block Grant (Title XX)	2,500,000	2,380,000	2,245,000	-255,000	-135,000	M

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
CHILDREN AND FAMILIES SERVICES PROGRAMS						
Programs for Children, Youth, and Families:						
Head Start	3,980,546	4,305,000	4,305,000	+324,454	---	D
Consolidated Runaway, Homeless Youth Prog	---	58,602	---	---	-58,602	D
Runaway and Homeless Youth	43,653	---	43,653	---	+43,653	D
Runaway Youth -- Transitional Living	14,949	---	14,949	---	+14,949	D
Subtotal, runaway	58,602	58,602	58,602	---	---	
Child Abuse State Grants	21,026	21,026	21,026	---	---	D
Child Abuse Discretionary Activities	14,154	14,154	14,154	---	---	D
Abandoned Infants Assistance	12,251	12,251	12,251	---	---	D
Child Welfare Services	291,989	291,989	291,989	---	---	D
Child Welfare Training	4,000	4,000	4,000	---	---	D
Adoption Opportunities	13,000	13,000	13,000	---	---	D
Adoption Initiative	---	21,000	---	---	-21,000	D
Family Violence (1)	62,000	---	---	-62,000	---	D
Social Services and Income Maintenance Research	44,000	18,043	21,000	-23,000	+2,957	D
Community Based Resource Centers	32,835	32,835	32,835	---	---	D

(1) The request and the bill provide funding for this activity in the Battered Women's Shelter program.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Developmental disabilities program:						
State Councils	64,803	64,803	64,803	---	---	D
Protection and Advocacy	26,718	26,718	26,718	---	---	D
Developmental Disabilities Special Projects	5,250	5,250	---	-5,250	-5,250	D
Developmental Disabilities University Affiliated	17,461	17,461	17,461	---	---	D
Subtotal, Developmental disabilities	114,232	114,232	108,982	-5,250	-5,250	
Native American Programs	34,933	34,933	34,933	---	---	D
Community services:						
Grants to States for Community Services	489,600	414,720	489,600	---	+74,880	D
Community initiative program:						
Economic Development	27,332	---	30,065	+2,733	+30,065	D
Rural Community Facilities	3,500	---	3,500	---	+3,500	D
Subtotal, discretionary funds	30,832	---	33,565	+2,733	+33,565	
National Youth Sports	12,000	---	14,000	+2,000	+14,000	D
Community Food and Nutrition	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---	D
Subtotal, Community services	536,432	414,720	537,165	+733	+122,445	
Program Direction	143,061	143,115	143,115	+54	---	D
Rescission of permanent appropriations	-27,000	---	-21,000	+6,000	-21,000	D
Total, Children & Families Services Programs	5,336,061	5,498,900	5,577,052	+240,991	+78,152	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS:						
Community Schools	12,800	12,800	---	-12,800	-12,800	D
Runaway Youth Prevention	8,000	15,000	15,000	+7,000	---	D
Domestic Violence Hotline	1,200	1,200	1,200	---	---	D
Battered Women's Shelters	10,800	70,000	82,800	+72,000	+12,800	D
Total, Violent crime reduction programs	32,800	99,000	99,000	+66,200	---	
Family Support and Preservation	240,000	255,000	255,000	+15,000	---	M
PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR FOSTER CARE AND ADOPTION ASSISTANCE						
Foster Care	3,807,143	3,540,300	3,540,300	-266,843	---	M
Adoption Assistance	567,888	700,700	700,700	+132,812	---	M
Independent living	70,000	70,000	70,000	---	---	M
Total, Program level: Payment to States	4,445,031	4,311,000	4,311,000	-134,031	---	
Less Advances from Prior Year	---	-1,111,000	-1,111,000	-1,111,000	---	M
Total, request, FY 1997 / 1998	4,445,031	3,200,000	3,200,000	-1,245,031	---	
New Advance, 1st quarter, FY 1998/1999	1,111,000	1,157,500	1,157,500	+46,500	---	M
Total, Administration for Children and Families	24,898,088	15,733,473	15,636,293	-9,261,795	-97,180	
Current year, FY 1997 / 1998	(21,243,088)	(11,915,973)	(11,818,793)	(-9,424,295)	(-97,180)	
FY 1998 / 1999	(3,655,000)	(3,817,500)	(3,817,500)	(+162,500)	---	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
ADMINISTRATION ON AGING						
Grants to States:						
Supportive Services and Centers	300,556	291,375	309,819	+9,263	+18,444	D
Preventive Health	15,623	15,623	---	-15,623	-15,623	D
Title VII	---	9,181	---	---	-9,181	D
Nutrition:						
Congregate Meals	364,535	359,810	364,535	---	+4,725	D
Home Delivered Meals	105,339	110,064	110,064	+4,725	---	D
Frail Elderly In-Home Services	9,263	9,263	---	-9,263	-9,263	D
Grants to Indians	16,057	16,057	16,057	---	---	D
Aging Research, Training and Special Projects	4,000	4,000	---	-4,000	-4,000	D
Program Administration	14,758	14,795	14,795	+37	---	D
Alzheimer's Initiative	---	8,000	---	---	-8,000	D
Total, Administration on Aging	830,131	838,168	815,270	-14,861	-22,898	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
GENERAL DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT:						
Federal Funds	96,135	96,517	101,329	+5,194	+4,812	D
Trust Funds	(5,851)	(5,851)	(5,851)	---	---	TF*
1% Evaluation funds (ASPE) (NA)	(20,552)	(20,552)	(20,552)	---	---	NA
Subtotal	(122,538)	(122,920)	(127,732)	(+5,194)	(+4,812)	
Adolescent Family Life (Title XX)	14,206	14,209	14,209	+3	---	D
Physical Fitness and Sports	998	1,000	998	---	-2	D
Minority health	34,584	23,100	23,100	-11,484	---	D
Office of women's health	12,495	12,500	12,500	+5	---	D
Anti-Terrorism	13,764	10,000	7,500	-6,264	-2,500	D
Total, General Departmental Management	178,033	163,177	165,487	-12,546	+2,310	
Federal funds	172,182	157,326	159,636	-12,546	+2,310	
Trust funds	(5,851)	(5,851)	(5,851)	---	---	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL:						
Federal Funds	34,790	31,921	30,921	-3,869	-1,000	D
H.R. 3103 funding (non-add)	(60,000)	(80,500)	(80,500)	(+20,500)	---	NA
Total, Office of the Inspector General	34,790	31,921	30,921	-3,869	-1,000	
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS:						
Federal Funds	16,183	17,216	16,345	+162	-871	D
Trust Funds	(3,307)	(3,314)	(3,314)	(+7)	---	TF*
Total, Office for Civil Rights	19,490	20,530	19,659	+169	-871	
Federal funds	16,183	17,216	16,345	+162	-871	
Trust funds	(3,307)	(3,314)	(3,314)	(+7)	---	
Policy Research	18,486	9,000	14,000	-4,486	+5,000	D
Total, Office of the Secretary	250,799	224,628	230,067	-20,732	+5,439	
Federal funds	241,641	215,463	220,902	-20,739	+5,439	
Trust funds	(9,158)	(9,165)	(9,165)	(+7)	---	
Public Health & Social Services Emergency Fund	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---	D
Total, Department of Health and Human Services	211,870,503	202,632,202	203,280,708	-8,589,795	+648,506	
Federal Funds	210,126,904	200,848,537	201,592,108	-8,534,796	+743,571	
Current year, FY 1997 / 1998	(178,482,911)	(169,230,348)	(169,973,919)	(-8,508,992)	(+743,571)	
FY 1998 / 1999	(31,643,993)	(31,618,189)	(31,618,189)	(-25,804)	---	
Trust funds	(1,743,599)	(1,783,665)	(1,688,600)	(-54,999)	(-95,065)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
EDUCATION REFORM (1)						
Goals 2000: Educate America Act:						
State & Local Ed. Systemic Improvement Grants.....	476,000	603,500	370,665	-105,335	-232,835	D
State & Local Ed. Systemic Improvement Grants (2).	---	1,500	1,500	+1,500	---	D
Parental Assistance (2).....	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---	D
Subtotal, Goals 2000.....	491,000	620,000	387,165	-103,835	-232,835	
School-to-work opportunities:						
State Grants and Local Partnerships.....	199,973	200,000	200,000	+27	---	D
Education Technology (2).....	200,000	425,000	435,000	+235,000	+10,000	D
Subtotal, Non-Goals 2000 Ed Reform.....	399,973	625,000	635,000	+235,027	+10,000	
Total.....	890,973	1,245,000	1,022,165	+131,192	-222,835	
Subtotal, Forward funded.....	(675,973)	(803,500)	(570,665)	(-105,308)	(-232,835)	

(1) Forward funded except where noted.

(2) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED (1)						
Grants to Local Education Agencies (LEAs):						
Basic Grants	6,269,712	6,187,350	6,187,850	-81,862	+500	D
Basic Grants (2)	3,500	4,000	3,500	---	-500	D
Subtotal, Basic grants	6,273,212	6,191,350	6,191,350	-81,862	---	
Concentration Grants	1,022,020	999,249	949,249	-72,771	-50,000	D
Targeted Grants	---	350,000	400,000	+400,000	+50,000	D
Whole School Reform	---	---	150,000	+150,000	+150,000	D
Subtotal, Grants to LEAs	7,295,232	7,540,599	7,690,599	+395,367	+150,000	
Capital Expenses for Private School Children	41,119	41,119	41,119	---	---	D
Even Start	101,992	108,000	108,000	+6,008	---	D
State agency programs:						
Migrant	305,473	319,500	305,473	---	-14,027	D
Neglected and Delinquent/High Risk Youth	39,311	40,333	39,311	---	-1,022	D
State School Improvement	---	8,000	---	---	-8,000	D
Evaluation (2)	6,977	10,000	10,000	+3,023	---	D
Total, ESEA	7,790,104	8,067,551	8,194,502	+404,398	+126,951	

(1) Forward funded except where noted.

(2) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Migrant education:						
High School Equivalency Program (1)	7,441	7,634	7,634	+193	---	D
College Assistance Migrant Program (1)	2,028	2,081	2,081	+53	---	D
Subtotal, migrant education	9,469	9,715	9,715	+246	---	
Total, Compensatory education programs	7,799,573	8,077,266	8,204,217	+404,644	+126,951	
Subtotal, forward funded	(7,779,627)	(8,053,551)	(8,181,002)	(+401,375)	(+127,451)	
IMPACT AID						
Basic Support Payments	615,500	584,000	667,000	+51,500	+83,000	D
Payments for Children with Disabilities	40,000	40,000	40,000	---	---	D
Payments for Heavily Impacted Districts (Sec. f)	52,000	20,000	62,000	+10,000	+42,000	D
Subtotal	707,500	644,000	769,000	+61,500	+125,000	
Facilities Maintenance (Sec. 8008)	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000	D
Construction (Sec. 8007)	5,000	4,000	7,000	+2,000	+3,000	D
Payments for Federal Property (Sec. 8002)	17,500	---	20,000	+2,500	+20,000	D
Total, Impact aid	730,000	658,000	796,000	+66,000	+138,000	

(1) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS						
Professional development (1)	310,000	360,000	310,000	---	-50,000	D
Program innovation (1)	310,000	---	350,000	+40,000	+350,000	D
Safe and drug-free schools:						
State Grants (1)	530,978	590,000	531,000	+22	-59,000	D
National Programs	25,000	30,000	25,000	---	-5,000	D
Subtotal, Safe and drug-free schools	555,978	620,000	556,000	+22	-64,000	
Inexpensive Book Distribution (RIF)	10,265	12,000	12,000	+1,735	---	D
Arts in Education	9,000	9,500	9,500	+500	---	D
Other school improvement programs:						
Magnet Schools Assistance	95,000	95,000	105,000	+10,000	+10,000	D
Education for Homeless Children & Youth (1)	25,000	27,000	27,000	+2,000	---	D
Women's Education Equity	2,000	4,000	2,000	---	-2,000	D
Training and Advisory Services (Civil Rights)	7,334	14,334	7,334	---	-7,000	D
Ellender Fellowships/Close Up (1)	1,500	---	1,500	---	+1,500	D
Education for Native Hawaiians	15,000	15,000	---	-15,000	-15,000	D
Alaska Native Education Equity	8,000	8,000	---	-8,000	-8,000	D
Charter Schools	50,987	100,000	100,000	+49,013	---	D
Subtotal, other school improvement programs	204,821	263,334	242,834	+38,013	-20,500	
Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers	25,554	34,388	27,054	+1,500	-7,334	D
Total, School improvement programs	1,425,618	1,299,222	1,507,388	+81,770	+208,166	
Subtotal, forward funded	(1,177,478)	(977,000)	(1,219,500)	(+42,022)	(+242,500)	

(1) Forward funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
LITERACY INITIATIVE						
Current year	---	260,000	---	---	-260,000	D
1999 advance funding	---	---	260,000	+260,000	+260,000	D
Total, Literacy initiative	---	260,000	260,000	+260,000	---	
INDIAN EDUCATION (1)						
Grants to Local Educational Agencies	58,050	59,750	59,750	+1,700	---	D
Office of Indian Education	2,943	2,850	2,850	-93	---	D
Total, Indian Education	60,993	62,600	62,600	+1,607	---	
BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION						
Bilingual education:						
Instructional Services	141,700	160,000	160,000	+18,300	---	D
Support Services	10,000	14,000	14,000	+4,000	---	D
Professional Development	5,000	25,000	25,000	+20,000	---	D
Immigrant Education	100,000	150,000	150,000	+50,000	---	D
Foreign Language Assistance	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---	D
Total, Bilingual and Immigrant Education	261,700	354,000	354,000	+92,300	---	

(1) Funding for this account for FY97 was provided in the Interior Appropriations Bill and is shown here for purposes of comparability.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SPECIAL EDUCATION						
State grants: (1)						
Grants to States Part B	3,107,522	3,240,750	3,425,911	+318,389	+185,161	D
Preschool Grants	360,409	374,825	388,985	+28,576	+14,160	D
Grants for Infants and Families	315,754	323,964	340,790	+25,036	+16,826	D
Evaluation	1,873	6,300	6,300	+4,427	---	D
Evaluation (2)	---	1,700	1,700	+1,700	---	D
Subtotal, State grants	3,785,558	3,947,539	4,163,686	+378,128	+216,147	
IDEA National Programs (P.L. 105-17):						
State Program Improvement Grants (1)	26,988	35,200	35,200	+8,212	---	D
Research and Innovation to Improve Services	62,803	64,508	64,508	+1,705	---	D
Technical Assistance and Dissemination	34,337	35,056	35,056	+719	---	D
Personnel Preparation	80,735	82,139	82,139	+1,404	---	D
Parent Information Centers	15,535	15,535	15,535	---	---	D
Technology and Media Services	30,023	30,023	32,523	+2,500	+2,500	D
Subtotal, IDEA special programs reauthorization	250,421	262,461	264,961	+14,540	+2,500	
Total, Special education	4,035,979	4,210,000	4,428,647	+392,668	+218,647	
Subtotal, Forward funded	(3,812,546)	(3,981,039)	(4,197,186)	(+384,640)	(+216,147)	

(1) Forward funded except where noted.

(2) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
REHABILITATION SERVICES AND DISABILITY RESEARCH						
Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants	2,176,038	2,246,888	2,246,888	+70,850	---	M
Client Assistance State grants	10,392	10,714	10,714	+322	---	M
Training	39,629	39,629	39,629	---	---	M
Special demonstration programs	18,942	16,942	15,942	-3,000	-1,000	M
Migratory workers	1,850	2,350	2,350	+500	---	M
Recreational programs	2,596	2,596	2,596	---	---	M
Protection and advocacy of individual rights (PAIR)	7,657	7,894	9,894	+2,237	+2,000	M
Projects with industry	22,071	22,071	22,071	---	---	M
Supported employment State grants	38,152	38,152	38,152	---	---	M
Independent living:						
State grants	21,859	21,859	21,859	---	---	M
Centers	42,876	44,205	44,205	+1,329	---	M
Services for older blind individuals	9,952	9,952	9,952	---	---	M
Subtotal, Independent living	74,687	76,016	76,016	+1,329	---	
Program Improvement	2,391	3,900	2,900	+509	-1,000	M
Evaluation	1,587	1,587	1,587	---	---	M
Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths & Adults	7,337	7,528	7,528	+191	---	M
National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR)	69,990	71,000	76,800	+6,810	+5,800	M
Subtotal, mandatory programs	2,473,319	2,547,267	2,553,067	+79,748	+5,800	
Assistive Technology	36,109	36,109	36,109	---	---	D
Total, Rehabilitation services	2,509,428	2,583,376	2,589,176	+79,748	+5,800	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES						
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND.....	6,680	6,680	8,186	+1,506	+1,506	D
NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF.....	43,041	43,041	43,841	+800	+800	D
GALLAUDET UNIVERSITY.....	79,182	79,182	80,682	+1,500	+1,500	D
Total, Special Inst for Persons with Disabilities.	128,903	128,903	132,709	+3,806	+3,806	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION (1)						
Vocational education:						
Basic State Grants	1,015,550	1,043,550	1,035,550	+20,000	-8,000	D
Tech-Prep Education	100,000	105,000	105,000	+5,000	---	D
Tribally Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions (2)	2,919	2,919	3,100	+181	+181	D
National Progams: Research	13,497	20,497	13,497	---	-7,000	D
Subtotal, Vocational education	1,131,966	1,171,966	1,157,147	+25,181	-14,819	
Adult education:						
State Programs	340,339	382,000	340,339	---	-41,661	D
National programs:						
Evaluation and Technical Assistance	4,998	6,000	4,998	---	-1,002	D
National Institute for Literacy	4,491	6,000	4,491	---	-1,509	D
Subtotal, National programs	9,489	12,000	9,489	---	-2,511	
Literacy Programs for Prisoners	4,723	---	---	-4,723	---	D
Subtotal, adult education	354,551	394,000	349,828	-4,723	-44,172	
Total, Vocational and adult education	1,486,517	1,565,966	1,506,975	+20,458	-58,991	
Subtotal, forward funded	(1,483,598)	(1,563,047)	(1,503,875)	(+20,277)	(-59,172)	

(1) Forward funded except where noted.

(2) Current funded.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE						
Pell Grant -- maximum grant (NA)	(2,700)	(3,000)	(3,000)	(+300)	---	NA
Pell Grants -- Regular Program	5,919,000	7,635,000	7,438,000	+1,519,000	-197,000	D
Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	583,407	583,407	583,407	---	---	D
Federal Work Study	830,000	857,000	860,000	+30,000	+3,000	D
Federal Perkins loans:						
Capital Contributions	158,000	158,000	135,000	-23,000	-23,000	D
Loan Cancellations	20,000	30,000	30,000	+10,000	---	D
Subtotal, Federal Perkins loans	178,000	188,000	165,000	-13,000	-23,000	
State Student Incentive Grants	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---	D
Total, Student financial assistance	7,560,407	9,263,407	9,046,407	+1,486,000	-217,000	
FEDERAL FAMILY EDUCATION LOANS PROGRAM						
Federal Administration	46,482	47,688	47,688	+1,206	---	D

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
HIGHER EDUCATION						
Aid for institutional development:						
Strengthening Institutions	55,450	55,450	55,450	---	---	D
Hispanic Serving Institutions	10,800	12,000	12,000	+1,200	---	D
Hispanic serving institutions (Agriculture bill)	(2,000)	(2,000)	(2,000)	---	---	NA
Subtotal, Hispanic serving institutions	(12,800)	(14,000)	(14,000)	(+1,200)	---	
Strengthening Historically Black Colleges (HBCUs)	108,990	113,000	120,000	+11,010	+7,000	D
Strengthening historically black graduate insts	19,606	19,606	25,000	+5,394	+5,394	D
Endowment Challenge Grants, HBCU set-aside	---	2,015	---	---	-2,015	D
Subtotal, Institutional development	194,846	202,071	212,450	+17,604	+10,379	
Program development:						
Fund for the Improvement of Postsec. Ed. (FIPSE)	18,000	18,000	18,000	---	---	D
Minority Teacher Recruitment	2,212	3,727	2,500	+288	-1,227	D
Minority Science Improvement	5,255	5,255	5,255	---	---	D
International educ & foreign language studies:						
Domestic Programs	53,481	53,481	54,481	+1,000	+1,000	D
Overseas Programs	5,270	5,770	5,770	+500	---	D
Institute for International Public Policy	1,000	1,000	---	-1,000	-1,000	D
Subtotal, International education	59,751	60,251	60,251	+500	---	
Urban Community Service	9,200	---	---	-9,200	---	D
Subtotal, Program development	94,418	87,233	86,006	-8,412	-1,227	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Interest Subsidy Grants for Prior Year Const.....	15,673	13,700	13,700	-1,973	---	D
Special grants:						
Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center.....	1,400	---	6,620	+5,220	+6,620	D
Federal TRIO Programs.....	499,994	525,000	532,000	+32,006	+7,000	D
National Early Intervention Scholarships and Partn	3,600	---	---	-3,600	---	D
Advanced Placement Fees.....	---	6,000	---	---	-6,000	D
Scholarships:						
Byrd Honors Scholarships.....	29,117	39,288	29,117	---	-10,171	D
Presidential Honors Scholarships.....	---	132,000	---	---	-132,000	D
George Bush Fellowships.....	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---	D
Edmund Muskie Foundation.....	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---	D
Pell Institute for International Relations.....	3,000	---	---	-3,000	---	D
Calvin Coolidge Memorial Foundation.....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---	D
Subtotal, Scholarships.....	39,117	171,288	29,117	-10,000	-142,171	
Graduate fellowships:						
Javits Fellowships.....	5,931	---	---	-5,931	---	D
Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need.....	24,069	30,000	30,000	+5,931	---	D
Subtotal, Graduate fellowships.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	---	---	
Total, Higher education.....	879,048	1,035,292	909,893	+30,845	-125,399	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
HOWARD UNIVERSITY						
Academic Program	166,511	162,981	180,511	+14,000	+17,530	D
Endowment Program	---	3,530	---	---	-3,530	D
Howard University Hospital	29,489	29,489	29,489	---	---	D
Total, Howard University	196,000	196,000	210,000	+14,000	+14,000	
COLLEGE HOUSING & ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS PROGRAM:						
Federal Administration	698	1,069	698	---	-371	D
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM						
Federal Administration	104	104	104	---	---	D

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT						
Research and statistics:						
Research	72,567	81,035	81,035	+8,468	---	D
Regional Education Laboratories	51,000	53,500	57,000	+6,000	+3,500	D
Statistics	50,000	66,250	66,250	+16,250	---	D
Assessment:						
National Assessment	29,752	35,502	35,502	+5,750	---	D
National Assessment Governing Board	2,865	2,871	2,865	---	-6	D
Subtotal, Assessment	32,617	38,373	38,367	+5,750	-6	
Subtotal, Research and statistics	206,184	239,158	242,652	+36,468	+3,494	
Fund for the Improvement of Education	40,000	40,000	80,000	+40,000	+40,000	D
International Education Exchange	5,000	5,000	---	-5,000	-5,000	D
21st Century Community Learning Centers	1,000	---	50,000	+49,000	+50,000	D
Civics Education	4,500	4,500	5,500	+1,000	+1,000	D
Eisenhower Professional Dvp. National Activities	13,342	30,000	21,000	+7,658	-9,000	D
Eisenhower Regional Math & Science Ed. Consortia	15,000	15,000	15,000	---	---	D
Javits Gifted and Talented Education	5,000	7,000	6,000	+1,000	-1,000	D
National Writing Project	3,100	---	3,100	---	+3,100	D
After School Learning Centers	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000	D

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
Education technology:						
Technology for Education	66,965	85,000	85,000	+18,035	---	D
Star Schools	30,000	26,000	---	-30,000	-26,000	D
Ready to Learn Television	7,000	7,000	---	-7,000	-7,000	D
Telcom Demo Project for Mathematics	1,035	2,035	---	-1,035	-2,035	D
Subtotal, Education technology	105,000	120,035	85,000	-20,000	-35,035	
Total, ERSI	398,126	510,693	508,252	+110,126	-2,441	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
LIBRARIES						
Public libraries:						
Services	100,636	---	---	-100,636	---	D
Construction	16,369	---	---	-16,369	---	D
Interlibrary Cooperation	11,864	---	---	-11,864	---	D
Library Education and Training	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---	D
Research and Demonstrations	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---	D
Institute of Museum and Library Services	---	136,369	142,000	+142,000	+5,631	D
Total, Libraries	136,369	136,369	142,000	+5,631	+5,631	
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT						
PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION	326,217	341,039	329,579	+3,362	-11,460	D
OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS	54,900	61,500	55,449	+549	-6,051	D
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	29,943	32,000	30,242	+299	-1,758	D
Total, Departmental management	411,060	434,539	415,270	+4,210	-19,269	
STUDENT LOANS						
New Annual Loan Volume (including consolidation):						
Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL)	(23,038,000)	(22,995,000)	(22,995,000)	(-43,000)	---	NA
Federal Direct Student Loans (FDSL)	(13,789,000)	(16,930,000)	(16,930,000)	(+3,141,000)	---	NA
Total Outstanding Loan Volume:						
Federal Family Education Loans (FFEL)	(88,864,000)	(101,148,000)	(101,148,000)	(+12,284,000)	---	NA
Federal Direct Student Loans (FDSL)	(23,153,000)	(36,829,000)	(36,829,000)	(+13,676,000)	---	NA
Total, Department of Education	28,957,978	32,069,494	32,144,189	+3,186,211	+74,695	
Current year	(28,957,978)	(32,069,494)	(31,884,189)	(+2,926,211)	(-185,305)	
1999 advance	---	---	(260,000)	(+260,000)	(+260,000)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
TITLE IV - RELATED AGENCIES						
ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME						
Operations and Maintenance: TF Limitation.....	55,663	55,452	55,452	-211	---	D
Capital Program: TF Limitation.....	432	24,525	14,825	+14,393	-9,700	D
Total, AFRH.....	56,095	79,977	70,277	+14,182	-9,700	
CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE						
Domestic Volunteer Service Programs: (1)						
Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA).....	41,235	54,000	41,235	---	-12,765	D
National Senior Volunteer Corps:						
Foster Grandparents Program.....	77,812	85,972	84,106	+6,294	-1,866	D
Senior Companion Program.....	31,244	35,449	34,669	+3,425	-780	D
Retired Senior Volunteer Program.....	35,708	45,043	39,408	+3,700	-5,635	D
Senior Demonstration Program.....	---	10,000	---	---	-10,000	D
Subtotal, Senior Volunteers.....	144,764	176,464	158,183	+13,419	-18,281	
Program Administration.....	27,850	29,836	28,129	+279	-1,707	D
Total, Domestic Volunteer Service Programs.....	213,849	260,300	227,547	+13,698	-32,753	
Corporation for Public Broadcasting:						
FY2000 (current request) with FY99 comparable.....	250,000	325,000	300,000	+50,000	-25,000	D
FY99 advance with FY98 comparable (NA).....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---	NA
FY98 advance with FY97 comparable (NA).....	(260,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(-10,000)	---	NA
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	32,525	33,481	33,481	+956	---	D
Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Comm'n.....	6,049	6,060	6,060	+11	---	D

(1) The request earmarks $38 million for America Reads. Appropriations for Americorps are included in the VA-HUD bill.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
National Commission on Libraries and Info Science.....	897	1,123	1,000	+103	-123	D
National Council on Disability.....	1,791	1,793	1,793	+2	---	D
National Education Goals Panel.....	1,495	2,000	2,000	+505	---	D
National Commission on Cost of Higher Education.....	650	---	---	-650	---	D
National Labor Relations Board.....	174,661	186,434	174,661	---	-11,773	D
National Mediation Board.....	8,284	8,100	8,400	+116	+300	D
Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n.....	7,738	7,800	7,900	+162	+100	D
Physician Payment Review Commission (TF).....	(3,258)	(3,578)	(3,258)	---	(-320)	TF*
Prospective Payment Assessment Commission (TF).....	(3,257)	(3,579)	(3,257)	---	(-322)	TF*
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD						
Dual Benefits Payments Account.....	223,000	206,000	206,000	-17,000	---	D
Less Income Tax Receipts on Dual Benefits.....	-9,000	-12,000	-12,000	-3,000	---	D
Subtotal, Dual Benefits.....	214,000	194,000	194,000	-20,000	---	
Federal Payment to the RR Retirement Account.....	300	50	50	-250	---	M
Limitation on administration:						
Consolidated Account.....	(87,728)	(88,800)	(85,728)	(-2,000)	(-3,072)	TF*
Inspector General.....	(5,394)	(5,400)	(5,000)	(-394)	(-400)	TF*

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION						
Payments to Social Security Trust Funds	20,923	20,308	20,308	-615	---	M
Additional Administrative Expenses (1)	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---	M
SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR DISABLED COAL MINERS						
Benefit payments	625,450	581,470	581,470	-43,980	---	M
Administration	4,620	4,620	4,620	---	---	M
Subtotal, Black Lung, FY97/98 program level	630,070	586,090	586,090	-43,980	---	
Less funds advanced in prior year	-170,000	-160,000	-160,000	+10,000	---	M
Total, Black Lung, current request, FY97/98	460,070	426,090	426,090	-33,980	---	
New advances, 1st quarter FY98/99	160,000	160,000	160,000	---	---	M

(1) No-year availability.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME						
Federal benefit payments	26,559,100	23,710,300	23,710,300	-2,848,800	---	M
Beneficiary services	100,000	46,000	46,000	-54,000	---	M
Research and demonstration	7,000	16,700	16,700	+9,700	---	M
Administration	1,946,015	2,037,000	2,037,000	+90,985	---	D
Automation investment initiative	19,895	50,000	50,000	+30,105	---	D
Subtotal, SSI FY97/98 program level	28,632,010	25,860,000	25,860,000	-2,772,010	---	
Less funds advanced in prior year	-9,260,000	-9,690,000	-9,690,000	-430,000	---	M
Subtotal, regular SSI current year, FY 1997 / 1998	19,372,010	16,170,000	16,170,000	-3,202,010	---	
User Fee Appropriation	---	35,000	35,000	+35,000	---	D
Additional CDR funding	25,000	75,000	75,000	+50,000	---	D
SSI reforms (welfare)	150,000	100,000	100,000	-50,000	---	D
Total, SSI, current request, FY 1997 / 1998	19,547,010	16,380,000	16,380,000	-3,167,010	---	
New advance, 1st quarter, FY98/99	9,690,000	8,680,000	8,680,000	-1,010,000	---	M

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES (1)						
OASDI Trust Funds	(3,068,300)	(2,992,440)	(2,934,440)	(-133,860)	(-58,000)	TF
HI/SMI Trust Funds	(846,099)	(965,000)	(965,000)	(+118,901)	---	TF*
Social Security Advisory Board	(1,268)	(1,600)	(1,600)	(+332)	---	TF
SSI	(1,946,015)	(2,037,000)	(2,037,000)	(+90,985)	---	TF
Subtotal, regular LAE	(5,861,682)	(5,996,040)	(5,938,040)	(+76,358)	(-58,000)	
User Fee Appropriation	---	(35,000)	(35,000)	(+35,000)	---	TF
OASDI Automation	(215,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(-65,000)	---	TF
SSI Automation	(19,895)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(+30,105)	---	TF
Subtotal, automation initative	(234,895)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(-34,895)	---	
TOTAL, REGULAR LAE	(6,096,577)	(6,231,040)	(6,173,040)	(+76,463)	(-58,000)	
Additional CDR funding (2)	(160,000)	(190,000)	(145,000)	(-15,000)	(-45,000)	TF
SSI reforms (welfare)	(150,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(-50,000)	---	TF
TOTAL, LAE	(6,406,577)	(6,521,040)	(6,418,040)	(+11,463)	(-103,000)	

(1) All trust fund limitations will be scored as BA in FY 98. Comparable adjustments for FY 97 and FY 98 displayed as scorekeeping adjustments.

(2) The request is $45 million above the authorized amount. The recommendation is for the full authorized amount.

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request	
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL						
Federal Funds	6,265	10,164	10,164	+3,899	---	D
Trust Funds	(31,089)	---	---	(-31,089)	---	TF
Portion treated as budget authority	---	(34,260)	(42,260)	(+42,260)	(+8,000)	TF*
Total, Office of the Inspector General	37,354	44,424	52,424	+15,070	+8,000	
Federal funds	6,265	10,164	10,164	+3,899	---	
Trust funds	(31,089)	(34,260)	(42,260)	(+11,171)	(+8,000)	
Total, Social Security Administration	36,331,934	32,231,862	32,136,862	-4,195,072	-95,000	
Federal funds	29,894,268	25,676,562	25,676,562	-4,217,706	---	
Current year FY 1997 / 1998	(20,044,268)	(16,836,562)	(16,836,562)	(-3,207,706)	---	
New advances, 1st quarter FY 1998 / 1999	(9,850,000)	(8,840,000)	(8,840,000)	(-1,010,000)	---	
Trust funds	(6,437,666)	(6,555,300)	(6,460,300)	(+22,634)	(-95,000)	
United States Institute of Peace	11,149	11,160	11,160	+11	---	D
Total, Title IV, Related Agencies	37,411,054	33,450,497	33,272,434	-4,138,620	-178,063	
Federal Funds (all years)	30,873,751	26,793,840	26,714,891	-4,158,860	-78,949	
Current year, FY 1997 / 1998	(20,773,751)	(17,628,840)	(17,574,891)	(-3,198,860)	(-53,949)	
FY 1998 / 1999	(9,850,000)	(8,840,000)	(8,840,000)	(-1,010,000)	---	
FY 1999 / 2000	(250,000)	(325,000)	(300,000)	(+50,000)	(-25,000)	
Trust funds	(6,537,303)	(6,656,657)	(6,557,543)	(+20,240)	(-99,114)	

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request
SUMMARY					
Title I - Department of Labor:					
Federal Funds	8,739,722	9,422,853	9,225,845	+486,123	-197,008
Current year	(8,739,722)	(9,422,853)	(9,125,845)	(+386,123)	(-297,008)
1999 advance	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)
Trust Funds	(3,432,410)	(3,726,020)	(3,596,917)	(+164,507)	(-129,103)
Title II - Department of Health and Human Services:					
Federal Funds	210,126,904	200,848,537	201,592,108	-8,534,796	+743,571
Current year	(178,482,911)	(169,230,348)	(169,973,919)	(-8,508,992)	(+743,571)
1999 advance	(31,643,993)	(31,618,189)	(31,618,189)	(-25,804)	---
Trust Funds	(1,743,599)	(1,783,665)	(1,688,600)	(-54,999)	(-95,065)
Title III - Department of Education:					
Federal Funds	28,957,978	32,069,494	32,144,189	+3,186,211	+74,695
Current year	(28,957,978)	(32,069,494)	(31,884,189)	(+2,926,211)	(-185,305)
1999 advance	---	---	(260,000)	(+260,000)	(+260,000)
Title IV - Related Agencies:					
Federal Funds	30,873,751	26,793,840	26,714,891	-4,158,860	-78,949
Current year	(20,773,751)	(17,628,840)	(17,574,891)	(-3,198,860)	(-53,949)
1999 advance	(9,850,000)	(8,840,000)	(8,840,000)	(-1,010,000)	---
2000 advance	(250,000)	(325,000)	(300,000)	(+50,000)	(-25,000)
Trust Funds	(6,537,303)	(6,656,657)	(6,557,543)	(+20,240)	(-99,114)
Total, all titles:					
Federal Funds	278,698,355	269,134,724	269,677,033	-9,021,322	+542,309
Current year	(236,954,362)	(228,351,535)	(228,558,844)	(-8,395,518)	(+207,309)
1999 advance	(41,493,993)	(40,458,189)	(40,818,189)	(-675,804)	(+360,000)
2000 advance	(250,000)	(325,000)	(300,000)	(+50,000)	(-25,000)
Trust Funds	(11,713,312)	(12,166,342)	(11,843,060)	(+129,748)	(-323,282)

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request
BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT RECAP					
Federal Funds (all years)	278,698,355	269,134,724	269,677,033	-9,021,322	+542,309
Mandatory, total in bill	211,774,424	198,701,281	198,572,081	-13,202,343	-129,200
Less advances for subsequent years	-39,556,993	-38,458,189	-38,458,189	+1,098,804	---
Plus advances provided in prior years	40,385,350	38,949,993	38,949,993	-1,435,357	---
Adjustment for savings related to CDRs	-100,000	---	---	+100,000	---
Total, mandatory, current year	212,502,781	199,193,085	199,063,885	-13,438,896	-129,200
Discretionary, total in bill	66,923,931	70,433,443	71,104,952	+4,181,021	+671,509
Less advances for subsequent years	-2,187,000	-2,325,000	-2,660,000	-473,000	-335,000
Plus advances provided in prior years	260,000	2,187,000	2,187,000	+1,927,000	---
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Trust funds considered budget authority	6,110,432	6,597,917	6,378,594	+268,162	-219,323
Childcare welfare reform rescission	-6,120	---	---	+6,120	---
Title I advance funding, 1997/1998	1,298,239	1,298,386	1,298,239	---	-147
Title I advance funding, 1998/1999	-1,298,239	-1,298,386	-1,298,239	---	+147
LIHEAP 1997 Contingency	300,000	---	---	-300,000	---
Adjustment to balance with FY97 bill	-9,778	---	---	+9,778	---
Community schools transfer	(12,800)	---	---	(-12,800)	---
Adjustment for leg cap on Title XX SSBGs	120,000	---	---	-120,000	---
Emer designations, child care & terrorism	-28,575	---	---	+28,575	---

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES ($000)

	FY 1997 Comparable	FY 1998 Request	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with FY 1997 Comparable	Bill compared with FY 1998 Request
Reclassification of non-BA trust funds (1)....	3,461,970	3,271,425	3,167,466	-294,504	-103,959
Supplemental Child Care provision.....	1,000	---	---	-1,000	---
HEAL provision.....	499	---	1,000	+501	+1,000
SSA user fee collection.....	---	-35,000	-35,000	-35,000	---
Direct Loan Administration limitation.....	-218,000	---	---	+218,000	---
Total, discretionary, current year.....	74,728,359	80,129,785	80,144,012	+5,415,653	+14,227
Crime trust fund.....	61,000	144,000	144,000	+83,000	---
General purposes.....	74,667,359	79,985,785	80,000,012	+5,332,653	+14,227
Grand total, current year.....	287,231,140	279,322,870	279,207,897	-8,023,243	-114,973
Total amount provided in this bill.....	278,698,355	269,134,724	269,677,033	-9,021,322	+542,309
Total 602(b) adjustments.....	8,532,785	10,188,146	9,530,864	+998,079	-657,282
Grand total, current year.....	287,231,140	279,322,870	279,207,897	-8,023,243	-114,973

(1) Reflects adjustments in scoring adopted in FY98. These adjustments are included in the FY97 comparable figures only for the purposes of comparability.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998''.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, there are many elements of this legislation that are very favorable and deserving of our support, such as additional funding for Pell grants, Head Start, and other education programs. However, I reluctantly must oppose the bill due to the adoption of the Goodling amendment prohibiting the Department of Education from developing national standards for reading and mathematics.

Education of our Nation's young people, the future workers and leaders of this country, must be our highest priority. If America is to remain competitive in the global economy, we must have the best educated and best trained work force in the world. In order to ensure this, it is incumbent on the Federal Government to ensure that children across America are receiving adequate instruction, particularly in the core subjects of reading and math. The Goodling amendment will prevent this and may allow many students to fall through the cracks and deny them the education that is critical for their own success and for America's prosperity.

I am hopeful that the conference committee will delete the Goodling amendment from the conference report, and that we are ultimately presented with an appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education that provides adequate funding for the educational needs of our young people, and ensures that these resources are actually utilized to prepare them for their future.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. If there are no further amendments, under the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, 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. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, pursuant to the previous order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 346, nays 80, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

YEAS—346

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snyder
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thune
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—80

Aderholt
Archer
Bachus
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Brady
Bryant
Burton
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Doolittle
Everett
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Largent
Linder
Lofgren
Manzullo
McCollum
McInnis
McIntosh
Mica
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Neumann
Norwood
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Petri
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Riley
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Snowbarger
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Wamp
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Condit
Furse
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Kasich
Schiff
Yates

☐ 1404

Messrs. WAMP, ADERHOLT, COX of California, BACHUS, and TAYLOR of Mississippi changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. SANCHEZ, and Messrs. HILLIARD, SUNUNU, PORTMAN, and Ms. CARSON changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby give notice of my intention to offer a resolution which raises a question of the privileges of the House. The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas, former Representative Robert Dornan has abused his privileges as a former