Martinez	Pascrell	Smith (WA)
Mascara	Pastor	Snyder
Matsui	Payne	Spratt
McCarthy (MO)	Pelosi	Stabenow
McCarthy (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Stark
McGovern	Phelps	Stenholm
McIntyre	Pickett	Strickland
McKinney	Pomeroy	Stupak
McNulty	Price (NC)	Tanner
Meehan	Rahall	Tauscher
Meek (FL)	Rangel	Taylor (MS)
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Rivers	Thurman
Millender-McDonald	Rodriguez	Tierney
Miller, George	Roemer	Towns
Minge	Rothman	Turner
Mink	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Moakley	Rush	Udall (NM)
Moore	Sabo	Velazquez
Moran (VA)	Sanchez	Vento
Murtha	Sanders	Visclosky
Nadler	Sandlin	Waters
Napolitano	Sawyer	Watt (NC)
Neal	Schakowsky	Waxman
Oberstar	Scott	Weiner
Obey	Serrano	Wexler
Olver	Sherman	Weygand
Ortiz	Shows	Wise
Owens	Sisisky	Woolsey
Pallone	Skelton	Wu
	Slaughter	Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Bilbray	Jefferson	Peterson (PA)
Deal	Lantos	Thompson (MS)
Ehrlich	McDermott	

□ 1246

Mr. CALLAHAN and Mr. SANFORD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2670.

□ 1248

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2670, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 2000, provides funding for programs whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes, to the conduct of diplomacy around the world, to predicting the weather from satellites in outer space.

Mr. Chairman, this bill requires a very delicate balancing of needs and requirements, from ongoing activities and operations of the departments and regulatory agencies, to new areas of concern like preparing to respond to the threat of domestic terrorism or beefing up worldwide security for our embassies overseas, to special funding requirements like the decennial census.

This year, our capacity to respond to all of these needs is tempered by the fiscal restraint under which we are forced to operate. The 1997 budget act for 5 years imposed spending restraints in each of those 5 years, in other words, budget caps, spending caps, beyond which we cannot exceed. We all went home after we passed that Budget Act of 1997, most of us voted for it, both sides of the aisle, and we crowed about how we were saving America's fiscal integrity, and we did.

Mr. Chairman, the piper is at the door waiting to be paid for that party, and this bill represents the piper. This is a very, very austere bill. We are having to live with those budget caps and yet maintain some very, very critical agencies of this government, a little bit like as I told in the full committee, the old drunk back home that was arrested for setting his bed on fire at the rooming house where he lived, he came into court and the judge asked for his plea, and the old fellow said, ''Well, your honor, I plead guilty to being drunk, but that doggone bed was on fire when I got in it.'' I am telling my colleagues that these budget caps are with us. We have to live with it. And we will.

We have had to carefully prioritize the funding in this bill and make very hard judgments about how to spend these limited resources.

The bill before the Committee today recommends a total of $35.8 billion in discretionary funding that comes from three places: $27.1 billion is general purpose discretionary funds; $4.2 billion is from the violent crime trust fund; and $4.5 billion is emergency funding.

Leaving aside the Census, and oh, how I wish I could leave aside the Census, the bill is $833 million below current spending and $1.3 billion below the CBO's freeze level for fiscal year 2000.

For the Department of Justice, the bill provides $18.1 billion, $6 million above current spending. Increases are provided to maintain current operating levels of key law enforcement agencies. FBI, DEA, U.S. Attorneys, U.S. Marshals, U.S. Bureau of Prisons all are maintained at their current operating level. And we address a severe detention space shortfall in the Bureau of Prisons and the INS with this bill.

These increases are offset by a decrease in funding for COPS, from $1.4 billion to $268 million. I would point out that that $268 million is the full authorization level set in law for the final year of the current program. That is all we are allowed by law to appropriate, and we did.

Local law enforcement and criminal justice block grants are maintained at or near last year's level, $1.3 billion more than the administration requested. That assures that your State and local law enforcement agencies, your sheriffs, your police departments, continue to have the resources to fight crime in your districts.

The major program increases in the bill can be counted on two fingers, and they are both in Justice, $100 million for 1,000 new border patrol agents, which the administration refused to request, and $22 million for the Drug Enforcement Administration, equaling the administration's budget request.

I would point out and remind Members that the latest statistics on violent crime in the United States show that America is now suffering the least number of violent crimes since we have been keeping records. I would like to say to my subcommittee members over those years, and the full committee members, and the full Congress, a big thank you on behalf of the American people for staying with funding for these law agencies over these years to enable America now to have the lowest crime rate in recorded history.

For the Immigration and Naturalization Service, we continue to provide resources for the naturalization backlog reduction initiative, for the detention shortfall, and for the border patrol, and we continue to hope against hope that the most mismanaged and unmanageable agency of the Federal Government, the INS, will dig its way out of its continuing state of crisis. They cannot claim money as a cause, because we have given them all the money they can spend and more, to be frank. We have doubled this agency's budget in 5 years, tripled it in the last 10 years, and yet it manages now to perform crisis after crisis.

In the Department of Commerce, we provide full funding for the 2000 decennial census. All the money is there.

Every penny that is needed by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Census to conduct the decennial census is in this bill. Make no mistake. For those who have been crying all of these years for adequate funding for the decennial census, and after we had pleaded with the administration to furnish us the dollar figure of the request for a full census, only 7 weeks ago, months and months behind schedule, they finally coughed up the figure. That figure now in this bill, $4.5 billion, is an increase of $3.5 billion over current spending, no restrictions. ''Do the census. You got the money.''

In the rest of the Commerce section, we provide $3.6 billion, which is $500 million below fiscal year 1999. We include current operating levels for the National Weather Service and avert commercial service office closings overseas, which are more than offset by decreases in low priority NOAA programs and the termination of the Advanced Technology Program.

Judiciary, $3.9 billion, an increase of $272 million, maintains current operating levels.

State Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors, $5.7 billion, $1.3 billion below current appropriations, including emergencies.

We include $568 million, Mr. Chairman, for the costs of worldwide security improvements to our embassies, places where Americans work overseas, and we replace vulnerable embassies started in 1999 with emergency funding.

We include $351 million for the third and final year of U.N. arrears, subject to authorization, the amount agreed to by the White House and Congress in the pending authorization.

It abolishes two agencies, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the U.S. Information Agency. We merge them into the State Department.

□ 1300

Most of the related agencies are frozen at 1999 levels; 141 million for the LSC; for SBA, 734 million, a $15 million increase over fiscal 1999. And we continue our emphasis on funding disaster loans, a function that SBA has continued to raid to fund salaries and expenses over the last 3 years. This is the second year we have been required to send them a message on that issue.

This is the bare bones of the recommendations before my colleagues today. It is based on a freeze with reductions where we could, and increases above fiscal 1999 where needed to maintain operations of critical law enforcement and other agencies. We give no ground on the war on crime and drugs. We provide the resources to State and local law enforcement that has helped bring the violent crime rate down for 5 straight years to its lowest level since Justice began tracking in 1973. We fully fund the 2000 census. We pull our weight with respect to meeting the need for fiscal restraint and more.

Mr. Chairman, this bill represents our best take on matching needs with scarce resources to do the right thing.

I want to thank the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), who has been a very effective and a very valued partner and colleague on this bill. He has been a quick study. He is brand new on the subcommittee and brand new as ranking member, and this is a complicated bill with a lot of coverage, and he has spent a lot of late nights working getting ready for preparing to help bring this bill to the floor. I want to thank him for his good work.

I also want to thank all of the members of the subcommittee: the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP), the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) for all of their help and assistance.

And let us take a moment to extend our deepest sympathy to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and his family on the loss of his father who preceded Alan, of course, as a Member of this body and on this subcommittee. Our hearts go out to Alan and all of his family, and I thank him for his valued help in preparing this bill.

Finally, I want to thank my full chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). They have been marvelous in helping us move this bill forward. We have tried very hard to produce the best bill we possibly could within the resources we had to work with. I think it is a good bill; it is a fair bill. It is austere, but I think it is fair, and I urge all Members to support it.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses	79,328	87,534	79,328	.....	-8,206
Narrowband communications	.....	80,000	.....	.....	-80,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(101,434)	(+101,434)	(+101,434)
Counterterrorism fund	10,000	27,000	10,000	.....	-17,000
1st Responder grants	135,000	.....	.....	-135,000	.....
Telecommunications carrier compliance fund	.....	7,000	7,000	+7,000	.....
Defense function	.....	8,000	8,000	+8,000	.....
Administrative review and appeals:					
Direct appropriation	75,312	89,901	84,200	+8,888	-5,701
Crime trust fund	59,251	59,251	50,363	-8,888	-8,888
Total, Administrative review and appeals	134,563	149,152	134,563	.....	-14,589
Office of Inspector General	34,175	45,021	42,475	+8,300	-2,546
Total, General administration	393,066	403,707	281,366	-111,700	-122,341
Appropriations	(333,815)	(344,456)	(231,003)	(-102,812)	(-113,453)
Crime trust fund	(59,251)	(59,251)	(50,363)	(-8,888)	(-8,888)
United States Parole Commission					
Salaries and expenses	7,380	8,527	7,380	.....	-1,147
Legal Activities					
General legal activities:					
Direct appropriation	466,540	568,316	355,691	-110,849	-212,625
Crime trust fund	8,160	8,555	147,929	+139,769	+139,374
Total, General legal activities	474,700	576,871	503,620	+28,920	-73,251
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)	4,028	4,028	3,424	-604	-604
Antitrust Division	98,267	114,373	105,167	+6,900	-9,206
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,000	-47,799	-47,799	-17,799	.....
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-68,275	-66,574	-57,368	+10,907	+9,206
Direct appropriation	-8	.....	.....	+8	.....
United States Attorneys:					
Direct appropriation	1,009,253	1,217,788	1,161,957	+152,704	-55,831
Crime trust fund	80,698	57,000	.....	-80,698	-57,000
Total, United States Attorneys	1,089,951	1,274,788	1,161,957	+72,006	-112,831
United States Trustee System Fund:					
Current year fee funding	114,248	129,329	108,248	-6,000	-21,081
Fees and interest (legislative proposal)	.....	32,000	6,000	+6,000	-26,000
Total, United States trustee system fund	114,248	161,329	114,248	.....	-47,081
Offsetting fee collections	-114,248	-129,329	-108,248	+6,000	+21,081
Offsetting fee collections - legis. proposal	.....	-32,000	-6,000	-6,000	+26,000
Total, US trustee offsetting fee collections	-114,248	-161,329	-114,248	.....	+47,081
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,227	1,175	1,175	-52	.....
United States Marshals Service:					
Direct appropriation	476,356	543,380	329,289	-147,067	-214,091
Crime trust fund	25,553	26,210	209,620	+184,067	+183,410
Construction	4,600	8,832	4,600	.....	-4,232
Justice prisoner and alien transportation system	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, United States Marshals Service	506,509	578,422	543,509	+37,000	-34,913
Federal prisoner detention	425,000	550,232	525,000	+100,000	-25,232
Fees and expenses of witnesses	95,000	110,000	95,000	.....	-15,000
Community Relations Service	7,199	10,344	7,199	.....	-3,145
Assets forfeiture fund	23,000	23,000	23,000	.....	.....
Total, Legal activities	2,626,606	3,128,860	2,863,884	+237,278	-264,976
Appropriations	(2,512,195)	(3,037,095)	(2,506,335)	(-5,860)	(-530,760)
Crime trust fund	(114,411)	(91,765)	(357,549)	(+243,138)	(+265,784)
Radiation Exposure Compensation					
Administrative expenses	2,000	2,000	2,000	.....	.....
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	.....	21,714	.....	.....	-21,714
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	2,000	23,714	2,000	.....	-21,714
Interagency Law Enforcement					
Interagency crime and drug enforcement 1/	304,014	.....	316,792	+12,778	+316,792
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses	2,396,239	2,742,876	2,064,542	-331,697	-678,334
Counterintelligence and national security	292,473	260,000	292,473	.....	+32,473
FBI Fingerprint identification	47,800	.....	.....	-47,800	.....
Direct appropriation	2,736,512	3,002,876	2,357,015	-379,497	-645,861

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Crime trust fund	223,356	280,501	752,853	+529,497	+472,352
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	2,959,868	3,283,377	3,109,868	+150,000	-173,509
Construction	1,287	10,287	1,287		-9,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	2,961,155	3,293,664	3,111,155	+150,000	-182,509
Appropriations	(2,737,799)	(3,013,163)	(2,358,302)	(-379,497)	(-654,861)
Crime trust fund	(223,356)	(280,501)	(752,853)	(+529,497)	(+472,352)
Salaries and expenses	875,523	1,055,572	1,012,330	+136,807	-43,242
Diversion control fund	-76,710	-80,330	-80,330	-3,620	
Direct appropriation	798,813	975,242	932,000	+133,187	-43,242
Crime trust fund	405,000	405,000	344,250	-60,750	-60,750
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	1,203,813	1,380,242	1,276,250	+72,437	-103,992
Construction	8,000	8,000	8,000		
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	1,211,813	1,388,242	1,284,250	+72,437	-103,992
Appropriations	(806,813)	(983,242)	(940,000)	(+133,187)	(-43,242)
Crime trust fund	(405,000)	(405,000)	(344,250)	(-60,750)	(-60,750)
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Salaries and expenses	1,617,269	2,435,638	1,665,041	+47,772	-770,597
Enforcement and border affairs	(1,069,754)	(1,900,627)	(1,130,030)	(+60,276)	(-770,597)
Citizenship and benefits, immigration support and program direction	(547,515)	(535,011)	(535,011)	(-12,504)	
Crime trust fund	842,490	500,000	1,267,225	+424,735	+767,225
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund	2,459,759	2,935,638	2,932,266	+472,507	-3,372
Fee accounts:					
Immigration user fee	(486,071)	(517,800)	(446,151)	(-39,920)	(-71,649)
Land border inspection fund	(3,275)	(6,595)	(6,595)	(+3,320)	
Immigration examinations fund	(635,700)	(688,579)	(712,800)	(+77,100)	(+24,221)
Breached bond fund 2/	(176,950)	(116,900)	(117,501)	(-59,449)	(+601)
Immigration enforcement fines	(4,050)	(3,800)	(1,303)	(-2,747)	(-2,497)
H-1b Visa fees		(1,125)	(1,125)	(+1,125)	
Subtotal, Fee accounts	(1,306,046)	(1,334,799)	(1,285,475)	(-20,571)	(-49,324)
Construction	90,000	99,664	90,000		-9,664
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(3,855,805)	(4,370,101)	(4,307,741)	(+451,936)	(-62,360)
Appropriations	(1,707,269)	(2,535,302)	(1,755,041)	(+47,772)	(-780,261)
Crime trust fund	(842,490)	(500,000)	(1,267,225)	(+424,735)	(+767,225)
(Fee accounts)	(1,306,046)	(1,334,799)	(1,285,475)	(-20,571)	(-49,324)
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses	2,952,154	3,191,928	3,172,004	+219,850	-19,924
Prior year carryover	-90,000	-70,000	-90,000		-20,000
Direct appropriation	2,862,154	3,121,928	3,082,004	+219,850	-39,924
Crime trust fund	26,499	26,499	22,524	-3,975	-3,975
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses	2,888,653	3,148,427	3,104,528	+215,875	-43,899
Buildings and facilities	410,997	558,791	558,791	+147,794	
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	3,000	3,429	2,490	-510	-939
Total, Federal Prison System	3,302,650	3,710,647	3,665,809	+363,159	-44,838
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice assistance	147,151	338,648	217,436	+70,285	-121,212
(By transfer)		(7,000)	(7,000)	(+7,000)	
State and local law enforcement assistance:					
Direct appropriations:					
Byrne grants (discretionary)	47,000			-47,000	
Byrne grants (formula)	505,000			-505,000	
Local law enforcement block grant			523,000	+523,000	+523,000
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)			(40,000)	(+40,000)	(+40,000)
State prison grants			686,500	+686,500	+686,500
State criminal alien assistance program			420,000	+420,000	+420,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	552,000		1,629,500	+1,077,500	+1,629,500
Crime trust fund:					
Byrne grants (formula)		400,000	505,000	+505,000	+105,000
Byrne grants (discretionary)		59,950	47,000	+47,000	-12,950
Local law enforcement block grant	523,000			-523,000	
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)	(40,000)			(-40,000)	
Juvenile crime block grant	250,000		250,000		+250,000
Drug testing and intervention program		100,000			-100,000
Indian tribal courts program	5,000	5,000		-5,000	-5,000
Drug courts	40,000	50,000	40,000		-10,000
Crime identification technology	45,000			-45,000	
State prison grants	720,500	75,000		-720,500	-75,000
State criminal alien assistance program	420,000	500,000		-420,000	-500,000
Violence Against Women grants	282,750	282,750	282,750		

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
State prison drug treatment	63,000	65,100	63,000		-2,100
DNA identification grants	15,000			-15,000	
Certainty of punishment grants		35,000			-35,000
Other crime control programs	5,700	5,700	5,700		
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	2,369,950	1,578,500	1,193,450	-1,176,500	-385,050
Total, State and local law enforcement	2,921,950	1,578,500	2,822,950	-99,000	+1,244,450
Weed and seed program fund	33,500		33,500		+33,500
Crime trust fund		33,500			-33,500
Community oriented policing services:					
Direct appropriations:					
Crime analysis technology		100,000			-100,000
Hiring program			150,000	+150,000	+150,000
School violence			17,500	+17,500	+17,500
Crime identification technology			15,000	+15,000	+15,000
Technology			15,500	+15,500	+15,500
Bulletproof vest grants			25,000	+25,000	+25,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations		100,000	223,000	+223,000	+123,000
Crime trust fund:					
Hiring program 3/	1,400,000	600,000		-1,400,000	-600,000
Police corps 3/	30,000			-30,000	
Crime identification technology		250,000	45,000	+45,000	-205,000
Community prosecutors		200,000			-200,000
Prevention		125,000			-125,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	1,430,000	1,175,000	45,000	-1,385,000	-1,130,000
Total, Community oriented policing services	1,430,000	1,275,000	268,000	-1,162,000	-1,007,000
Juvenile justice programs	284,597	288,597	284,597		-4,000
Public safety officers benefits program:					
Death benefits	31,809	32,541	32,541	+732	
Disability benefits		3,500			-3,500
Total, Public safety officers benefits program	31,809	36,041	32,541	+732	-3,500
Total, Office of Justice Programs	4,849,007	3,550,286	3,659,024	-1,189,983	+108,738
Appropriations	(1,049,057)	(763,286)	(2,420,574)	(+1,371,517)	(+1,657,288)
Crime trust fund	(3,799,950)	(2,787,000)	(1,238,450)	(-2,561,500)	(-1,548,550)
Total, title I, Department of Justice	18,207,450	18,542,949	18,213,926	+6,476	-329,023
Appropriations	(12,736,493)	(14,392,933)	(14,180,712)	(+1,444,219)	(-212,221)
Crime trust fund	(5,470,957)	(4,150,016)	(4,033,214)	(-1,437,743)	(-116,802)
(By transfer)		(7,000)	(108,434)	(+108,434)	(+101,434)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses	24,200	26,501	25,205	+1,005	-1,296
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	1,300			-1,300	
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	44,495	47,200	44,495		-2,705
Total, Related agencies	69,995	73,701	69,700	-295	-4,001
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration	286,264	308,431	298,236	+11,972	-10,195
Offsetting fee collections	-1,600	-3,000	-3,000	-1,400	
Direct appropriation	284,664	305,431	295,236	+10,572	-10,195
Export Administration					
Operations and administration	50,454	58,578	47,650	-2,804	-10,928
CWC enforcement	1,877	1,877	1,877		
Total, Export Administration	52,331	60,455	49,527	-2,804	-10,928
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs	368,379	364,379	364,379	-4,000	
Salaries and expenses	24,000	28,971	24,000		-4,971
Total, Economic Development Administration	392,379	393,350	388,379	-4,000	-4,971

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development	27,000	27,627	27,000		-627
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	826,369	860,564	829,842	+3,473	-30,722
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses	48,490	55,123	48,490		-6,633
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses	136,147	156,944	136,147		-20,797
Periodic censuses and programs	1,186,902	4,637,754	142,320	-1,044,582	-4,495,434
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	44,900			-44,900	
Emergency appropriations			4,476,253	+4,476,253	+4,476,253
Total, Bureau of the Census	1,367,949	4,794,698	4,754,720	+3,386,771	-39,978
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses	10,940	17,212	10,940		-6,272
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	21,000	35,055	18,000	-3,000	-17,055
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2003		299,000			-299,000
Information infrastructure grants	18,000	20,102	13,000	-5,000	-7,102
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	49,940	371,369	41,940	-8,000	-329,429
Patent and Trademark Office					
Current year fee funding	643,026	785,976	735,538	+92,512	-50,438
Prior year fee funding	71,000			-71,000	
(Prior year carryover)	(40,500)	(115,774)	(116,000)	(+75,500)	(+226)
Rescission	-71,000			+71,000	
Subtotal	(683,526)	(901,750)	(851,538)	(+168,012)	(-50,212)
Legislative proposal fees	102,000	20,000		-102,000	-20,000
Total, Patent and Trademark Office	(785,526)	(921,750)	(851,538)	(+66,012)	(-70,212)
Offsetting fee collections	-643,026	-785,976	-785,976	-142,950	
Offsetting fee collections - legis. proposal	-102,000	-20,000		+102,000	+20,000
Total, PTO offsetting fee collections	-745,026	-805,976	-785,976	-40,950	+20,000
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	1,466,379	5,221,190	4,794,712	+3,328,333	-426,478
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Technology Administration					
Under Secretary for Technology/ Office of Technology Policy					
Salaries and expenses	9,495	8,972	7,972	-1,523	-1,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services	280,136	289,622	280,136		-9,486
Industrial technology services	310,300	338,536	99,836	-210,464	-238,700
Construction of research facilities	56,714	106,798	56,714		-50,084
NTIS revolving fund		2,000			-2,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	647,150	736,956	436,686	-210,464	-300,270
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities	1,579,844	1,738,911	1,477,738	-102,106	-261,173
Offsetting collections (fisheries) (proposed)		-20,000			+20,000
Offsetting collections (navigations) (proposed)		-14,000			+14,000
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	1,880			-1,880	
Direct appropriation	1,581,724	1,704,911	1,477,738	-103,986	-227,173
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(63,381)	(64,926)	(67,226)	(+3,845)	(+2,300)
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent)	5,000			-5,000	
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund)	-5,000			+5,000	
(By transfer from Coastal zone management)		4,000			-4,000
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,581,724	1,708,911	1,477,738	-103,986	-231,173
Procurement, acquisition and construction	584,677	630,578	480,720	-103,957	-149,858
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2018		5,363,345			-5,363,345
Pacific coastal salmon recovery		160,000			-160,000
Coastal zone management fund	4,000		4,000		+4,000
Mandatory offset	-4,000	-4,000	-4,000		
Fishermen's contingency fund	953	953	953		
Foreign fishing observer fund	189	189	189		

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Fisheries finance program account	338	10,258	238	-100	-10,020
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	2,167,881	7,870,234	1,959,838	-208,043	-5,910,396
Appropriations	(2,167,881)	(2,506,889)	(1,959,838)	(-208,043)	(-547,051)
Advance appropriations		(5,363,345)			(-5,363,345)
Total, Science and Technology	2,824,526	8,616,162	2,404,496	-420,030	-6,211,666
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses	30,000	34,046	30,000		-4,046
Office of Inspector General	21,000	23,454	22,000	+1,000	-1,454
Total, General administration	51,000	57,500	52,000	+1,000	-5,500
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Fisheries promotional fund (rescission)		-1,187	-1,187	-1,187	
Total, Department of Commerce	5,098,279	14,680,528	8,010,163	+2,911,884	-6,670,365
Appropriations	(5,169,279)	(9,019,370)	(3,535,097)	(-1,634,182)	(-5,484,273)
Emergency appropriations			(4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-71,000)	(-1,187)	(-1,187)	(+69,813)	
Advance appropriations		(5,662,345)			(-5,662,345)
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	5,168,274	14,754,229	8,079,863	+2,911,589	-6,674,366
Appropriations	(5,239,274)	(9,093,071)	(3,604,797)	(-1,634,477)	(-5,488,274)
Emergency appropriations			(4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)	(+4,476,253)
Rescissions	(-71,000)	(-1,187)	(-1,187)	(+69,813)	
Advance appropriations		(5,662,345)			(-5,662,345)
(By transfer)	(63,381)	(64,926)	(67,226)	(+3,845)	(+2,300)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices	1,690	1,698	1,698	+8	
Other salaries and expenses	29,369	34,241	33,343	+3,974	-898
Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)	921			-921	
Total, Salaries and expenses	31,980	35,939	35,041	+3,061	-898
Care of the building and grounds	5,400	22,658	6,872	+1,472	-15,786
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	37,380	58,597	41,913	+4,533	-16,684
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,943	1,945	1,945	+2	
Other salaries and expenses	14,158	15,691	14,156	-2	-1,535
Total, Salaries and expenses	16,101	17,636	16,101		-1,535
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,506	1,525	1,525	+19	
Other salaries and expenses	10,298	10,621	10,279	-19	-342
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,804	12,146	11,804		-342
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	238,329	240,375	240,375	+2,046	
Other salaries and expenses	2,583,492	2,979,551	2,693,763	+110,271	-285,788
Direct appropriation	2,821,821	3,219,926	2,934,138	+112,317	-285,788
Crime trust fund	10,164	29,395	156,539	+146,375	+127,144
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,831,985	3,249,321	3,090,677	+258,692	-158,644
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,515	2,581	2,138	-377	-443
Defender services	360,952	374,839	361,548	+596	-13,291
Crime trust fund	30,879	36,605	26,247	-4,632	-10,358
Fees of jurors and commissioners	66,861	69,510	63,400	-3,461	-6,110
Court security	174,569	206,012	190,029	+15,460	-15,983
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	3,467,761	3,938,868	3,734,039	+266,278	-204,829
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses	54,500	58,428	54,500		-3,928
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses	17,716	18,997	17,716		-1,281
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	37,300	39,700	39,700	+2,400	

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses	9,487	10,600	8,500	-987	-2,100
General Provisions					
Judges pay raise (sec. 304)	.....	9,000	.....	.....	-9,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	3,652,049	4,163,972	3,924,273	+272,224	-239,699
Appropriations	(3,611,006)	(4,097,972)	(3,741,487)	(+130,481)	(-356,485)
Crime trust fund	(41,043)	(66,000)	(182,786)	(+141,743)	(+116,786)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs 4/	1,644,300	2,838,934	2,482,825	+838,525	-356,109
Worldwide security upgrade	.....	.....	254,000	+254,000	+254,000
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	1,644,300	2,838,934	2,736,825	+1,092,525	-102,109
Salaries and expenses	355,000	.....	.....	-355,000	.....
Capital investment fund	80,000	90,000	80,000	.....	-10,000
Office of Inspector General	27,495	30,054	28,495	+1,000	-1,559
Educational and cultural exchange programs	.....	210,329	175,000	+175,000	-35,329
Representation allowances	4,350	5,850	4,350	.....	-1,500
Protection of foreign missions and officials	8,100	9,490	8,100	.....	-1,390
Security and maintenance of United States missions	403,561	747,683	403,561	.....	-344,122
Worldwide security upgrade	.....	.....	313,617	+313,617	+313,617
Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2005	.....	3,600,000	.....	.....	-3,600,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	5,500	17,000	5,500	.....	-11,500
(By transfer)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	.....	.....
Commission on Holocaust Assets in U.S. (by transfer)	(2,000)	(1,162)	(1,162)	(-838)	.....
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	593	593	593	.....	.....
Administrative expenses	607	607	607	.....	.....
(By transfer)	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	.....	.....
Total, Repatriation loans program account	1,200	1,200	1,200	.....	.....
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	14,750	15,760	14,750	.....	-1,010
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	132,500	128,541	128,541	-3,959	.....
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	2,676,756	7,694,841	3,899,939	+1,223,183	-3,794,902
Appropriations	(2,676,756)	(4,094,841)	(3,899,939)	(+1,223,183)	(-194,902)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,600,000)	.....	.....	(-3,600,000)
International Organizations and Conferences					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	922,000	963,308	842,937	-79,063	-120,371
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	231,000	235,000	200,000	-31,000	-35,000
Arrearage payments	475,000	446,000	351,000	-124,000	-95,000
International conferences and contingencies (by transfer)	(16,223)	.....	.....	(-16,223)	.....
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	1,628,000	1,644,308	1,393,937	-234,063	-250,371
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	19,551	20,413	19,551	.....	-862
Construction	5,939	8,435	5,750	-189	-2,685
American sections, international commissions	5,733	6,493	5,733	.....	-760
International fisheries commissions	14,549	16,702	14,549	.....	-2,153
Total, International commissions	45,772	52,043	45,583	-189	-6,460
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation	8,250	15,000	8,000	-250	-7,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	.....	525	525	+525	.....
Israeli Arab scholarship program	.....	350	350	+350	.....
East-West Center	.....	12,500	.....	.....	-12,500
North/South Center	.....	2,500	.....	.....	-2,500
National Endowment for Democracy	.....	32,000	31,000	+31,000	-1,000
Total, Department of State	4,358,778	9,454,067	5,379,334	+1,020,556	-4,074,733
Appropriations	(4,358,778)	(5,854,067)	(5,379,334)	(+1,020,556)	(-474,733)
Advance appropriations	.....	(3,600,000)	.....	.....	(-3,600,000)
RELATED AGENCIES					
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency					
Arms control and disarmament activities	41,500	.....	.....	-41,500	.....
United States Information Agency					
International information programs	455,246	.....	.....	-455,246	.....
Technology fund (by transfer)	(2,000)	.....	.....	(-2,000)	.....
Educational and cultural exchange programs	202,500	.....	.....	-202,500	.....
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	525	.....	.....	-525	.....
Israeli Arab scholarship program	350	.....	.....	-350	.....
International Broadcasting Operations	362,365	.....	.....	-362,365	.....

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Broadcasting to Cuba (direct)	22,095			-22,095	
Radio construction	13,245			-13,245	
East-West Center	12,500			-12,500	
North/South Center	1,750			-1,750	
National Endowment for Democracy	31,000			-31,000	
Total, United States Information Agency	1,101,576			-1,101,576	
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations		431,722	410,404	+410,404	-21,318
Broadcasting capital improvements		20,868	11,258	+11,258	-9,610
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors		452,590	421,662	+421,662	-30,928
Total, related agencies	1,143,076	452,590	421,662	-721,414	-30,928
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,501,854	9,906,657	5,800,996	+299,142	-4,105,661
Appropriations	(5,501,854)	(6,306,657)	(5,800,996)	(+299,142)	(-505,661)
Advance appropriations		(3,600,000)			(-3,600,000)
(By transfer)	(25,223)	(6,162)	(6,162)	(-19,061)	
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Maritime Administration					
Maritime Security Program	89,650	98,700	98,700	+9,050	
Operations and training	69,303	72,164	69,303		-2,861
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Guaranteed loans subsidy	6,000	6,000	5,400	-600	-600
Administrative expenses	3,725	3,893	3,725		-168
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	9,725	9,893	9,125	-600	-768
Total, Maritime Administration	168,678	180,757	177,128	+8,450	-3,629
Census Monitoring Board					
Salaries and expenses		4,000			-4,000
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses	265	265	265		
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses	8,900	11,000	8,900		-2,100
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses	1,170	1,250	1,170		-80
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses	279,000	312,000	279,000		-33,000
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses	192,000	230,887	192,000		-38,887
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-172,523	-185,754	-185,754	-13,231	
Direct appropriation	19,477	45,133	6,246	-13,231	-38,887
Federal Maritime Commission					
Salaries and expenses	14,150	15,300	14,150		-1,150
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	116,679	133,368	116,679		-16,689
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,000	-39,472	-39,472	-9,472	
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-76,500	-93,896	-77,207	-707	+16,689
Direct appropriation	10,179			-10,179	
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	300,000	340,000	141,000	-159,000	-199,000
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,240	1,300	1,240		-60
Ocean Policy Commission					
Salaries and expenses	3,500			-3,500	
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses	23,000			-23,000	
Current year fees	214,000	230,000	193,200	-20,800	-36,800
1998 fees	87,000	130,800	130,800	+43,800	
Direct appropriation	324,000	360,800	324,000		-36,800

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses	288,300	263,000	245,500	-42,800	-17,500
Office of Inspector General	10,800	11,000	10,800		-200
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	2,200	4,000	762	-1,438	-3,238
Guaranteed loans subsidy	128,030	144,368	128,030		-16,338
Administrative expenses	94,000	131,000	94,000		-37,000
Total, Business loans program account	224,230	279,368	222,792	-1,438	-56,576
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	76,329	39,400	139,400	+63,071	+100,000
Contingent emergency appropriations		158,000			-158,000
Administrative expenses	116,000	86,000	116,000		+30,000
Contingent emergency appropriations		75,000			-75,000
Total, Disaster loans program account	192,329	358,400	255,400	+63,071	-103,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	3,300			-3,300	
Total, Small Business Administration	718,959	911,768	734,492	+15,533	-177,276
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses 5/	6,850	15,000		-6,850	-15,000
Total, title V, Related agencies	1,856,368	2,198,573	1,687,591	-168,777	-510,982
Appropriations	(1,856,368)	(1,965,573)	(1,687,591)	(-168,777)	(-277,982)
Contingent emergency appropriations		(233,000)			(-233,000)
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Working capital fund (rescission)	-99,000			+99,000	
Legal Activities					
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)	-2,000			+2,000	
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
FY 1998 FBI construction (rescission)	-4,000			+4,000	
No Year FBI salaries and expenses (rescission)	-6,400			+6,400	
FY 1996 VCRP (rescission)	-2,000			+2,000	
FY 1997 VCRP (rescission)	-300			+300	
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	-12,700			+12,700	
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Immigration emergency fund (rescission)	-5,000		-1,137	+3,863	-1,137
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
FY 1998 Commerce (rescission)	-2,090			+2,090	
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Industrial technology services (rescission)	-6,000			+6,000	
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research and facilities (rescission of emergency appropriations)		-3,400			+3,400
DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
United States Information Agency					
Buying power maintenance (rescission)	-20,000			+20,000	
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International broadcasting operations (rescission)			-14,829	-14,829	-14,829
RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Maritime Administration					
Ship construction fund (rescission)	-17,000			+17,000	
Small Business Administration					
Business Loans Program Account:					
Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission)			-12,400	-12,400	-12,400
Total, title VII, Rescissions	-163,790	-3,400	-28,366	+135,424	-24,966
Rescissions	(-163,790)		(-28,366)	(+135,424)	(-28,366)
Rescission of emergency appropriations		(-3,400)			(+3,400)

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2670)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VIII - OTHER APPROPRIATIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses	21,680			-21,680	
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses	10,200			-10,200	
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Salaries and expenses	10,000			-10,000	
Border affairs	80,000			-80,000	
Department of Justice (Y2K conversion)	84,396			-84,396	
Total, Department of Justice	206,276			-206,276	
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities	5,000			-5,000	
Department of Commerce (Y2K conversion)	57,920			-57,920	
Total, Department of Commerce	62,920			-62,920	
THE JUDICIARY					
Judicial information technology fund (Y2K conversion)	13,044			-13,044	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs	790,771			-790,771	
Salaries and expenses	12,000			-12,000	
Office of Inspector General	1,000			-1,000	
Security and maintenance of United States missions	677,500			-677,500	
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	12,929			-12,929	
Department of State (Y2K conversion)	64,918			-64,918	
Total, Department of State	1,559,118			-1,559,118	
RELATED AGENCIES					
Small Business Administration					
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	71,000			-71,000	
Administrative expenses	30,000			-30,000	
Total, Disaster loans program account	101,000			-101,000	
Small Business Administration (Y2K conversion)	4,840			-4,840	
Total, Small Business Administration	105,840			-105,840	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Maritime Administration (Y2K conversion)	530			-530	
Federal Communications Commission (Y2K conversion)	8,516			-8,516	
Federal Trade Commission (Y2K conversion)	550			-550	
Marine Mammal Commission (Y2K conversion)	38			-38	
Office of the US Trade Representative (Y2K conversion)	498			-498	
Securities and Exchange Commission (Y2K conversion)	8,175			-8,175	
United States Information Agency (Y2K conversion)	9,562			-9,562	
Total, title VIII, emergency appropriations	1,975,067			-1,975,067	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	36,197,272	49,562,980	37,678,283	+1,481,011	-11,884,697
Appropriations	(28,944,995)	(35,856,206)	(29,015,583)	(+70,588)	(-6,840,623)
Emergency appropriations	(1,975,067)		(4,476,253)	(+2,501,186)	(+4,476,253)
Contingent emergency appropriations		(233,000)			(-233,000)
Advance appropriations		(9,262,345)			(-9,262,345)
Rescissions	(-234,790)	(-1,187)	(-29,553)	(+205,237)	(-28,366)
Rescission of emergency appropriations		(-3,400)			(+3,400)
Crime trust fund	(5,512,000)	(4,216,016)	(4,216,000)	(-1,296,000)	(-16)
(By transfer)	(88,604)	(78,088)	(181,822)	(+93,218)	(+103,734)

1/ The Administration's request proposes to eliminate this account and distribute the funding to GLA, US Attorneys, US Marshals, FBI, DEA and INS.

2/ The Administration's June 8, 1999 budget amendment proposes to reinstate the 245(i) adjustment of status fee, which would increase receipts in the Breached Bond Fund by $110 million.

3/ The President's request includes $30 million for the Police Corps within the hiring program.

4/ As a result of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 and other changes, the amounts requested and recommended in FY 2000 include amounts appropriated separately in previous fiscal years for State Department, USIA and ACDA salaries and expenses.

5/ The President's budget proposed $5 million for State Justice Institute.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, today we take up H.R. 2670, the bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice and State, the Judiciary, and several related agencies. It has been a great personal pleasure for me to work with our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and with the other members of the subcommittee. Special thanks also to my ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The gentleman from Kentucky's (Mr. ROGERS) many years on this subcommittee have given him tremendous knowledge, both broad and deep, of the wide variety of topics under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. His stewardship of the subcommittee is marked by his fairness and attentiveness to the interests and concerns of Members. I have also benefited greatly from the guidance of the former chairman and ranking Democrat of the subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who has spent so many years on this bill. I know all my colleagues join me and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) in sending their condolences to Alan and his family on the loss of his father, Robert Mollohan, who served with such distinction in this body.

I must also say a word about our very professional and able staff who have worked long and hard, including nights and weekends, to get us to the floor so quickly after the decision on offsets. More on that later. They enabled us to begin putting a bill together. Since we are on first-name basis, I will do it this way. On the majority side they are Jim and Jennifer, Mike and Cordia and Christine, with Kevin and Jason from the office of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS). On our side we have Sally and Pat, who have done just tremendous work on my behalf, and of course all of my personal staff under the leadership of Lucy Hand.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, this year I was catapulted from not on the subcommittee at all to ranking Democrat. Learning this large and challenging bill practically from scratch has made this an interesting and educational year for me.

As the chairman has explained, the bill includes budget authority of about $35.7 billion. This is certainly much better than our initial 302(b) allocation, but it is still about $3 billion short, below the budget request. The manner in which the chairman allocated funds among the major accounts was for the most part fair and even-handed, and I applaud his efforts to minimize staff cuts and facility closings.

But the bill still has problems. The biggest problem is simply the inadequacy of the subcommittee's allocation. This bill underfunds important programs. It does not fund important Member and administration initiatives, and still has to use gimmicks to stay under the allocation. It is ironic that House and Senate Republicans pointed to forecasts of huge on-budget surpluses to justify passing their bills to make massive backloaded tax cuts; but forecasts of future economic activities are unreliable at best, and, more important, the surpluses mostly depend on Congress sticking with the deepening appropriations cuts enacted in the Balanced Budget Act, which, incidentally, I did not support. The gimmicks used to make this bill look as if it is under the FY2000 cap show how unlikely it is that these spending cuts will materialize over the next decade.

The main gimmick, of course, is the emergency designation for the census. This provision, imposed on the committee by the Republican leadership, is a misuse of the emergency designation; we have known that a census would be required in 2000 for about 200 years. It also means spending the Social Security surplus.

On more specific provisions, the bill provides the Census Bureau with the resources it needs to do the 2000 census and the necessary quality checks on it. This is a tremendous accomplishment, and I am very proud of the work that both sides of the aisle did on this.

While I am pleased that the bill includes funding for the U.N. arrears, I am very concerned that the bill underfunds our U.N. accounts. This may cost us our vote in the General Assembly and, with it, any leverage we might hope to exercise over management and budget reforms at the U.N. The bill is $95 million short of the request for arrears, creates new arrears by cutting funding for peacekeeping, and conditions $100 million of our payments on a time-consuming certification process. But if we do not pay the U.N. $352 million by December 31, our General Assembly vote will automatically, and we mean automatically, be lost.

The most troubling shortfall and the major exception to the relatively even-handed treatment of other agencies is the real cut to SBA salaries and expenses, which would have a drastic impact on the agency. If enacted, the SBA estimates it would require a reduction in force of 2,400 employees or 75 percent of SBA's work force. Apart from effectively closing down activities vital to our Nation's small businesses, it would also hamper SBA's ability to monitor a loan portfolio totaling $45 billion. By the end of this process, this devastating cut must be restored.

The Legal Services Corporation, too, was grossly underfunded in what has become an annual ritual. The bill provides only $141 million, less than half of last year's level, and 200 million below the President's request. Each year for the last 3 or 4 years this level has been proposed, and each year there has been an amendment raising the level to $250 million or so. And so it will be again this year.

Other important examples of underfunding includes the COPS program, over $1 billion under the request; the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, frozen at $33 million below the request; the Civil Rights Commission, also frozen at $2 million below the request; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, half a billion under the request; and the State Department, half a billion under the request.

Unfunded initiatives include the 21st century policing initiative or COPS II, the anti-drug initiative on the State or local law enforcement, efforts to combat terrorism and cybercrime, the advanced technology program, the new markets initiative, the Lands Legacy initiative, the tobacco lawsuit, and the Pacific Salmon Recovery initiative.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I think the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has generally done a good job distributing funds within a much too small allocation. The meager size of the bill and the programs and initiatives that cannot be fully funded within the total remain problems, and the administration has raised serious concerns with the bill, many of which I have mentioned, and has suggested that it would be vetoed in its present form.

However, Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with my chairman to address these problems. I am hopeful that by the time we bring a conference report to the floor we will have more money to work with so that we can restore much-needed resources to the important programs in this bill and to accommodate requests for important initiatives.

Let me say, so that I am clear, that this is so important to me that I am giving my vote to this bill in support of the chairman's desire to make this a better bill. I cannot account for the rest of my Members who may feel that this bill, as it stands, will not get any better, and we will see quite a large number of Members voting against it. I personally will vote for it in the hope that we can achieve our objectives. If we cannot achieve the improvements that I hope for, I will oppose the conference report. If the President vetoes the bill, I will vote to sustain his veto. But for now I choose to move the process along, and I will support H.R. 2670.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNGC), the very effective chairman of the full committee who has done a wonderful job this year bringing these bills to the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and to pay a special tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the ranking member, because as we get to the end of the appropriations process for the 13 regular

bills, the job gets a little more difficult, and they have done a really outstanding job in bringing us a bill that we should pass here.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) mentioned he wants to make it a better bill. He will be an important member of the conference committee as will the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) who will chair the conference committee.

But they have got a good bill now. Could they use more money? Why sure. Back in our homes we could all use more money, at least most of us could. And in our businesses, we all could use more money. The government loves to have more money.

But we took on the responsibility of trying to stay within the budget cap, at least balance the budget and stay at or below last year's level, and that is what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has been able to accomplish. I know there are some disagreements and some differences in how we got where we are, but let me tell my colleagues where we are.

First off, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee on Appropriations really have a special responsibility to this House and to the Nation. Of all the legislation that we consider in this House, the only bills that really have to pass, that must pass, are the appropriation bills, and the appropriators have recognized that responsibility, and I am happy to report that as we pass this bill today, we will have passed through the House 11 of the 13 regular appropriations bills.

The 13th bill we had put off by agreement until we resume our sitting in September, and the VA–HUD bill that we were scheduled to consider on tomorrow, we have delayed consideration out of respect for our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) due to the loss of his father yesterday. So we will put off that bill until we reconvene in September.

□ 1315

We will have done 11 regular bills before we break for the recess. We have done two supplementals. We will have done two conference reports by the time we pass this bill today. So 11 plus 2 is 13, plus 2 more is 15 important measures that the appropriators have brought to this House and passed through this House.

We also expect, Mr. Chairman, to have 3 more conference reports ready on regular bills before this week is over.

We have done a good job. There have been some disagreements, some in subcommittee, some in full committee, some on the floor. But, Mr. Chairman, this committee has had to consider, and I want all Members to pay attention to this, this committee has had to consider requests from Members, and Members have every right to come to this body to represent their districts and to represent what they believe is right for America, for some $80 billion in requests to add money over the budget. In most of those cases, while most of them were good projects that should have been considered, we did not have the money to fund them.

Despite the fact we had to say no to an awful lot of Members because we did not have the money to fund the program that they wanted to fund exactly the way they wanted it, and again I want all Members to listen to this, Mr. Chairman, the Transportation appropriations bill passed with a vote of 429 to 3; the Energy and Water appropriations bill passed with a vote of 420 to 8; the Military Construction appropriations bill passed with a vote of 418 to 4; the Defense appropriations bill passed with a vote of 379 to 45; the Interior appropriations bill passed with a vote of 377 to 47; the District of Columbia appropriations bill passed with a vote of 333 to 92; and the list goes on. The bills have been receiving great bipartisan support.

The appropriators have done a good job, have brought good appropriations bills at or below last year's level, which is the first time that has happened, except for national defense, where we did have increases that were necessary because of the many, many deployments that our troops have been required to conduct in the last 6 or 7 years.

So I support this bill. It is a good bill. I understand that in conference the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) will have an opportunity to work further on the bill, but with the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the tremendous staff that we have on this subcommittee, I am satisfied that the end result will be a product that most of us can support.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say the remarks that I will make are in no way intended to criticize either the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee or the distinguished ranking member. They have both done the best job they can under the circumstances. The problem is that the circumstances are ridiculous.

Let me cite first my concerns with the specifics of this bill. This bill, despite evidence that community policing has been of great assistance in lowering the crime rate, this bill effectively ends the Cops on the Beat program. It provides the last remaining money that is needed to fund that program, but it does not fund the follow-on program that is meant to put additional police on the streets in our communities, because it is not authorized. If this Congress does not provide that money, it is a serious mistake.

This bill would take a number of actions which I think are extremely mean-minded in terms of the way it deals with the poor and with minority groups in our society. The bill effectively terminates the Legal Services Corporation. The funding provided would effectively result in a 3-year phaseout of that corporation.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, it cuts $33 million or 11 percent below the request. We ought to be doing more to enforce the law against discrimination, not less in real terms.

The bill eliminates the entire $20 million requested for the Justice Department to initiate litigation against the tobacco industry to recover Federal costs for smoking-related illnesses under Medicare.

The bill effectively will provide for the loss of the U.S. voting rights in the General Assembly in the United Nations. That is definitely not in our national interest.

It provides very deep cuts in environmental programs, such as our National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration programs and the National Weather Service, and it has an outrageous provision which, in a gross abuse of the Budget Act, pretends that somehow the Congress did not know we were going to have to appropriate over $4 billion to run the decennial census. That abuse of the budget process by declaring those funds to be emergency funds outside the normal limits of the budget process discredits the committee.

I believe in the committee having the right when we have a legitimate emergency to declare one and to move forward to meet that emergency, but if we pretend that amounts that we know we are going to spend on a regular basis are actually emergency appropriations, we lose the right to have people view our request with credibility when we make requests for a legitimate emergency designation.

The problem with this bill is simply that it is not real. It is yet another bill that allows the majority in this House to maintain the fiction that we can afford to pass out $1 trillion in tax cuts, two-thirds of the benefits of which are going to the highest income 10 percent of the people in this country. It pretends that we can do all of that, but there is a hidden assumption. That hidden assumption is that the government is going to take everything that we do in the appropriations process, the education programs, the health programs, the anti-crime programs, and that we are essentially going to carve those up by at least 20 percent.

Right now we spend about $1,100 per person to provide those kinds of services to the American people. If we can hold the defense budget to the level that the President has asked, we will only see under this and other bills provided by the majority, we will only see that cut to $780 per person. That is a huge per-person reduction in services for education and health and environmental cleanup and the rest.

If the Clinton budget numbers for the military budget are not held and if in

fact we spend more on defense, as this committee has already done, then what we are providing by way of those investments per person in this country will drop from over $1,100 per person to just over $600 per person.

Does anybody really believe that this Congress is going to make those kinds of cuts? That is a false promise, that is a phony promise, and I do not think we ought to be making promises this institution does not have any intention of keeping.

That is why this bill is going to be vetoed by the President. This is another one of the appropriations bills which is on a short route to nowhere.

I would remind you, we have only 18 legislative days left before the beginning of the next fiscal year. We need to have our work done. This is going to delay our ability to get our work done. That is why I think we ought to vote against the bill on final passage.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to a very hard working Member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill for this next fiscal year.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of our subcommittee, has worked with Members on both sides of the aisle to craft a bill that I think properly reflects this Congress' priorities, particularly in the area of law enforcement.

Each year there are new and greater challenges confronting law enforcement officials throughout this Nation. In order to be successful, Federal, State and local law enforcement need to work together in a coordinated effort to combat criminals that are increasingly better organized, more lethal and more technologically advanced.

To assist local law enforcement in every Members' districts, this bill once again provides $523 million in local law enforcement block grants that the administration, again this year, tried to eliminate in its budget submissions.

In my home State of Iowa, like many States throughout the Midwest and the West, it has become inundated with the methamphetamine production and trafficking. In fact, the tri-state Siouxland region of Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota has become the meth distribution center of the country, where the drug costs up to $30,000 a kilo.

According to DEA officials, more than 20 Mexican organizations run operations in this region and supply 90 percent of Iowa's meth. This is no happenstance. These people actually sat down, set up a marketing plan in the U.S., targeted the upper Midwest, and are executing this marketing plan with this poison to our families and our children.

Mr. Chairman, even though we have the cartels active in the area, domestic producers are also a very significant problem. In 1994, Iowa law enforcement officials seized one clandestine meth lab. In 1996, it had risen to 10. Despite the increased awareness of the problem, this year in Iowa we will have over 300 meth labs seized in the State.

The bill before us today provides greater resources for the DEA to focus on the meth epidemic in America's heartland. The DEA is funded at more than $1.2 billion, which includes funds targeted at meth production and trafficking, and funding is provided to assist small communities in my district and throughout rural America with the expensive and technologically challenging removal of hazardous waste generated from clandestine meth lab sites.

The bill directs $35 million in resources to local law enforcement in the war on meth, to the COPS Meth Drug Hot Spots Program. Included in this funding is the innovative tri-state meth training center in Sioux City, Iowa, which provides police officers in rural areas with training and comprehensive counter-drug operations that their communities would not be able to afford or have access to.

Continuing our efforts to stem the flow of illegal aliens, this bill once again provides funding for 1,000 new Border Patrol agents.

I would like to take the remainder of my time to thank the chairman, who has done a fantastic job and been so responsive to the needs of rural America, and I think for this entire country in his outstanding efforts as far as law enforcement, and also thank the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO). It has been a pleasure to work with you in your first year on the committee. I look forward to working together very, very closely in conference and to get a bill that passes with an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, timeliness is critical to the census. The Census Bureau needs full funding on October 1st. Delay will irrevocably degrade the accuracy of the count. A lot of work has been done to make the census better than previous ones. I know the problems of 1990, I went through the process with a number of us here, and I do not want to see them repeated again.

Without timely funding, the advertisements for the awareness campaign will not be aired when people will hear them; they will be aired at 3 in the morning when nobody is listening. That is what happened during 1990 when we missed 8.4 million people and double-counted another 4.4 million. The Bureau needs to screen and hire and train hundreds of thousands of workers for its 520 offices and 12 regional centers. Without timely funding, staffing and operations of those offices will be delayed, and that will compromise the quality and the accuracy of the census.

Without timely funding, the work of local governments in developing the critical address lists will be crippled. If those address lists are not complete, we will miss large numbers of people and vital information that is needed for addressing national and local policies. We simply cannot afford to do that again.

There is an enormous part of this census that depends on the accurate and timely execution of the work. That is why timely funding is so important.

Let me just add one final note. There appears to be a misunderstanding about the 2000 census plan. There will not be two censuses, there will be one, starting with the direct count using the mail and the follow-up visits, two operations for which the Bureau has prepared since its first unveiling of its 2000 plan in 1996.

Next there will be a large 300,000 household quality check survey to account for people missed and to eliminate double counting. The need to visit all unresponsive households and the addition of several field canvassing activities, unfortunately, are the most costly, labor intensive, and time-consuming aspects of the census. That is why it is important that it be done on time.

It is one census with one count using both direct and statistical methods. The census planning a sample quality check operation like the survey first proposed, but at a lower cost.

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

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

□ 1330

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman satisfied that in this bill we adequately fund the census in order for the census to be maintained and conducted appropriately?

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, the critical question is whether or not what we have done in the House will meet timely resolution with what is being done in the Senate, and whether or not the rest of the bill can withstand administration scrutiny. That is what is at stake. It is not the quality of the work that has been done by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the question is, is there enough money in the bill to do the census?

Mr. SAWYER. I believe there is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), a very hard working member of our subcommittee.

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

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

I want to say that the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member and the staff have done an excellent job under the constraints that were put on the subcommittee in terms of the amount available.

Mr. Chairman, this funds a very diverse range of projects. I would just like to address a couple of them that I think are very important. But first, I would mention embassy security and additional Border Patrol agents. Those are certainly two items that needed additional funding and received it.

The two I want to mention, one is the JASON program and the other is our trade functions. The bill provides an additional $1 million in funding over last year's base for the U.S. Trade Representative's office, because this is a very important function in terms of opening up markets for U.S. goods. I think Ambassador Barshefsky has done an outstanding job as the USTR and has been very aggressive in getting markets open to U.S. products, and I am pleased that we can not only support them with last year's numbers, but add $1 million to their budget.

The second item under the trade issue is the ITA, the International Trade Administration. They too, as part of the Commerce Department, have continued with the important programs, including the Import Administration, which enforces our U.S. trade laws. We have had a number of cases in which they have ruled in favor of American goods to prevent unfair trade practices and dumping into our market and taking jobs away from American workers. Those two things, opening foreing markets and protecting U.S. jobs against unfair trading practices, are critical to the expansion of our economy and the job base and maintaining well-paying jobs.

The other item is the JASON project. This is an exciting program. JASON is pioneering in terms of interactive TV. This is the way in which a classroom in Ohio or Kentucky or New York can take the electronic school bus to sites all over the world. Thus far, JASON has taken students to the Yellowstone National Park and compared the thermals there, with thermals in Iceland. They have taken students to the bottom of Monterey Bay. They have taken students to the rain forest in Brazil. So students in a classroom, in our case in Ohio, could interact through the medium of TV to talk to these people in Monterrey Bay or in the rain forest.

This is an exciting program, and I think it is going to be the future. I can see when the agencies around this city, the National Gallery, the Smithsonian, the Kennedy Center, the Holocaust Museum will be doing a lot of this type of work with classrooms throughout the Nation. We provide $2 million for the JASON program. Next year they hope to take students into outer space and deep sea laboratories and juxtaposite the outer space with the deep sea laboratories in one program, so students can compare what is not only happening up in space, but what is happening on inner space, namely the bottoms of the oceans or in the deep sea areas.

So it is a great project. I am pleased that we have the funding for this in the bill. This is the third year, and I believe it is a pioneering effort that will bring great benefits to the education programs of this Nation.

I would like to commend the Chairman for putting together a bill under very difficult circumstances this year.

The Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill contains many diverse functions from Federal law enforcement programs, to trade negotiation and enforcement programs, to diplomatic functions, to the funding of our Federal Judiciary.

Under the tight funding caps, an effort was made to keep most programs and agencies at last year's levels so that no program or personnel reductions would be necessary. There are program enhancements to ensure embassy security and to provide additional border patrol agents, in addition to the funding needed to do the enhanced Census work required by the recent Supreme Court decision.

I would like to discuss two issues of particular interest to me—funding for our national trade functions and funding for an innovative educational partnership with the JASON program.

The bill provides an additional $1 million in funding over last year's base for the U.S. Trade Representative's office so that the important work of opening foreign markets for U.S. goods is continued. The U.S. market remains the most open market in the world and it is critical that we ensure that other nations reciprocate by opening their markets to U.S. goods.

The Commerce Department also contains important trade functions within the International Trade Administration (ITA). The bill provides funding sufficient to continue the important program within ITA including the Import Administration which enforces our U.S. trade laws against unfair foreign imports. Also with ITA is the U.S. Foreign Commercial Service which provides technical and practical assistance to help U.S. companies enter foreign markets.

Expanding markets for U.S. goods and protecting domestic industries against unfair foreign imports are two important functions of our Federal Government. These functions are critical to ensure a level playing field in the global marketplace and to maintain well-paying jobs for American workers.

The bill also provides $2 million to continue the exciting educational partnership that has developed between the JASON program and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). The partnership allows Federal research on oceans to be used in the interactive educational JASON program. This program seeks to excite our elementary, junior high and high school students into pursuing careers in the sciences.

Next year the students will be studying ''extreme environments'' focusing on outer space and deep sea laboratories and comparing the science related to both of these environments.

Every year after studying the course materials, the students take the electronic school bus on a virtual scientific expedition using interactive communications technology. This innovative program represents the future of our education system.

I urge members to support the Fiscal Year 2000 Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair, and I thank my ranking member for allowing me this time.

I rise today in opposition to this bill. I do not think this bill reflects our national priorities. I am concerned about this bill's commitment to reducing crime. This bill virtually eliminates the COPS program, which is the community policing program, despite the fact that law enforcement groups all over the country strongly support it. It is no accident that the national crime rate is at its lowest that it has been for 25 years. We can credit the drop in crime to strong local efforts, in partnership with the Federal Government. The COPS program has been a critical part of that partnership. Yet, this bill decimates COPS.

The COPS program has funded positions for 100,000 officers across the Nation, 50,000 of which are out on the beat right now, and the rest are being trained and certified. But what I do not understand is when we are enjoying unmitigated success in reducing the crime rate, why would we now choose this time to change our tactics? My local police officers support the COPS program, my county officials support this program, my neighbors support this program, and so do I.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today with very serious concerns about this legislation. Despite all of the rhetoric about being tough on crime, this bill cuts the program to put 100,000 police officers on the street by $1 billion. Despite all of the rhetoric by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle just last night about needing stronger science before instituting new regulations, this bill would make extensive cuts in science and technology programs.

Despite our nearly unanimous claims that we support small business, this bill cuts SBA funding to a level that could lead to the elimination of up to 75 percent of current staff.

And, here is the topper. Despite 200 years of advance warning on the need for conducting a census next year, this bill designates the decennial census as ''emergency spending.'' It does all of this at a time when Members of this body are finalizing a package of tax

cuts totaling $792 billion that the people do not think is needed, when they think we really ought to be working on balancing the budget and reducing the debt.

Mr. Chairman, this is a cynical, desperate approach to continue this appearance of this Congress is balancing its budget by staying in the caps while in reality, spending the surplus on tax breaks.

Now, that being said, I do want to point out one area where we do agree, and that has to do with funding for methamphetamine programs. The other body provided less money, and I am grateful that this committee has chosen to include the full thirty-five million dollars requested by the President for the state and local methamphetamine grant program at the Department of Justice. But here is the problem. We need more.

In my home State of Washington, the number of methamphetamine labs has increased by 400 percent in the first 6 months of 1999, a 400 percent increase. Methamphetamine is produced oftentimes in clandestine labs and oftentimes in our rural communities. This leads to huge problems in cleaning up the hazardous sites and, of course, in the use of the material itself. So far this year, the Washington State Department of Ecology has already identified 322 labs and dump sites, nearly passing the 349 that were identified in all of 1998.

Law enforcement officials know of this problem. We need to fully support funding to solve this problem, and I will work with this committee to make sure we increase funding for methamphetamine treatment and prevention.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), who is a member of our subcommittee, but incidentally and coincidentally is chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve with the gentleman this year on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies and to bring this appropriations bill to the floor today, which I very strongly support.

The Republican leadership of this House has always made a commitment to the American people that we will provide the resources needed by the Census Bureau to conduct a full enumeration in accordance with the Constitution and the law, and we have provided that in a timely manner.

Today, this Congress will fulfill that commitment, and we provide every dollar requested by the Census Bureau for the decennial census.

I would for a minute like to explain how we got to this point today. While my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said that the cost of the census has increased by $1.7 billion because of the Republican court challenge, nothing could be further from the truth. We took the administration to court because we believe that the plan they were putting forward violated the law and the Constitution. To be intellectually honest, any additional costs associated with the census are because of the original plan put forth by the administration was in violation of the law, and that is the truth, plain and simple.

It is also important that we take into account what the cost would have been had the administration's illegal plan not been challenged in a timely manner. There was a real chance that the entire 2000 Census could have been voided by the Supreme Court. This could have forced us to hold up reapportionment and redistricting to allow the Census Bureau time to conduct an emergency census at a cost of billions and billions of dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this body, regardless of how they feel about sampling, is at least gratified that we found out now and not later that the Clinton-Gore plan was illegal. There is no doubt that it will always cost more to be thorough and accurate than it does to cut corners and take a risky short cut.

While some are critical of the mechanism being used to fund the census, it seems to me that the most important thing is that we are paying for the census to be done correctly. Republicans have always given the Census Bureau the money it needs. In fact, in each of the appropriation bills for the past several years, we have given the Census Bureau more money than the administration has requested. In fact, this fiscal year 1999, we gave the Bureau almost $180 million more than requested by the administration. The Republicans made a promise to pay a full count census, and today, we are fulfilling that promise. Promise made, promise kept.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support final passage of the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, no matter what we do, we must fund the decennial census, and we have to stop putting the census in jeopardy. The Census Bureau needs full funding by October 1. The administration has requested $4.5 billion in order to count everyone in America. The bill before us contains all but about $11 million of that request, and I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census of the Committee on Government Reform for providing that money.

Almost as important, this bill contains none of the onerous language prohibiting the use of modern scientific methods which has been in previous Commerce-Justice-State funding bills that have held up two budgets and led to one presidential veto of a disaster relief bill because of the antisampling language attached to it.

The Census Bureau plans to use such methods to conduct a quality check on the raw census field counts. These more accurate numbers can and will be used for nonapportionment purposes like redistricting and the distribution of hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal funds.

Mr. Chairman, we have been debating the census for an entire decade. No one should be surprised. But Congress failed to allow for the census in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, and now, we find ourselves in the embarrassing situation of declaring the census unanticipated. This is not an emergency. We have done the census every 10 years since 1790. The majority is about to put together and pass a huge tax cut. They should pay for the census out of that, rather than resorting to an accounting trick and declaring it an emergency.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the question was raised by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) about timing on October 1. As I have said in the past, I will work with the chairman and the leadership to make sure the funding is going to be there on October 1 if a CR, which happens historically, on this bill is necessary. Because I agree and I understand the problem, and as we have in the past, we have always worked to make sure that money flows.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman knows better than most people, the tight time frame that the Census Bureau is on, all that needs to be done, and it is very strictly marked down on a tight time frame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) has again expired.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, what bothers me is if the bill is vetoed, as the President has said he will do, then that will put in jeopardy the time frame of getting the money to the Census Bureau on time.

□ 1345

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on crafting a bill which I feel is extremely fair under the circumstances. Given this, I know that funding any new initiatives or requested increases was all but impossible. However, there are three key programs which are vitally important that I would like to continue to work together on as the bill moves through conference.

The administration requested funding for a Pacific Salmon Recovery Fund which would assist the four West Coast States of Alaska, Washington, Oregon, and California, and help them respond to the recent Endangered Species Act listings of 13 salmon and steelhead populations.

Our region has been extremely hard hit by these listings, and is responding with both local and State money, but the Federal money requested by the administration is imperative, given the complexity of this species and the densely populated areas they impact.

Related to the coastal initiative, the National Marine Fisheries Service has requested an increase for expanded workload on the West Coast for Endangered Species Act requirements. Without the necessary consultation and permitting, routine growth in our region will come to a standstill.

Lastly, the United States and Canada recently reached agreement on the Pacific Salmon Treaty, which sets harvest restrictions and conservation measures between the two countries. To implement this agreement, the administration has requested appropriations for two endowment funds to assist with resource conservation and targeted buybacks.

Given the importance of this treaty in addressing over-harvest, I remain optimistic that this, too, may be revisited.

It is my strong hope that the gentleman can agree to continue to work with me on these issues as the bill proceeds in conference. I would be happy to work with the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. I would be happy to work with the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I know how important the gentleman feels this is to his State and region. We will be happy to continue to work with him.

Mr. DICKS. I thank the gentleman. I commend him for his work on the bill.

I want to compliment the ranking member, who has also promised he would work with us on this important issue.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

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

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington for bringing such an important issue to the forefront of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of efforts to provide much-needed resources to the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund. This fund will help local efforts in Oregon, and across the Pacific Northwest, to restore native salmon runs.

I also want to commend Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber and Washington Governor Gary Locke for their hard work and interstate cooperation on this issue.

Salmon are a cultural icon in the Pacific Northwest; indeed, they are part of our identify. But salmon are also a national treasure, and more importantly, they are an indicator species. Like the canary in the coal mine, the health of salmon tell us volumes about how clean and safe our rivers and streams are.

Steep declines in Northwest salmon have led to several species listings under the Endangered Species Act. The four H's which have contributed to the consistent decline of salmon are habitat, hatcheries, hydro and harvest: Only by making sound investments in the programs that address these four H's, will we be able to bring salmon back.

The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund, which was included in the President's Budget at a level of $100 million, will support local initiatives to save salmon. It will help give states the ability to improve habitat, and bring salmon back. The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund will help local communities continue efforts such as mass marking, which help commercial and sport fisherman determine the difference between habitat fish and wild fish. Mass marking can reduce the amount of wild fish that are mistakenly taken and thus continue economic stability by harvesting hatchery fish. Finally, the Pacific Salmon Recovery fund could help local communities build Fish ladders, purchase fish friendly turbines and continue with mitigation around dams.

These are just a few examples of important initiatives that people in Oregon and the Northwest have taken upon themselves to restore salmon. All of these local initiatives are in desperate need of federal help.

Several species of salmon are on the verge of extinction, and we now find ourselves with a choice to make. Are we going to honor the commitments we have made to our children? Will they have the chance to enjoy clean water and healthy streams in the future? Will they inherit a healthy ecosystem that includes indigenous salmon? Or are we going to stand idly by and let salmon vanish?

By funding the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund, we can continue the process of helping coastal states recovery salmon. I want to work with my friend from Washington, Mr. DICKS, and the entire subcommittee to help ensure that the Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund is funded at the maximum possible level, and that Oregon gets its fair share.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

Mr. Chairman, I also want to praise the gentleman for the excellent work that he has done on this bill.

With that, and saying that I am opposed to the bill, I will lay out the reasons why I am opposed to the Commerce-State-Justice appropriation bill.

It is my view in this effort that in order for the Republican leadership to fund a massive tax cut, that this bill will ultimately do harm to the most vulnerable people in our society, to minorities and to communities attempting to make their streets safe. This bill cuts in half the funding for the Legal Services Corporation, which is the Republican leadership's attempt to phase out this program.

It zeros out the hiring portion of the COPS program, meaning 50,000 fewer police officers will be on our streets. This bill freezes the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which will hinder the agency's efforts to reduce the backlog of discrimination complaints.

Funding for the Civil Rights Division under Justice is so low that it will tie the hands of investigators looking into prosecuting criminal civil rights cases, including hate crimes. The list goes on. The bill eliminates the Advanced Technology Program in order to pick a fight with the administration. It decimates funding for the Small Business Administration's work force, causing a reduction in force of more than 2,400 Federal employees, or 74 percent of the SBA's work force.

It eliminates the entire $20 million to help the Justice Department initiate litigation against the big tobacco companies in order to recover Federal costs for smoking-related illnesses. It freezes State Department funds.

It pretends to deal with U.N. arrearages, but makes them subject to authorization, so if the authorizing bill gets held up, the U.S. could lose its voting rights in the General Assembly. It guts the NOAA and the National Weather Service.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that we ought not to vote to gut legal services, to gut civil rights, our police forces, or the Small Business Administration, or research on advanced technology. Vote no on the Commerce-State-Justice appropriation bill because I believe that it has America's priorities upside down.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), my friend, colleague, and neighbor.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee for including report language recognizing the tragic killing of Amadou Diallo in the Bronx, New York, in the gentleman's district. However, I still feel the need for additional report language regarding police brutality.

In the committee report's section dealing with the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the committee directs BGS to implement a voluntary annual reporting system of all deaths in law enforcement custody, and to provide a report to the committee on its progress no later than July 1, 2000.

Although this is a start in addressing this problem, I ask for report language

that instructs the Attorney General to do three things: Evaluate and collect data in regard to police brutality; not later than September 15, 2000, to report the findings; and third and most importantly, make recommendations to Congress regarding effective strategies to combat such brutal acts.

It is not enough for a statistical report to be issued like the one I have in my hand. We need recommendations to solve this problem, and we need to work hand in hand with the Attorney General.

I just ask the gentleman, will he help to work on that to make sure it is in the reporting language?

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. I thank the gentleman for his concern. Mr. Chairman, we have worked together on this issue. This is a very serious issue, to the point where the gentleman and I gave ourselves up for arrest during demonstrations that took place in New York. We did not do that lightly. We took that very seriously at this stage in our development as human beings, and at this stage in our careers.

I give the gentleman my word that on the way to passage and signature of this bill, to approval by the President, I will do whatever I have to do to see that we make changes in the language that will fit the gentleman's request and our desire.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I appreciate his hard work.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted once again to thank the gentleman, my chairman, for his work, and for the way he has treated me in these dealings. I have made it clear to the chairman that this is a very difficult bill; one, however, that I personally support, and I will try in my support of this bill to send the chairman and the majority a message that I stand ready, willing, and able to work with them to make this bill a better bill.

However, I have to state that with the problems that this bill has, it still does have a very positive statement about the Census, one that I support, one that I know is necessary, and one that I thank the chairman for.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me close with thanking the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO). As I said, he is a new member of the subcommittee, as well as being the new ranking member of the subcommittee, and that is a heavy chore dumped in his lap overnight. But he has carried it out admirably and with good humor. He makes the heaviest of tasks a lot lighter because of his sense of humor and his joy, and he is a joy to work with.

I appreciate very much the work that he has done on this bill with us all year long. He has attended every hearing, and I think we had 23 or so hearings covering a broad expanse of the government. But the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) educated himself on those matters as the hearings came up, and participated brilliantly, and he has been a real asset. I mean that sincerely, and I appreciate his work.

I appreciate his support for the bill. That takes a good deal of courage, and I really appreciate that kind of commitment.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, Webster's dictionary defines the word emergency as, ''an unforseen combination of circumstances or the resulting state that calls for immediate action.'' In the past, Congress has passed emergency spending legislation to address pressing needs resulting from natural disasters, wars or other unforseen crisis. But today, the House will consider legislation to expand the definition of ''emergency'' to fund, of all things, the census.

Now, maybe I'm just naive. Or maybe I just don't get it. But from what I understand, the federal government has been conducting the census every ten years since 1790. In fact, the authority of Congress to do so is explicitly enumerated in the Constitution. Over 200 years later, how can anyone with a straight face really say that census funding is something unforseen—an emergency?

If funding for the census is truly an emergency, what is not? What about the Departments of Treasury, Justice or State? Like the census, these are a core responsibility of the federal government. Should we use emergency spending to fund these departments? Where does it end?

Unfortunately, this isn't the first time Congress has used emergency spending to bypass spending limits. The Omnibus spending bill passed last year contained about $20 billion in speciously classified emergency spending. I voted against that bill for the same reason that I will oppose this legislation today—because it is fiscally irresponsible.

It's time to end this charade. We impose budget caps for a very simple reason—to control spending. If we are not willing to respect those caps, let's not use a bunch of fancy budget gimmickry and smoke and mirrors to fool the American people into believing that we are. Let's have an honest vote—up or down—on whether or not we are willing to abide by the agreement we passed in 1997. At least that way, the American people will know who is serious about controlling spending and who is not.

I urge my colleagues to support the Coburn Amendment.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee, the Ranking Member, and all members of the Subcommittee for the inclusion of a $500,000 appropriation for planning and site money for a Immigration and Naturalization Service's (INS) detention center in Grand Island, Nebraska.

Unfortunately, the national INS office has been slow to respond to the urgent need for enhanced enforcement, including additional detention facilities, in the interior. Various economic and geographic circumstances are attracting large numbers of illegal aliens to Nebraska and other interior states. In response, INS launched enforcement initiatives in Nebraska and along the Interstate 80 corridor. However, INS does not currently have detention facilities in our state to house illegal aliens. That's why I am pleased the Chairman recognizes the importance of locating a detention facility in my district, Nebraska.

In closing, I want to once again express my appreciation to the Chairman for his attention to Nebraska's concerns and his efforts toward improving INS administration, enforcement, and service.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my strong support of the FY2000 Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary appropriations bill for FY2000. Approving this legislation would provide $585 million in funds for State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP).

SCAAP was established as a way to reimburse state and local governments for the costs of incarcerating illegal criminal aliens. These funds are distributed at the discretion of the Department of Justice to those states most afflicted by this problem.

Mr. Chairman, California shoulders approximately half the costs associated with criminal aliens in the entire nation. It is clear to me that at both the State and Federal level for the containment of those criminals are staggering and should not be made the responsibility of the California taxpayer alone.

Mr. Chairman, illegal immigration is a problem the Federal government should be addressing. Neither California nor any other state should be made liable for the federal government's failure to restrict the entry of illegal immigrants. I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 2670, the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary Appropriations Bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill contains a number of provisions of importance to the people of my district. Two National Weather Service (NWS) programs in particular are of critical importance: the funding level for the Advanced Weather Interactive Processing System (AWIPS) Build 5, and the reductions in base operations dollars. I would ask that the Members of the conference committee support these critical programs during conference.

AWIPS is a key component of the National Weather Service multiyear, multi-billion dollar modernization effort. AWIPS capabilities have enabled NWS forecasters throughout the country to provide more timely, accurate forecasts and warnings to the American people. The capability of this new technology was most recently demonstrated during the May tornado outbreak in Oklahoma and Kansas. The investment of new technology, as represented by AWIPS, has saved lives.

Funding AWIPS Build 5 is crucial to the continuing success of NWS modernization. Longer lead times for severe weather warnings is but one example of the many benefits of the Build 5 program. An increase of as little as 4 minutes of lead time can mean the difference between life and death for people in the path of a tornado. I hope the Conference committee Members will also support this initiative.

NWS base operations funds provide the wherewithal to staff the offices, analyze the data, gather the time critical information needed to produce the warnings and forecasts on

which all Americans rely. The NWS is committed to becoming a ''No Surprise'' weather service, and the key to accomplishing that goal is a combination of the latest technology coupled with sufficient personnel to operate and understand it. Cuts to base funds cut bone, not fat, Mr. Chairman, and I would ask the members to the conference committee to remember that as this legislation proceeds to conference.

Mr. Chairman, the NWS is a critical federal agency. The work of the men and women at offices across the country affects each and every one of use every single day, twenty-four hours a day. Let's give them the resources needed—both in terms of personnel and technology—to continue to do the tremendous job, which we have become accustomed.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the effort this bill represents to increase security at America's embassies around the world. I have seen my share of our embassies, and know the Americans and national employees who work there to be courageous people who are committed to their work, and who deserve the support of this Congress and our State Department.

I comment Chairman ROGERS and Mr. SERRANO for their work on this bill, and for their commitment to see that we do everything in our power to deter attacks like those on two of our embassies last year—and that no future attack, if one occurs, produces such carnage.

I particularly appreciate their efforts to see that the situation at our embassy in Cambodia is addressed. As I have told the Committee, the State Department, and others, I recently visited Cambodia and was shocked to see how exposed it is to almost any threat. The building is virtually on top of a busy street, with no setback, and is shared with non-embassy organizations. It would not take a bomb to do severe damage; even a hand grenade tossed from the street would certainly kill Americans and Cambodians who work there.

Mr. Chairman, after 30 years of civil war Cambodia is now achieving peace. But while there is no longer the threat of war, the country is far from stable; street violence and public unrest had been common until recent months and the U.S. embassy was one site of Chinese demonstrations after the United States mistakenly bombed Beijing's embassy in Belgrade.

I appreciate that the Committee does not want to list which embassies are vulnerable in report language that it traditionally uses to give direction to government officials. But I want to thank the Committee's members for whatever they can do to get the State Department to do something to make Embassy Phnom Penh safer.

In my view, too much attention is being focused on a few Cadillac solutions that turn a handful of embassies into impenetrable fortresses—but leave all the rest not a whit safer. I think money invested in relocating our embassy in Cambodia, as our outgoing ambassador has suggested, would be money well spent, and I hope the Committee and its staff will keep pressing until we get a solution that is more responsible than the State Department's suggestion to our ambassador that he move the embassy to another country.

I am hopeful about the United States' relations with Cambodia, and believe we now have an unusual opportunity to help close the door on the wars and genocide that have devastated it for 30 years. Many hurdles remain to helping its suffering people, but few of them could set back U.S. policy as an attack on our embassy could—even if, by some miracle given the building's situation, no one was hurt.

Mr. Chairman, I will continue to urge this Administration to look for an immediate remedy to this disaster-waiting-to-happen. Not only is that essential to the safety of some of the hardest-working foreign service officers I have met during my many years of focusing on humanitarian issues; it is also important for our efforts to aid some of the poorest people in the world.

Mr. Chairman, my thanks again to the Committee for its achievement in providing money needed to secure America's embassies.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to comment on H.R. 2670, the Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Act of 1999. This bill contains funding for the Department of Commerce's (DOC) Science and Technology programs as well as legislative guidance on some key project management issues at the Department of Commerce.

In May of this year, the Committee on Science passed H.R. 1552, the Marine Research and Related Environmental Research and Development Programs Authorization Act of 1999, and H.R. 1553, the National Weather Service and Related Agencies Authorization Act of 1999. H.R. 1553 has since passed the House on May 19th and awaits Senate action.

In H.R. 2670, NOAA is funded at $1,959,838,000 and contains transfers of $67,226,000. Within this amount, the National Weather Service (NWS) is funded at $599,196,000, which is a 7% increase over the FY 1999 enacted. Chairman Rogers noted that the NWS is the highest priority within NOAA and I concur with his comments. The protection of our citizens' life and property from severe weather must be NOAA's highest priority.

This bill funds the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research at NOAA at a level of $260,560,000. I concur with Chairman ROGERS' assessment that this office should not be funding duplicative social-science and human dimensions research, and should fund hard computational science that has real benefit to the American taxpayer. The National Science Foundation (NSF) has a social science program area that is capable of making these assessments and I consider social science research at NOAA to be a low research priority.

I am pleased that the National Sea Grant College Program is funded at $58,500,000, which is $7,000,000 above the President's request. Sea Grant's cost-sharing approach with states provides greater bang for the research buck and in tight fiscal times it is the best way to stretch research dollars.

Finally, I am extremely gratified that Chairman ROGERS decided not to fund the Fisheries Research Vessels that were in the NOAA request. The Commerce Inspector General and the Government Accounting Office have pointed out time and time again the need for outsourcing NOAA fleet operations. While NOAA is making some progress in the oceanographic and hydrographic outsourcing areas, there is little to no progress in the fisheries research area. I urge NOAA to examine the use of UNOLS vessels to support fisheries research. NOAA should closely examine the Dorman report which pointed out that the need for these ships is questionable.

H.R. 2670 funds the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) at $436,686,000 for FY 2000. This amount is $300,270,000 below the President's request and $210,464,000 below the FY 1999 enacted amount.

The Advanced Technology Program (ATP) at NIST is terminated in H.R. 2670. As I have stated in the past, until fundamental reforms are made to ATP that will ensure that federal grant funding is not simply displacing private capital investment, I do not think the program should be funded. The Science Committee and the full House passed just such structural changes to the program last year, but unfortunately the Senate did not act on them. The changes would not only prevent the displacement of private capital, but would increase private sector matching requirements for the program. Congresswoman MORELLA has once again introduced legislation, H.R. 1744, the National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act of 1999, to fix the problem and authorize ATP. I am hopeful that this time the bill will be enacted.

The Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) at NIST is funded at a level of $99,836,000 in H.R. 2670. I am pleased that the bill fully funds MEP at the President's.

Finally, the construction account at NIST is funded at $56,714,000 for FY 2000. This will provide $44,916,000 of the required funds for the Advanced Measurements Laboratory. Unfortunately, funding AML at this level will not allow NIST to begin construction of the project during FY 2000. The AML is necessary due to the precise measurements required for establishing standards associated with today's increasingly complex technologies. It is my hope that additional funding may become available during the Conference to allow construction of AML to begin during Fiscal Year 2000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendments printed in House Report 106–284 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, shall be considered read, debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment, and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 5 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in

Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, $79,328,000, of which not to exceed $3,317,000 is for the Facilities Program 2000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 43 permanent positions and 44 full-time equivalent workyears and $8,136,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 1999: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 41 permanent positions and 48 full-time equivalent workyears and $4,811,000 shall be expended for the Offices of Legislative Affairs and Public Affairs: *Provided further,* That the latter two aforementioned offices shall not be augmented by personnel details, temporary transfers of personnel on either a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis or any other type of formal or informal transfer or reimbursement of personnel or funds on either a temporary or long-term basis: *Provided further,* That the Attorney General is authorized to transfer, under such terms and conditions as the Attorney General shall specify, forfeited real or personal property of limited or marginal value, as such value is determined by guidelines established by the Attorney General, to a State or local government agency, or its designated contractor or transferee, for use to support drug abuse treatment, drug and crime prevention and education, housing, job skills, and other community-based public health and safety programs: *Provided further,* That any transfer under the preceding proviso shall not create or confer any private right of action in any person against the United States, and shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purposes of entering into a colloquy with the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I appreciate all the hard work that the gentleman and his committee have done on this measure.

As the chairman knows, the recent listings of the nine salmon and steelhead runs in the Pacific Northwest as endangered has resulted in substantial delays in the processing of jeopardy reviews under the Endangered Species Act by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

This backlog has already caused important local transportation projects to be delayed, and has even put Federal highway funding for some of these projects at risk of expiring.

In some cases, such as the replacement of traffic lights in Richland, Washington, these projects have no discernible impact on endangered species. I know the gentleman shares my support for the measures, which will reduce this backlog within existing resources. The NMFS has previously entered into cooperative agreements with State agencies to use State employees to process these reviews more quickly.

Will the chairman work with me to encourage NMFS to continue these efforts to reduce delays without increasing the number of NMFS employees?

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention. I certainly share the gentleman's concern about these delays. As the gentleman knows, the committee was forced to make some very difficult decisions in this bill. Where steps can be taken to address these problems without additional Federal funding, I am eager to see them taken, and will assist the gentleman in that.

I will be very pleased to work with the gentleman to encourage NMFS to modify this matter in that direction.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with the chairman on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. WHITFIELD). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of any domestic or international terrorist incident; and (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities: *Provided,* That any Federal agency may be reimbursed for the costs of detaining in foreign countries individuals accused of acts of terrorism that violate the laws of the United States: *Provided further,* That funds provided under this paragraph shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER COMPLIANCE FUND

For payments authorized by section 109 of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1008), $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, $84,200,000.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask permission of the Chair and of my esteemed colleague and chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary if he would engage in a brief colloquy with me.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's longstanding support of the laboratory programs and the research facilities at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST. As the gentleman knows, NIST's unique mission of promoting our Nation's competitiveness requires world-class state-of-the-art facilities to provide precise measurements for today's increasingly complex technologies.

As a result, an expedited NIST construction of the Advanced Measurement Laboratory has been an important goal for both my Subcommittee on Technology and, indeed, the gentleman's subcommittee. Over the past 2 years the Committee on Appropriations has supported the AML, appropriating well over half the total needed to complete the project.

But while H.R. 2670 includes $44 million for the AML, that is not enough to begin construction in fiscal year 2000.

□ 1400

So while I appreciate the budget constraints imposed upon the Subcommittee, it is my understanding that the Committee is still fully committed to the AML construction. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) if that is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Maryland yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. Indeed, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct. The Committee has continued to support the construction of the laboratory within the availability of existing resources.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the clarification of the gentleman from Kentucky and ongoing support for this. This is really important.

Should additional funds become available in conference with the Senate, it is my hope that a portion of those funds can be used to begin AML construction in fiscal year 2000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, $50,363,000, for such purposes, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $42,475,000; including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided,* That up to two-tenths of one percent of the Department of Justice's allocation from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund grant programs may be transferred at the discretion of the Attorney General to this account for the audit or other review of such grant programs, as authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322).

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, $7,380,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed

$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, $355,691,000; of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed $18,166,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through ''Salaries and Expenses'', General Administration: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses.

In addition, $147,929,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, to remain available until expended for such purposes.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, as amended, not to exceed $3,424,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $57,368,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $57,368,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected in fiscal year 2000 for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a) note) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2000, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2000 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than $0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, $1,161,957,000; of which not to exceed $2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2001, for (1) training personnel in debt collection, (2) locating debtors and their property, (3) paying the net costs of selling property, and (4) tracking debts owed to the United States Government: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $10,000,000 of those funds available for automated litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Offices of the United States Attorneys, not to exceed 9,044 positions and 9,360 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Attorneys.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), $114,248,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $114,248,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2000, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2000 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0: *Provided further*, That 28 U.S.C. 589a is amended by striking ''and'' in subsection (b)(7); by striking the period in subsection (b)(8) and inserting in lieu thereof ''; and''; and by adding a new paragraph as follows: ''(9) interest earned on Fund investment.''.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,175,000.

Mr. ROGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 12 line 16 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any time.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 9, line 1 through page 12, line 16 is as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service; including the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of vehicles, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, $329,289,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i); of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed $4,000,000 for development, implementation, maintenance and support, and training for an automated prisoner information system shall remain available until expended; and of which not less than $2,762,000 shall be for the costs of conversion to narrowband communications and for the operations and maintenance of legacy Land Mobile Radio systems: *Provided*, That such amount shall be transferred to and administered by the Department of Justice Wireless Management Office.

In addition, $209,620,000, for such purposes, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

CONSTRUCTION

For planning, constructing, renovating, equipping, and maintaining United States Marshals Service prisoner-holding space in United States courthouses and federal buildings, including the renovation and expansion of prisoner movement areas, elevators, and sallyports, $4,600,000, to remain available until expended.

JUSTICE PRISONER AND ALIEN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FUND, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

Beginning in fiscal year 2000 and thereafter, payment shall be made from the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System Fund for necessary expenses related to the scheduling and transportation of United States prisoners and illegal and criminal aliens in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, including, without limitation, salaries and expenses, operations, and the acquisition, lease, and maintenance of aircraft and support facilities: *Provided*, That the Fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments from amounts available to the Department of Justice, other Federal agencies, and other sources at rates that will recover the expenses of Fund operations, including, without limitation, accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the Fund: *Provided further*, That proceeds from the disposal of Fund aircraft shall be credited to the Fund: *Provided further*, That amounts in the Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation, and may be used for operating equipment lease agreements that do not exceed 5 years.

FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

For expenses, related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, but not including expenses otherwise provided for in appropriations available to the Attorney General, $525,000,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), to remain available until expended.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diems of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, including advances, $95,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $6,000,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovations, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings, and the purchase of equipment incident thereto, for protected witness safesites; and of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, $7,199,000 and, in addition, up to $1,000,000 of funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred by the Attorney General to this account: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict prevention and resolution activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1) (A)(ii), (B), (F), and (G), as amended, $23,000,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to that portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SERRANO

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SERRANO:

Page 12, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $23,000,000)''.

Page 14, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $44,000,000)''.

Page 21, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $44,000,000)''.

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $32,000,000)''.

Page 65, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $24,000,000)''.

Page 72, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 93, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $109,000,000)''.

Page 94, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $108,110,000)''.

Page 94, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $890,000)''.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriation for the Legal Services Corporation to $250 million. Of this increase, $108 million would be for the LSC's basic field programs and required independent audits and $900,000 would bring the Office of Inspector General up to the fiscal year 1999 level to assist in improving case reporting.

To offset the increase and assure that the amendment is outlay-neutral, it would cut $23 million from administration of the Justice Department's Asset Forfeiture Fund, $20 million from the FBI's National Instant Check System, $32 million from the salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Prisons, $24 million from the salaries and expenses of the Federal Judiciary, and $10 million from the salaries and expenses of the Department of State, and transfers $44 million within the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

These are not easy cuts to make. But each can be justified. The cut of 53 percent contained in the bill would virtually abandon our long-standing Federal commitment to the legal protection of low-income Americans, including children, the elderly, and the victims of spousal and child abuse, arbitrary government action, and consumer fraud.

A reduction of the fiscal year 2000 funding level to $141 million would result in severe reductions in services to most clients. The number of cases closed would fall, and families would actually be turned away and denied access to the court. There would be a decrease in the number of neighborhood offices resulting in no offices providing legal assistance to clients in thousands of counties throughout the United States.

Especially hard hit would be the millions of poor people living in rural areas in the South, Southwest, and large parts of the Midwest. The number of Legal Services Corporation attorneys serving the poor would be drastically reduced with just one LSC lawyer for every 23,600 poor Americans in the year 2000.

The Legal Services Corporation, Mr. Chairman, was created in 1974 with bipartisan sponsorship and signed into law by President Nixon. The Legal Services Delivery System is based on several principles: local priorities, national accountability, competition for grants, and a strong public-private partnership.

This corporation has been a success with real programs to help low-income women who are the victims of domestic violence. LSC-funded programs have helped millions of children living in poverty by providing lawyers who represent children and their parents in civil cases, helping them to avoid homelessness, to obtain child support or supplemental security income, and to find a safe haven against violence in the home.

Significant services are provided to the elderly who, because of their special health, income, and social needs, often require legal assistance.

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Services Corporation provides a valuable, even essential, service to the Nation's low-income families that would be reduced by the funding level in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to give LSC more resources to meet the legal needs of the poor. This is without a doubt the most important amendment of the day and one that I know can have bipartisan support on behalf of people who need it and on behalf of those principles we stand for in this country.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the purported purpose of the Legal Services Corporation, which is to help the needy when they have problems with an eviction or some other legal action and they do not have the financial resources to turn to an attorney and get the legal assistance that they need.

Indeed, that is a purpose for the Legal Services Corporation that I believe I support and the vast majority of the Members of this House would support. Certainly the people who will rise in opposition to this amendment would agree to that, that if that were the purpose, the sole purpose of the Legal Services Corporation, then there would be unanimous support for the Legal Services Corporation, and there would be no call for reducing their funding.

But the fact of the matter is that the Legal Services Corporation has engaged in a lot of other legal activity other than what they purport to do. Indeed, I believe they file legal briefs challenging our welfare reform legislation that this body passed and the President ultimately signed, which I believe most Americans today would now say has been a fabulous success.

I could go on and on and list all of the various left-wing causes that the Legal Services Corporation has decided to sign up to over the years.

Now, I have had their members come into my office and say we are getting away from that, we are going to just strictly apply ourselves to the bread and butter issues of helping those poor people with the legal representation that they needed.

Frankly, I had seen a trend in that direction in my State. But now we have reported to us by their own IG and the GAO that they have been falsifying their records of caseloads for the last I do not know how many years, and that they are not actually representing the number of people that they are supposed to be representing.

Indeed, we have been informed that they are actually doing about half the amount of work that they have been claiming to the Congress that they have been doing.

I have been here for 5 years now, and this to me has been one of the most outrageous misrepresentations of any agency in the 5 years that I have been here. I must say it is probably one of the worst in this century.

I applaud my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations. They did the appropriate thing. The data comes in and says, no, the Legal Services Corporation is doing half the amount of work that it is supposed to be doing. Therefore, we will cut their appropriation in half. We will fund them at the level that they are actually doing.

Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment. Support the committee mark in this area. It is the right thing to do, and it is the right thing to do for all of the working people in this country who get up every morning and work very, very hard and typically do not have enough money at the end of the week to pay all of the bills that they need to pay.

We are entrusted with the sacred responsibility to be able to take the hard-earned dollars of the American taxpayers and spend it appropriately; and to give an agency that has been falsifying their records an amount of money consistent with their falsified volume to me is absolutely unconscionable.

I urge my colleagues in the strongest way to vote against this amendment and support the original committee mark in this area.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just come to the floor from a hearing in the Committee on Judiciary dealing with the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. As I listened to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), although his arguments are pertaining to the amendment of the

gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) of which I rise to support, and I appreciate his distinguished leadership on this issue, the sound is similar.

For the opponents of the hate crimes legislation were making a number of legal arguments, a number of arguments that would question Congress' rightness in doing this for fear that it would be difficult to prosecute or that the courts would argue or the courts would find this law unconstitutional.

Those of us who profess to support it recognize that the courts may have their chance at the legislation. But we also recognize that people were dead. James Barrett is dead. Matthew Shepherd is dead. A gay man is dead. We realize that the Congress had to act.

In this instance, I support the Legal Services Corporation because poor people should have equal access to legal services. Whether they are Indians on America's reservations; whether they are citizens on the border in Texas; whether they are African-American single mothers in the inner cities of Houston or all over this Nation, we must provide in a manner that is responsible and efficient the kinds of services that are the privileges of the rich.

If any of us have ever entered into the halls of a courtroom, and I practiced law for a number of years and presided as an associate judge for the Municipal Court of the City of Houston, I know the pain of those who do not have adequate representation, the pain of those who come into a system that is confusing and intimidating. Our legal services are officers and attorneys who work in the shadow of poor working conditions, poor money as compared to their counterparts in the private sector, but they work with compassion and dedication.

I cannot imagine this Congress opposing the opportunity to say to America that, because one is not born with all of the attachments of privilege and wealth that one does not have the opportunity to receive justice, as I would not want to tell the Jewish person or the black person or the Hispanic or the gay or lesbian person that they cannot be protected by the laws of this land in a hate crimes act, as we tried to tell African Americans in not being for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voter Rights Act of 1965.

We have a better and a higher calling, and I believe that this amendment of the ranking member is a good amendment, a fair amendment, and I would ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I practiced law for 27 years. I was a city attorney of Pinebluff, Arkansas, for 2 of those years. I saw how the Legal Services Corporation was doing a good job in rural America.

I stayed with this program up until right now. I stayed with it because of what the lawyers, my fellow lawyers, were telling me were the circumstances. It reminded me of what the circumstances were at home.

□ 1415

But now I can see that people who had other ideas were just using the poor people. I would like to see how they, if they were given the case, would handle the misrepresentation. In other words, if we went to these political activists, if that is what we want to call them, or the people that use the poor people to try to get other things done, I would like to see what case they would make as to whether or not the money we have appropriated over the years, based on their figures, should be returned; how they would handle that and what they would call it. I think it would be very clear that they would have an excellent case.

We have seen the Legal Services Corporation used for exotic theories and almost for law school type circumstances where they say, let us try this, let us try this, let us see if we can do this and that, and that all comes from idleness. I think the only way to bring the Legal Services Corporation back to focusing on poor people and trying to help them in their only touch, sometimes, with justice, in the municipal courts and smaller claims courts all across the country, is just to reduce the size of the appropriations; make them, Mr. Chairman, understand what their purpose is and get back to the principles. Otherwise, we are going to just promote misrepresentation and government bureaucracy, and I think that is a disservice to the poor people.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment with the ranking member, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD). Our preceding speaker referred to or used the metaphor about cooking the books. Well, if somebody is cooking the books, we should get new cooks, not go and blow up the kitchen.

Last year, Legal Services Corporation provided support to 258 local agencies in every county and Congressional District in America. That support is a lifeline for hundreds of thousands of people with no other means of access to the legal system.

Who are these people that rely on Legal Services? Over two-thirds are women, and most are mothers with children. They are women, women seeking protection against abusive spouses, who oftentimes have their personal safety at risk along with the personal safety of their children. They are children living in poverty and neglect. They are elderly people threatened by eviction or victimized by consumer fraud. They are veterans denied benefits, and small farmers facing eviction. Everywhere in rural America this is occurring.

These are the people who will be hurt if this amendment is not adopted today. If Legal Services is forced to absorb the huge cuts made in committee, nearly a third of the 890 neighborhood Legal Services offices will have to close. This will leave one lawyer to serve every 23,600 poor Americans. Over 250,000 people in need of legal services will have to be turned away.

Nevertheless, we have already heard from some critics that we should cut the funding for the program. Why? Because some local grant recipients overstated the number of cases they handled back in 1997, chiefly by reporting telephone referrals to be cases. Never mind the fact that the agency itself uncovered the problem, brought it to congressional attention and moved speedily to correct it. Never mind the fact that despite the cries of fraud and abuse, neither LSC nor its affiliates derived any financial gain from the erroneous reports, because case numbers have no bearing on the program's funding levels. Allocations are based on eligible population living in each service area, not on the number of cases handled or referred. This has been pointed out repeatedly. However, the allegations continue.

There is a real irony here. Those who criticize LSC for counting referrals as cases fail to appreciate that referrals are what an agency does for the thousands of needy people when it is unable to provide services. And even without the proposed cuts, referrals must be made in many thousands of cases because current funding meets only 20 percent of the need. So if my colleagues want to eliminate referrals, I can tell them how to do it. Give the Legal Services Corporation the resources it needs to do the job more fully.

Instead of doing this, the committee voted to make further cuts that will devastate the program. Our amendment does not fully restore funding to last year's level because we could not find sufficient offsets in the bill. Moreover, some of the offsets we are using come at the expense of other legitimate and worthwhile programs. I am troubled by this, as is the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

I hope that after we pass the amendment, and I hope we will, that we can work with the White House and our Senate colleagues to fully restore the funding for Legal Services and restore some of those offsets as well. Meanwhile, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment. It is a critically important vote, and it is the right thing to do.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I join in sponsoring this amendment to prevent the draconian 53 percent cut in Legal Services' funding. If the committee's attempt to wipe out Legal Services prevails, our poorest most vulnerable citizens will have no civil justice, and those sacred

words ''equal justice under law'' etched across the street on the Supreme Court building will be meaningless.

Congress has already cut Legal Services 30 percent since 1995. If we enact this 53 percent cut on top of that 30 percent cut, we would devastate thousands of domestic violence victims, children, seniors, and people with disabilities who depend on Legal Services for their mere survival.

Although as sponsors of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, we would prefer to restore funding to last year's level, a problem with finding sufficient offsets means this amendment, which I am sponsoring, still represents a $50 million cut from last year's funding level of $300 million.

Now, some have argued that funding for the Legal Services Corporation should be drastically cut because five legal aid programs, of the 258 programs total, allegedly overstated the number of low-income clients they serve. Mr. Chairman, it is time to look at the facts.

GAO found absolutely no evidence of fraud or intentional misreporting. Let me repeat that. GAO found absolutely no evidence of fraud or intentional misreporting. The Legal Services Corporation has already taken action to eliminate the confusion about what constitutes a case for reporting purposes and it is aggressively enforcing the reporting guideline.

The truth is, as the previous speaker and cosponsor of this amendment pointed out, no financial incentive exists to overstate the number of cases they handle because funding is not based on the number of cases but on the number of people in the area living at or below the poverty level. So there is absolutely no incentive for Legal Services to overstate the number of cases.

Mr. Chairman, it is also time to set the record straight about the misleading outdated charges by people on this floor who ignore the fact that the Legal Services Corporation was reformed by Congress in 1996. In 1996, we enacted tight restrictions on the Legal Services Corporation, so there are no class action lawsuits, no lobbying, no legal assistance to illegal aliens, no political activities, no prisoner litigation, no redistricting representation, no collection of attorneys' fees, and no representation of people evicted from public housing because of drug charges. These restrictions are in permanent law, as we all should know, and are restated in this bill.

These tight restrictions are not limited just to Legal Services Corporation funds. Legal aid programs cannot even use State or private funding on these purposes if they receive just one penny from the Legal Services Corporation. They cannot use State or private funding on these purposes that have been banned by the Congress by law. If they violate these restrictions, attorneys can be disbarred, programs lose their funding and their ability to apply for funding in the future. So we have appropriate sanctions to deal with any abuses.

Now, some critics here have already pointed to a few isolated cases that appear to be abusive. In these cases that have actually been documented, not the rumors and the innuendoes, but the cases that have actually been documented, either no Legal Services Corporation funding program was involved or the Legal Services Corporation is enforcing sanctions against the abuses, as they should.

But even with all the alleged abuses that have been talked about by critics of Legal Services, these represent a mere handful of aberrations in a program with countless success stories, Mr. Chairman, of service to domestic violence victims, to children in need of support, to seniors and people with disabilities in danger of losing the services that they need for their survival.

Mr. Chairman, let us not shut the courthouse door to poor people in America. Let us not give our most vulnerable Americans the heave-ho. Let us give poor people and vulnerable Americans their day in court just like every other American. If our justice system is only accessible to people with means, it cannot truly be just. I urge my colleagues to support fairness, to support equality under the law by restoring Legal Services funding.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by associating myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD). He has eloquently spoken of the importance of the Legal Services program and of the phony nature of the attacks against the Legal Services program.

I would like to focus my comments on a couple of other dimensions of the Legal Services program. First, I think it is worth noting that the Legal Services Corporation is 25 years old this year. Twenty-five years represents the commitment that we have made at the Federal level to equal access to the law.

I have personally participated in various aspects of the Legal Services program for 32 years, going back to the mid-1960s, actually, 34 years. I first became acquainted with it as a student in law school. Upon finishing law school, I joined with other attorneys in Minneapolis in forming a volunteer attorney program. I worked with the Legal Services Corporation as a law school faculty member, and then as a country lawyer I was on the Legal Services board in our rural area of Minnesota and also again worked with the volunteer attorney program.

My service is not unique, Mr. Chairman. There are thousands and thousands of lawyers around the country who have volunteered millions of hours of time to provide volunteer legal services to those in our country who cannot afford access to the legal system.

Now, some may say if there are all of these volunteer attorneys, why do we need this Federal money? Well, I can assure my colleagues that the ability of volunteers to handle the caseload is not adequate to the demands that are made upon the programs. It simply is not there. And the established program is important in coordinating the work of the volunteers, in making sure that they have some of the basic resources that are necessary for adequate representation. The Legal Services Corporation and the individual programs around the country are serving a vital need in even this coordination function.

Going beyond that, I think that it is critical that we understand the importance of equal access to the law in this country. It is one of the fundamental concepts in our Democratic form of government that everybody has access to the political and the legal processes of our Nation. If we lose this quality of equal access to the law in America, we compromise our commitments to our Democratic form of government. Once people feel that they are consigned to the trash heap of being unable to obtain redress for their legal grievances, they lose faith in our Democratic form of government.

And we may say, well, it is the ballot box that they have access to. But I would like to emphasize that the arena in which we are working, the legislative branch, the elected officials, is only part of our form of government.

□ 1430

The rest of it is the judicial system. And redress of grievances is as important a function of the judicial system and our ensuring people that they have access to the judicial system is as important as ensuring them that they have access to the ballot box. We cannot compromise this feature of our democratic form of government without in my opinion undermining our democratic form of government. For this reason, I urge that all of us maintain a commitment to this very important program.

I would also like to point out that in funding this program, we are not funding some lavish program that has highly compensated employees. We are funding a program that is employing people at very modest levels of compensation. Often what we find is that the attorneys in the Legal Services program serve a few years and go on into private practice because they say they cannot afford to continue to work in a program that provides modest compensation. If you compare this to the Medicaid and the Medicare programs in our country, you will find that the professional, the university, the postgraduate educated folks are not highly compensated members of their profession. They are very humbly compensated. So we, I think, have a very economical program. We are getting a very good return on our dollar.

I again urge support of the amendment.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this debate really, let me assure my colleagues, is not about the attributes of the volunteers at home who do good work, I believe, for their clients who need their assistance. This debate is all about integrity. This debate is all about honesty.

Let me give my colleagues a little bit of background of what happened this year. I had an individual come to my office who worked for Legal Services to explain to me, because of my position on this subcommittee on appropriations that funds Legal Services, exactly what had happened in 1997 and 1998 and exactly what had happened when we were going through the process last year of appropriating additional dollars for Legal Services.

This individual, who happened to be in part working with the Inspector General at Legal Services and with the Inspector General at Legal Services, had audited five different agencies, local agencies, and found that they had overreported their cases in those five by 90,000 cases. If anyone will remember the debate last year on Legal Services about how many times people would stand up here and say that Legal Services did 1.9 million cases last year and this justifies our appropriation.

So after this individual, who was with the Inspector General, came to my office to tell me what had happened, we ordered a GAO report to look at just six more local agencies. When they looked at those six agencies, they found that another 75,000 cases were falsely reported. So in total now, Mr. Chairman, we are up about 165,000, 170,000 cases, or 50 percent of the total cases reported by these 11 agencies.

Now, the question is, should they have told us last year before we made the appropriation for Legal Services that their numbers were totally bogus? They say, ''No, we don't have any cause to report to you on a timely basis.'' I would respectfully submit the fact that under the Inspector General statute, they in fact were required to report to Congress and the Legal Services board was required to report to us exactly the phony numbers that they had derived and that they put to Congress. And when they were questioned during the appropriations process, they continually denied that they had held back this information until in fact I was able to lay the facts out.

We wonder why this would happen. The reason is, Mr. Chairman, the Inspector General at Legal Services, which the board admitted to the committee, said that his job was in jeopardy, and in fact what happened, he did not report to Congress as it is stated in statute that he has to if there are dramatic changes, he did not, because he was afraid of losing his job at Legal Services.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is not about what Legal Services does. This is about integrity and honesty to Congress. Every Member here should show the disdain toward Legal Services which they showed toward you as a Member of Congress, to flat out come to us with false numbers and then say once again, ''No, these are true'' until they were presented with the facts and then they say, ''Well, wait a minute, it doesn't matter what we said, because our appropriation isn't based on that, anyway.''

This is a personal affront to every Member of Congress. If you believe that Congress can now go forward and talk to any other Federal agency and say that they have to be accountable but say to Legal Services, ''It doesn't matter what you tell us because it's okay because you have a role that people like, that you're helping poor people, so it's okay no matter what you tell Congress to justify the money.''

Mr. Chairman, that is what it is about. It is about honesty and integrity. I personally have supported Legal Services in the past. You can check my record. I have voted to increase funding. But I will not do so this year. The reason is, because I will not be insulted once again.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment to eliminate the proposed draconian 53 percent cut in the appropriations for Legal Services.

Legal Services Corporation makes a real difference in the lives of those low-income Americans who need legal representation. Without the Legal Services Corporation, we would truly have the best legal rights that money can buy. It is bad enough that we have failed to enact campaign finance reform, so that Will Rogers' quip that we have the best government money can buy has more than a slight ring of truth. Without Legal Services, only those with money would have any real chance of finding justice in our courts.

There may be Members of this House who do not worry about the ability of low-income people to receive basic Legal Services. The annual assault on Legal Services Corporation would suggest that this is the case. In fact, the Legal Services Corporation does the opposite of what the money-driven politics which too often tends to rule this House these days would command. The Legal Services Corporation helps the poor and powerless assert their rights against the wealthy and powerful. It represents tenants against landlords, it represents victims of toxic pollution against corporate polluters, it represents those who have suffered discrimination against those who discriminate, it represents victims of domestic violence against those who perpetrate domestic violence. No wonder it is so unpopular.

But, Mr. Chairman, the poor, just like the wealthy, should be entitled to fair legal representation. A right without a ability to enforce it legally is not meaningful. If any Member of this House had a dispute or a legal problem, he or she would seek out the best legal services he or she could afford or could raise the money to afford. So there is a general recognition that to have meaningful rights, you need competent legal representation in this society.

In criminal proceedings, that need is so obvious that the Constitution requires publicly funded counsel. But that requirement has not been deemed to extend to protection of rights outside the criminal court, to family court, housing court or civil court. That is the job of Legal Services. We are not forced by the Constitution to do this, but simple decency and a commitment to equal justice under law should be enough. It was enough for President Nixon and for the bipartisan coalition that brought Legal Services into being and it should be enough now.

Some have argued that Legal Services Corporation has failed to live up to Congress' expectations for record keeping and accounting. Some have argued there is some waste and fraud and even abuse in Legal Services. I believe the wild claims that LSC is wasting or misusing large sums of taxpayers' money bear little relation to reality. But imagine if we applied the sort of rigorous accounting rules and this reasoning, the kind of reasoning we heard from the last speaker, to some other programs, like, for instance, the Defense Department. No one has ever suggested that because there is obviously waste, fraud and abuse in the Pentagon, we should abolish the defense budget, zero out the defense budget. That would be absurd.

Mr. Chairman, there is incredible cynicism in this country. The newspapers, the press have pointed out that the polls show that people feel that government responds to the rich and the powerful, that we do not particularly care about what ordinary people think. There is substantial truth to this. Who gets their phone calls returned from Congress or the executive branch more quickly, the ordinary voter or the $100,000 contributor? The answer is obvious. That is bad enough in the legislative and executive branches. Only the Legal Services Corporation prevents this from also being true in our courts of law, in the judicial branch, too.

We must adopt this amendment to protect the honesty and the integrity of the judicial branch and to protect the faith of our citizens and the fact that if they are hauled before the judicial branch, if they need the services of the judicial branch and if they cannot afford legal representation on their own, they will have the ability to have fair representation.

This amendment must be passed to protect the integrity and the honesty and the due regard of our people for the judicial branch of government and for what we claim to be our regard for equal justice under law.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, equal access under the law. Equal justice for all. The compassionate Nation providing legal resources to obtain these things for the poor and the itinerate in this population. These are great principles. They are honorable principles. They are principles we all embrace and principles we are willing to support. These are principles, Mr. Chairman, that we have entrusted to the Legal Services Corporation. We have said, ''This is an important job. It is a job where you are trusted to reflect the heart, the compassion, the commitment of the American people. Do it right. Be of service. Make us proud.''

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Services Corporation has failed in this duty. They have failed in such a way as to inflate the statistical data for the purpose of getting more of that money that might be otherwise used.

Mr. Chairman, in February of 1999, John McKay, the President of Legal Services Corporation said, and I quote, ''Case statistics play an essential role in budget requests and the performance plan submitted by the Legal Services Corporation to Congress each year.''

He went on to say, ''Therefore, the reliability of case statistics''—therefore, the reliability of case statistics—reliability, that it be true and accurate. That is what ''reliability'' means here. True and accurate reporting of real cases really handled that reflect our compassion and our commitment to equal justice under the law for all Americans. ''The reliability of case statistics submitted by programs to LSC is vital to obtaining continued Federal funding for Legal Services.'' This type of information holds great promise for securing increased Federal funding.

I could not agree more. Give us great reliability, and we will fulfill great promise for increased funding. But what did we find out? The Inspector General of Legal Services Corporation and the General Accounting Office audited 11 grantees. What did they find out? These 11 grantees reported 370,000 cases handled. The IG and the GAO invalidated, either because the case was not handled, it was merely a phone call and a referral or that the case was in fact a case taken on by Legal Services for somebody with means not intended to be covered by this service under the law or that the case was counted more than one time, 175,000 invalid cases.

□ 1445

That is not the judgment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY). That is the General Accounting Office, the accountability test.

The committee, quite rightly, saw this, took Mr. John McKay at his word and engaged in a further endorsement not only of what this agency is supposed to do but the standard by which they should demonstrate their achievement as reported by the agency themselves and cut their budget back to their actual caseload. A fair thing to do. A necessary thing to do.

Accountability is not a passing fancy, my colleagues, in the Government of the United States. We are given a trust to create agencies of compassion and service and then to hold them accountable to the fulfillment of that promise and the law by which we created.

Agencies that fail in their duty should not be rewarded. Yes, indeed, if our favorite charity was not in fact doing the things for which we voluntarily give our money, we would cut back. And we, as Members of Congress, given the trust to represent the compassion of the American people, must do the same for a Federal Government agency that does not fulfill its promise.

That is what is going on here. Do not reward them for giving us data that is not reliable for inflating the caseloads.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one final observation. If we are going to in fact restore money to Legal Services Corporation by this amendment in order to let them continue to operate in such a fashion as to report so many more cases than they actually do, where does this amendment suggest we take the money? From all funds to run the seized asset program vital to the battle against drug traffickers. Twenty million from the FBI's investigative expenses, 44 million from INS border enforcement, 44 million from violent crime initiative, 32 million from Federal prisons, and 10 million from operations of the Federal Court.

This is a serious moment in oversight accountability and service, Mr. Chairman. Are we in Congress going to take money from these agencies with these precious necessary duties so important to the safety and security of our citizens and say, no, we will take that fund away from them and give it to an agency that has been proven to squander their money and report falsely?

Mr. Chairman, for me to falsely represent my misdeeds is unacceptable. But, Mr. Chairman, for me to exaggerate and falsely report my virtue in the quest for the taxpayers' dollar is wholly unacceptable and frankly undignified.

Let us vote for the dignity, the service, and the compassion of the American people through its government and vote down this amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

I can understand why the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) entered that amendment, because he has had first-rate experience with some of the pious platitudes I hear on this floor. He has seen some of the things that are happening. He is not basing all of his opinion merely on statistical data.

My mother used to have an old saying, ''Figures do not lie but liars figure.'' We find that out a lot of times when we look at things in the Congress.

I just heard a litany of abuses of the Legal Services system, one of which said 11 particular programs in Legal Services abuse the statistical count.

What about the 258 others? Are they to go down because 11 of them went out of the way? 250,000 cases we are looking at. So what are the opponents of the Legal Services program voting against? They are voting against the rights and interest of one in every five Americans who are potentially eligible for legal services.

My colleagues are against their right to contest evictions when the slum lords put them out. They are willing to protect them so that they can contest foreclosures on these poor people, to obtain access to health care. They are willing to protect them because of these 11 people who abuse the law. They are trying to keep them from seeking redress, which anyone in this country should have, for child support and custody matters, to pursue unemployment or disability claims, or to protect their family members from domestic violence, one of the biggest problems we have in this country.

The Legal Services opponents are voting against some four million Legal Services clients. I see them every day in my community. Most of my colleagues see them in their community. I am not the only one.

So remember, we are representing people here. We are not representing some numbers that someone has put together to make us believe that there is this widespread abuse. I say to my colleagues, there is not.

My colleagues are overlooking the family members which they talk so much about, family values. If we believe in family values, let us then protect some of these poor and middle-class people who cannot afford to protect their families. They are voting against the elderly people of this country who comprise 10 percent of Legal Services clients. They do not know which way to go. They cannot go to another attorney.

Simply put, they are voting against equal justice under the law. I could give my colleagues all kinds of cases which would refute what we have heard on the floor today regarding the liability and validity of numbers.

I am saying to my colleagues to look at the 11 cases. Yes, they should be punished. But do not cut their budget down to $150 million. Look at all the money we spend here in the Congress. We spend it on widgets and gidgets and everything else. Yet we cannot look at these poor families that need legal services.

They have met some success over the years, Legal Services has. In 1995, we gave them $415 million for legal services. That was not a whole heck of a lot, but at least we gave it to them.

In 1996 we cut them to $278 million, slowly deescalating this wonderful agency. At the end of 1994, Legal Services programs funded by the LSC operated more than 1,200 neighborhood offices and they employed 4,500 attorneys.

These attorneys are not making a big amount of money either. They are working for the good of the people. By the end of 1996, we closed down 300 offices and the number of attorneys was cut by 900.

Where are we going to send these people? We cannot send them to a big, highly-paid lawyer. Where are we going to send these senior citizens who have no redress?

So in Florida there are about 106 million people living at or below the poverty level. They qualify for LSC-funded programs. In the Miami area alone, there are 350,000 poor citizens who are eligible and depend upon Legal Services programs.

Walk the streets of Miami with me and my colleagues will see those who came there, some by boat, some by ship, some forced there; and they cannot get any help because here in the Congress we quibble over $250 million.

I say to my colleagues it is a travesty of justice. I hope that we will vote for the Serrano amendment and forget about this litany of statistical misinformation.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment that has been offered to reinstate some of the funds for Legal Services. I do so with great pain and reluctance. Because many times in the past, even though I have always supported the right of the poor to have and to gain access to the court systems of our country, I have felt that there were certain abuses, alleged or actual or real, within the Legal Services Corporation and its grantees that cried out for reform.

We have succeeded many times to bring about such reforms. Those reforms are still in the play book. We must bring more accountability to Legal Services. But until we do, we cannot immediately put a finishing touch on the Legal Services' attempt to serve those people who are already on the books and who are yet to come.

I looked very carefully at the report of the committee, which I think is one of the finest analyses accompanying a decision by an appropriations committee that I have ever seen, and it seems to me that the language of the report serves as our next set of duties in the questions of the Legal Services Corporation.

The committee report talks about the serious concerns about the case service reporting and associated data reports, all those things that have been repeated by both the proponents and the opponents of Legal Services.

There is no question about it, we need accountability. There are abuses rampant in what we have seen already on the record in this proceeding.

It is my reasoning that we ought to consider all of this as allegations for the time being that the report by the committee, as excellent as it is, should constitute an indictment against the Legal Services Corporation and that we should, as fact-finders, proceed down the line with hearings and other oversight capacity to make sure that this never occurs again.

Now, if we consider this an indictment, that means that we should not consider the Legal Services Corporation at this moment or the grantees guilty. We give them the benefit of the doubt, assume their innocence until they are proven guilty, and then move to the rest of the calendar in this remaining first year of this session and in the next session to determine the truth of the allegations, and then in next year's allocation and appropriation, in that time, to make the corrections that are absolutely necessary.

This is an indictment that the Legal Services Corporation shall not avoid, and we have the duty to pursue this indictment. We have already determined in the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law that we will have an oversight hearing on the Legal Services Corporation on Wednesday, September 22, 1999, at 2 p.m. We are doing so in following the lead of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary because of the findings of that committee; and that committee set of findings will also be part of the hearing that we intend to conduct.

At all times, we will keep in constant touch with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) to make sure that this indictment against the Legal Services Corporation be fully fleshed out in a full trial before the American people to guarantee that the money will go to serve the poor, to guarantee access of the court system to the poor, and to make sure that accountability for it and accountability by the professionals shall be a part of the next era of Legal Services.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I know there are a number of speakers on either side waiting to be heard. But I wonder, in the interest of time, if it might be possible to set some sort of time limit on the time devoted to this amendment. We have a number of other amendments waiting.

I ask unanimous consent that we have a time limit of 30 minutes for all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto divided equally between both sides.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the desire of the chairman to set a reasonable time limit. But I think there are probably more Members here wishing to speak. So if he would amend his unanimous consent request to, I think, an hour, that may be satisfactory.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think if we did 40 minutes it would be a reasonable time.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, continuing to reserve my right to object, I believe we have too many Members on the floor.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

□ 1500

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first let me compliment the ranking member on this amendment which I support which would restore the moneys that have been cut or recommended to be cut from the Legal Services Corporation.

It is interesting. I listened to some of the opponents, and the Legal Services Corporation has enjoyed bipartisan support throughout its history and for good reason. There are many Republicans and Democrats who are coming to the well today to speak in favor of this amendment because we understand the importance of equal access to our legal system in our rule of law.

We are looked upon around the world as the beacon of hope for democracy and freedom, in part because of our rule of law. Our rule of law does not mean anything unless we have equal access to justice, and the Legal Services Corporation helps provide that equal access to justice.

The Legal Service Corporation is a conduit of funds that go into our local communities. They are used for basic services in our legal system, to get child support payments, or to get protective orders against abuse, or to help get benefits that people are entitled to, low-income Americans; they are entitled to that rule of law, to the access to our legal system.

Now the bill before us, Mr. Chairman, would cut the funding to the Legal Service Corporation by 53 percent, to $141 million.

Mr. Chairman, for a period of time I chaired the Maryland Legal Services Corporation, and as a private attorney I handled pro bono cases; and, yes, there is a responsibility on the private sector to help make access to justice a reality for all people in our community, but government must play a principal role.

The last time that we had a major cut in 1995, I can tell my colleagues what happened in my own State of Maryland. The Maryland Legal Services had to close two offices, and there was drastic cuts which necessitated further closings, eliminating about 20 attorney positions, forcing Legal Aid to handle about 6,000 fewer cases. I can tell my colleagues today that we can handle about 30 percent of the need in our community of people who come forward for help, and in many of those

cases we have to conclude those issues through legal advice only because we do not have the support necessary to pursue a court remedy.

That is not equal access to our justice system. That is wrong. We should do better, and we can do better.

We have looked at the Maryland statistics, and this is true around the Nation. We know that we are not meeting the need that is there. We know in every State in the country there are people being turned away today, and let me remind my colleagues the Legal Service Corporation provides some of the funds for the local programs, and we want to penalize the local programs and our constituents and penalize our system of justice because of an audit report that quite frankly I do not think is the real reason why this cut is being brought forward. Many of the people that are supporting it have never supported the Legal Services Corporation. They will look for any reason to reduce that budget.

Mr. Chairman, access to our legal system by every American, no matter how poor, is vital to the liberties that this Congress is supposed to protect and promote. If my colleagues will vote against this amendment, they are voting against fairness and access to our justice for people in this country who are most in need. It would be a shameful stance for this body to provide such a drastic cut.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for several reasons. First of all, I have a philosophical difference with my colleagues on whether this is a Federal responsibility. I do not disagree with the previous speaker about the need for access to legal services, but we are talking about State court issues and not the Federal court issues. So the question is: Why is the Federal Government taking this responsibility?

So I just have a question, why we need to do it. At the Federal court level I definitely could support it or this type of program, but the State court level, this should be a State and local responsibility.

The second reason I have a problem with this particular amendment is the way we are trying to fund it. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) had a very tight number to work with, and we all recognize that; and he had to make some tough choices, and what this amendment does is it cuts programs from essential Federal programs.

For example, it is going to cut $44 million from the Border Patrol. We have all agreed we need to tighten our border, and now we are going to cut 44 million?

The National Instant Check System. We have all been fighting over the gun issue. We all agree, I think, that we should have an instant check. And now our colleagues want to take $20 million away from that? How do we even do it if we want to check for guns if they are going to take the money away when we start going after the issue of gun shows unless it is a funded program?

We are going to take $44 million from the violent crime reduction program and the Federal prisons, $32 million. Well, let us see. Let us just turn some more prisoners loose and cut the Federal prison system.

So it is wrong to make these cuts.

And, finally, the third reason I am opposed to this is what the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) talked about, and that is this issue of credibility of the Legal Services Corporation. GAO and the Inspector General both issued reports that really question the credibility there as an oversight responsibility. We need to make sure that the money is being spent in the right manner and wisely, and the Legal Services Corporation has not been straight with the subcommittee.

So Mr. Chairman, I have serious concerns about whether this program should even exist, and I very much disagree with the gentleman, the ranking member, for taking cuts from programs that are already cut too much already, and I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, let me renew my unanimous consent request.

I think the number of speakers has diminished somewhat. If each of them would restrict their comments maybe to 3 minutes apiece, I think we can be through in a reasonably short period of time.

Could we agree to a 30-minute limit of time divided equally?

The CHAIRMAN. Is that a unanimous consent request?

Mr. ROGERS. That is a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. BERMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, under my reservation I yield to the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), for any thoughts he has.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's request, and we all want to finish as quickly as we can, but there are just on this side too many speakers.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. If I can inquire, how many speakers does my colleague have?

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, we know of at least about a dozen who want to speak now, and all the courtesy should be given to them. So it is a problem at this point.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I only see three on the gentleman's side. There is maybe four on my side.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can take my word for it. They are here if their time comes to speak.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, can we agree on any time limit, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BERMAN. Under my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, for the life of me I never understand why when we go to the Committee on Rules we do not come out with a set time limit so that time can be allocated at the beginning based on the demand for people to speak, but at this particular point I just think we are not quite ready to entertain this. I suggest submitting it in a little while, but we are not quite ready, and so I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BERMAN. I move to strike the requisite number of words, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a moment just to review the bidding on the Legal Services Corporation.

In 1981 this program took an unbelievably deep cut which it took 11 years, until Fiscal Year 1993, to get back to where it was in 1981. In Fiscal Year 1995, we finally reached the $400 million level on Legal Services Corporation appropriations, a level which served nowhere near 50 percent of the population then living in poverty in terms of legal services programs.

Since that time the program has been reduced to the present level of 300 millions, so the bill in front of us which the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) seek to amend is a 53 percent cut for a program that is already $100 million less than it was in Fiscal Year 1995. This is a massive cutback in an essential program.

All the laws we have to protect consumers and tenants and employees, our whole quality of life, these are rendered virtually meaningless for low-income people if they cannot get a lawyer to advocate on their behalf.

When I hear the leader talk about the different sins of the Legal Services Corporation, and on each one there is an answer, there is a different interpretation; I believe there is a fairer interpretation. What I do know is that the distinguished majority leader has opposed the Legal Services Corporation every year with the GAO report, without a GAO report, with an Inspector General comment, without an Inspector General comment. The majority leader does not like the program.

Now there is an alternative to Legal Services Corporation. It is creating the most massive bureaucracy of enforcers of these laws one could imagine at a time when we surely do not want to do that to regulate and control every aspect of commercial and landlord-tenant and other kinds of private relationships to make sure that low-income people are getting a fair shake.

I suggest this program is the most efficient and most effective way. It utilizes the skills of tremendously talented people who get very low wages. No one in this Chamber would work for the salaries that these people are working for. These people could make factors of two and three times as much money going off in the private sector, but their commitment to serve low-income people allows them and motivates them to serve in these kinds of jobs.

The American people and the low-income people in this country are getting tremendous service from this. We talk about case numbers. One can have a case that involves a phone call for 20 minutes and an interview for 15 minutes and a letter that takes another 10 minutes, or one can have a case that takes hundreds of hours of research and judicial time and court time and deposition time and discovery time. To get into a clinical analysis of numbers of cases and then make automatic assumptions about budget makes no sense whatsoever in terms of the real world of the legal practice of these people who again, I repeat, are working at far below the incomes that their talents would justify.

I myself think the amendment in front of us is much too low; $250 million is not an acceptable figure. That would leave a cut of $50 million from the already too low level we are at this year. I myself do not like the offsets, but I know that in a conference committee we can change the offsets, we can continue this effort; and if my colleagues believe in what the Legal Services programs represent in this country, they have to vote aye on this amendment, and I urge an aye vote.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. I would just take time from the gentleman to clarify a point.

This amendment does not cut any funding from the Border Patrol. My amendment merely shifts funding from one INS account to another, a shift of $44 million that is budget-authority neutral. This shift is necessary to keep this amendment outlay-neutral in total.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, just to add one thing. There are other offsets, some of them I have to admit I do not like, I would not have chosen. But I have to sympathize with the subcommittee, too. I could not come up. The cap for this subcommittee is woefully inadequate to meet the needs of the Commerce Department, the Justice Department, the State Department and Legal Services Corporation. It is woefully inadequate to do that. Any offset is going to pay a price, but the principle here is the principle, do we continue our commitment to legal services for the poor? I urge an aye vote on the amendment.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I hold my colleague from California in high regard, but I just have a different opinion about this. I agree with the majority leader. It is just unbelievable to me that we are talking about cutting FBI funds, the funds for the INS, which we believe goes to the Border Patrol, for the violent crime reduction programs, for the Federal prison system, even cutting judges' salaries in order to fund this Federal legal services program. Whatever happened to the States? Whatever happened to volunteerism? Why do we have to have the Federal Government step in and fill every little nook and cranny?

□ 1515

We are in the era of downsizing and of moving power back from the Federal Government to the States. It is not as though there are not well-established programs and many, many attorneys across the country already donating their time. So, please, I support helping poor people as well as anyone else. It does not require increasing the budget of the Legal Services Corporation.

I heard my friend who spoke earlier from Florida talk about giving them the benefit of the doubt. They do not deserve the benefit of the doubt. This is an entity that has repeatedly abused its authority, and now we find evidence that they have intentionally and wrongfully inflated their statistics with the intent to secure more funding. So we are going to turn around and give them more funding, when we have caught them red-handed deceiving the Congress about how much work they actually do?

This is just outrageous. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for his speech against this amendment, and I hope we will all join with him.

We are about setting priorities. This is not a high priority. In fact, this agency deserves to be punished for the clear abuses it has committed. We should not reward them. What are we going to say to these arrogant Federal bureaucrats if we allow them to lie and then to be blessed with a huge increase in funding as a result of that lie? I think it is very, very bad policy.

I think I should remind Members that this agency, we as a Congress actually had to get involved and tell the Legal Services Corporation through legislation that they could not get involved in redistricting, that they could not get involved in abortion litigation or prison litigation on behalf of prisoners' rights or welfare litigation or pro-union advocacy or union organizing; they could not get involved in fee-generating cases or representation of public housing tenants charged with possession of illegal drugs or against whom eviction proceedings had begun as a result of illegal drug activity; we had to tell them they could not get involved in representing illegal aliens.

It is outrageous. So we told them. Hopefully they are complying, although we will see. But now they are inflating their own statistics.

I think it is interesting that the President of Legal Services, Mr. McKay, earlier this year no less had this to say: ''Case statistics play an essential role in the budget request and performance plans submitted by the Legal Services Corporation to Congress each year. Therefore, the reliability of case statistics submitted by programs to Legal Services Corporation is vital to obtaining continued Federal funding for Legal Services. This type of information holds great promise for securing increased Federal funding.'' Then we find out that they have just about 50 percent less clients than was represented.

It is outrageous, Mr. Chairman. We should oppose this amendment.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. To the Members of the House, I have just listened to the very scathing critique of another colleague who supports the majority leader's position, but I rise to point out that this request is still $50 million short of last year's funding level. What we have here is still a reduction, even with the amendment skillfully put together by the gentleman from New York in a bipartisan way.

Let me tell you that in Michigan, these Legal Service corporations do wonderful work. Wayne County Legal Service, headed by attorney Linda Bernard, has been working for years and years on a very important mission and does great work. They get rave reviews constantly.

This request, even though short $50 million of last year's funding level, is still $90 million short of the administration's request, so I do not think we are doing anything as dramatic as one of the speakers indicated.

Are we trying to punish the poor or deprive them from legal access? This amendment says restore funding.

As it is written, we cannot help but notice that the bankruptcy reform that the majority supported, that the majority leader supported, gives big companies and powerful creditors even more power, and at the same time they impose dramatic cuts on Legal Services representation for the poor. What are we revealing about this Congress? Fortunately, I am told that most of the Members of the House and the other body support some modest improvements.

So we have to remember that during last year's impeachment proceedings, it was the majority that clamored about ensuring equal access to justice and equal access to the courts. The cuts in this bill, however, only ensure unequal access to the court.

Remember, the Legal Services Corporation is only representing some of the people that are eligible. It is not

that everybody eligible for Legal Services that is getting them. We are still very much short of providing all of the work and representation they need.

Now, these are not bureaucrats. Somebody referred to them as bureaucrats. These are members of the bar who have sacrificed in many ways, not just financially, but to work the long hard hours. I have visited some of these people. They work long hard hours on cases that will not bring them fame, certainly not fortune. So to merely pass them off as some kind of a government apparatus is really not doing fairness and demeans the whole concept of this organization.

Happy birthday, Legal Services Corporation. You are 25 years old, and there are still people trying to beat your brains out. Perhaps you are doing too good a job to those who do not want the poor to be represented. But I am sure that there is a spirit larger than some of the language and debate that I am hearing here.

So, despite repeated attempts to reduce Legal Services, and, from some people's point of view, let us face it, to kill Legal Services, to get rid of it entirely, we feel that there is strong support in both bodies for this Legal Services mission.

Join us in this bipartisan effort to show that democracy can work in the Legal Services area.

I commend all of the Members who have created this amendment, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), and I think that they will be rewarded in the end.

I urge the Members to support the Serrano-Ramstad-Delahunt amendment seeking funding for the Legal Services Corporation at the level of $250 million. This is a modest request that is still $90 million short of the Administration's request and $50 million short of last year's funding level.

As it is written, this bill demonstrates the hypocrisy of the Majority's position. They use bankruptcy reform to give big companies and powerful creditors even more power, and, at the same time, they impose dramatic cuts on the Legal Services Corporation to take power away from those who have none. Moreover, during last Congress's impeachment proceedings, the Majority clamored about ensuring equal access to justice and equal access to the courts. The cuts in this bill, however, only ensure unequal access to justice. If the Majority truly is interested in empowering those who most need legal assistance, the powerless, it will support this modest increase in funding for the LSC.

Only in March, Majority Members of the Judiciary Committee promised to hold a hearing on what level of funding the LSC should receive. Yet, here we are, 5 months later, and no such hearings have been held. Now, we are left debating the future of the LSC, at the last possible minute, on the House floor. We cannot allow the Majority to constrict the LSC until it can no longer function.

Despite repeated attempts to reduce or kill legal services funding, we have learned that the full House and Senate are strongly supportive of the Legal Services mission, which is to assist non-profit organizations that provide legal services to individuals living in poverty.

And the need for Legal Services continues to be overwhelming even though we live in a time of great economic prosperity. There are still 35 million Americans living below the poverty line and 10 million additional individuals with income below 125% of the poverty level. This means almost 1 in 5 Americans is eligible for LSC-funded services.

If we increase funding for the Legal Services Corporation, we will enable it to address over 1.6 million issues annually involving critical legal problems for clients and their families, including employment disputes, individual rights, consumer fraud, and assistance to veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder.

Nearly 30% of the requested increase is needed to provide a small cost of living adjustment, while the remaining 70% would fund initiatives to help victims of domestic violence and children, and to expand the use of technology to promote client self-help.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this common sense amendment.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points. Legal Services was in need of reform, desperate reform, and I have got to tell you that in 1996 that happened. There are strong penalties for those that abuse the system. In fact, you can lose your license. You can be disbarred.

In 1995, Legal Services was cut by one-third, and that cut is in essence still in place. In fact, if the Serrano amendment does pass today, there will still be a $50 million cut in 2000 versus 1999. It does not go quite far enough.

Some here today have talked about some abuses. As far as I know, they are pretty old abuses. They were corrected, rightly so. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) who spoke a little bit before me talked about some of the abuses, and he was quite proud, rightly so, of the efforts that were made.

Some here today may have heard from some of their farmers, and goodness knows I have a lot of folks in agriculture in southwest Michigan. Last year, I wrote more than 4,000 of my farmers asking them for specific cases of abuse that they could tell me about involving Legal Services. Do you know how many responses I got back? None. Not a single farmer responded back with a single case of abuse, period.

Lawyers are expensive. They are costly to any family, whether you be rich or poor.

Let me tell you about a couple of the cases I found out, my local Legal Services, what they have done back in Michigan this year. The Berrien County Legal Services, my home county, intervened to assist a home-bound elderly woman who was ready to sign an unfair contract for home improvement. Not only did this widow avoid, thank goodness, because of the efforts of Legal Services, but she avoided entering into that agreement, and had she done so, the contractor would have ended up owning all of the equity in her home. Wrong. She got help, and she deserved it.

Another case, Legal Services helped a 76-year-old woman adopting her 8-year-old great granddaughter that she had raised from birth, even though the adoption was contested by the girl's father, her real father, who is serving time in prison and, in fact, had never seen his daughter. Legal Services succeeded in keeping this young girl in a stable home environment that she had known from birth. Those are the cases that Legal Services does every day of the week.

We have heard a little bit about padding some of the cases here, and, rightly so, perhaps. It is troublesome. But I have to tell you, the funding for all of these counties comes based on the poverty level in your counties. It is not by level of cases. It is based on need.

This is a program that works. If it does not work, Members of this House should go to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, who has proven his moxie, has proven he has the votes to get things done, bring those abuses to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, if they are true, he will fix them. I have confidence in the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

There are lots of statements around here that are chiseled into buildings. ''Equal justice under law.'' Let us not ask that brick layer to take that statement off the wall and instead put in ''no justice for some.''

Without this amendment, the brick layers may as well go back to work. Let us not close the courthouse doors. Let us not take away rights that the middle class and the rich are able to be able to pay for, whether it be adoption or custody or even doing a will. That is not right.

This amendment, even if it passes, still reduces Legal Services by almost 20 percent. A $50 million cut in a $300,000 program is still going to throw a lot of people out of work.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I want to speak in support of the Serrano-Ramstad-Delahunt amendment to restore funding to Legal Services Corporation. If this amendment is not accepted, the Legal Services Corporation will suffer yet another devastating blow.

As currently written, this bill provides only $141 million for Legal Services Corporation. This proposal is $159 million less than the current appropriation and $199 million less than the administration's request. Such a reduction would crush an already vulnerable Legal Services, thereby rendering it even more difficult to provide Legal Services for those who most need it.

Let us be clear: Legal Services has already been cut to the bone. This worthy program cannot survive another massive reduction in funds. We have

cut Legal Services from a budget of $415 million in fiscal year 1995 to $283 million in fiscal year 1998. I know that there are people who just do not like legal aid, so they have decided to devastate it by attacking it every year with cuts, cutting it to the bone so it cannot operate. It is not fair.

The effects of these cuts are already being felt by those low-income clients that depend on Legal Services organizations. In California, the Legal Services Corporation provided Legal Services to 217,015 clients in 1997. Those represented included our most vulnerable citizens, including the elderly, battered women, and families who are barely surviving poverty.

□ 1530

However, if the Serrano-Ramstad-Delahunt amendment is not accepted, we, as legislators, would effectively be abandoning the longstanding commitment to legal services for the poor.

Let us put a face on it. Who are we talking about? We are talking about renters. Do my colleagues know that still in America there are unscrupulous landlords who turn off the water, who put padlocks on the doors, who set people out on the sidewalk. They would rather do this than go through the expense of going through the courts, and if they went to the courts, many times, the renters would be found to be within their rights to refuse payment. In California, we have Deduct and Repair. If one is living in run-down rental units, if the water is not working, the electricity is not working, one can repair it and deduct it from the rent. Some landlords do not like that. So we have people who depend on Legal Services. We have the elderly, as just described, who are oftentimes tricked into signing contracts, and they cannot get out of them alone. They cannot get to the courts. They do not have any money.

We have people who are tricked into signing contracts that my colleagues and I, if we saw them, would be outraged by them, but it is legal services who is there to help. The more we cut them, the more exposed these very vulnerable populations are.

To make matters worse, in my own State, the State of California, many of the poor are already without service because of Governor Pete Wilson's veto of the State Bar Fee Authorization in 1997. The poor in California have been failed by their governor, and this amendment is their last hope. Moreover, the deep cuts in Legal Services will mean that whole sectors of our society will be left without access to Legal Services Corporations. In many poor and rural regions of the country, there will be no publicly-funded legal assistance available to the poor. We must not forget that 40 percent of the 23 million people over 18 who live in poverty in this country are the working poor, and they also depend on Legal Services, organizations for legal assistance.

Now, I know there are some who do not know a lot about this, and they may think that the poor are just in these inner cities depending on these services. I am amazed at how many legislators are representing poor districts that are not cities, that are in suburban communities, in rural communities, and they act as if they do not have the poor. They are simply not getting their representation.

There are many poor farmers who need legal services, who have lost everything, who have nowhere to turn. And the legal services are there for them in some areas, but with these kinds of cuts, we are not going to have them in those poor, rural communities.

The American public supports a federally funded Legal Services Corporation for those individuals who would not otherwise be able to afford an attorney's services in certain civil matters. The provision of adequate Federal funding for legal services cannot be provided elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for support for this very important amendment.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to give my thanks to the gentleman from Arizona, who is a member of the committee.

I rise to oppose this amendment on behalf of farmers of all income levels in Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina and throughout the southeastern United States. This agency, under the leadership of President John McKay, has abused its legislative mandate and has misled the U.S. Congress, as many people have talked about, on its caseload. We could spend a lot of time talking about the caseload, but I want to talk about an aspect of the Legal Services Corporation that continues to create problems, particularly in the Southeast, as well as other parts of the country.

Section 504 of the law states that none of the funds appropriated in this act to Legal Services may be used to provide legal services for or on behalf of any alien, unless the alien is present in the United States.

Now, that should be clear to anyone, and we want aliens who are working in the U.S. under some agricultural program to have access to the courts. And they do have access to the courts. But when they leave and they go back to Mexico or wherever they may go, the law states that they cannot be bringing lawsuits while they are not present in the U.S.

But, despite that, the President of the Legal Services Corporation, John McKay, has said that he will not penalize any Legal Services Corporation if they misinterpret the phrase, ''is present in the United States.'' He wants it to say, ''was present in the United States.'' Mr. McKay goes on to say that he has absolute discretion to determine what laws to enforce and how.

Now, the Legal Services Corporation, as a result of that, has ignored the statutory authority that is even in the bill this year. It was there last year and he ignored it, and it was there the year before and he ignored it, and the legal services lawyers from North Carolina were videotaped on an illegal trip to Mexico to recruit clients to sue farmers in North Carolina, in Kentucky, and other States. Paralegals were sent passing out brochures saying that you have these rights that need to be pursued in court. And not only that, but when they find these clients, they send threatening letters to farmers throughout my district in which they are saying, if you will pay $4,763 to one farmer, $14,289 that another farmer receives, $26,000, $65,000, $73,000, if you will pay this money, then we will not proceed in court.

Now, a lot of these farmers do not believe that there is any legal basis to file the suit, so they defend themselves in suits filed in Kentucky, in Tennessee, in North Carolina, and in many cases, the local judges grant a summary judgment for the farmer. And then what happens? Well, then the legal aid lawyers go to Texas Federal court and they file lawsuits there.

So when the farmers try to get it transferred to a Federal court in Kentucky or North Carolina, then the judges say, no, I am not going to transfer it. So then the farmers have to hire lawyers in Texas, they have to go to Texas for depositions, they have to go to Texas for lawsuits for the case to be tried, and it costs large sums of money, and many of them end up settling and some of them have even gone into bankruptcy because of this abuse.

The sad thing about this is, many of the plaintiffs are not present in the U.S., even though the law specifically says, you must be present when the lawsuit is filed. And John McKay has repeatedly ignored that, has repeatedly disavowed that and has said, I will interpret the law the way I want to interpret it.

Mr. Chairman, there is something wrong when we have a system that is taking tax dollars from hard-working, law-abiding taxpayers to have suits filed against them in violation of the law that is there. I realize we live in a particularly permissive society, but I hope we have not reached the point where we not only condone a Federal agency misleading Congress about its caseload, but we reward them when we discovered that they provided false testimony, and then we turn our head when we know that the agency is violating Federal law.

Now, the President says he is going to veto this, and I would urge him if he does, I want to take him to Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and he can talk to the farmers about why he is vetoing it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the Legal Services Corporation celebrates its 25th anniversary this year. For 25 years, legal services has provided critical legal aid

to low-income people, including children, the elderly, and victims of domestic abuse. In those years, legal services has helped low-income Americans fight unjust eviction from their apartments, arbitrary government actions, and consumer fraud. And reflecting their level of concern for low-income Americans, the Republican leadership has slashed funding for the Legal Services Corporation.

The Republican leadership is prepared to give a $792 billion tax break to the rich. It is also trying to cut $159 million in legal aid to the poor. The other side of the aisle argues that those who pay little in taxes should get no tax relief, and some of them argue that those with little recourse to our legal system should get no legal aid, but not all of them. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) and others who have spoken today have stood up for legal services and have stood up for the principle of equal justice under law.

The bill before us cuts funding for the Legal Services Corporation in half. Mr. Chairman, with this cut, more than 250,000 families will be denied access to legal counsel in the courts, and there will be only one Legal Services Corporation for every 24,000 low-income Americans. This drastic cut to Legal Services funding will hurt hundreds of thousands of Americans, particularly those who live in rural areas, because legal services programs will have to close neighborhood offices and limit their services.

I believe that claims that Legal Services is misrepresenting the number of people it has helped are vastly overstated and have been properly addressed, but it is the latest excuse for those who year after year after year after year come to this floor to do just what they are trying to do today and cut out legal aid for the poor.

We should listen to the scores of businesses, religious organizations, seniors' groups and victims' advocacy groups that support the Legal Services Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I would have thought that legal services for the poor to help ensure equal justice under law was a conservative ideal, an ideal rooted in our Constitution. I believe it is simply wrong to slam the courthouse doors shut on the poor simply because they do not have the money to obtain legal counsel.

In Maine, one of the great advocates for legal services for the poor is a man named Howard Dana. He was appointed to the Legal Services Board, I believe, by President Reagan, and year after year after year in the 1980s he fought to make sure that the Legal Services Corporation remained in existence and was adequately funded. He was and remains a conservative Republican. As I said, this is a conservative ideal: equal justice under law. He is now a distinguished judge on the Maine Supreme Court, and I know he stands by the beliefs that he held as a member of the board.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to remember that although Legal Services attorneys may not be convenient, they may be inconvenient, for landlords, for corporations, and even for this government, inconvenience is no argument for subverting a fundamental principle of our Constitution. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Serrano-Ramstad-Delahunt amendment which would restore funding for the Legal Services Corporation. All Americans deserve equal justice under law, not just those who cannot afford it. Keep the courthouse door open for all Americans.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be concluded in 30 minutes, and that the time be equally divided on either side of the aisle.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken to the chairman, and we do not object.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) each will control 15 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, others have spoken here today about the improprieties or, some would say at the very least, the inconsistencies that we have seen in the caseload figures that have been provided by the Legal Services Corporation. Others have said, well, that is not really how they get their funding, they get it from the level of poverty that is found in each of the areas where legal services are provided.

But the fact is, we have seen some wild variations in the caseloads, and we do know that the Inspector General and even the Chairman of the Legal Services Corporation, has himself acknowledged that there are tremendous discrepancies in the way caseloads these are reported.

Now, some say it is because there are no real guidelines. Well, I believe the Board has a responsibility to promulgate those guidelines to make sure that it is clear so that we know what cases are being accepted or how they are being disposes of so that we can have consistent statistical data on which to make the judgment in the subcommittee that I serve on level of funding for the Legal Services Corporation.

□ 1545

We also heard the gentleman from California talk about how over the years Congress has had to take action against the Legal Services Corporation for meddling in areas where Congress has demonstrated clear legislative direction. Instead, too often the Legal Services Corporation has attempted not to implement legislative intent, but to block the actions of Congress. We heard about that most dramatically, in the memory of most of the Members of Congress, in the area of redistricting.

I want to talk about another area where this is going on, legislation that we passed a few years ago dealing with migrant farm worker programs, and the very limited guest worker programs with foreign countries.

These are very heavily constricted programs with a lot of regulations, a lot of rules which must be implemented in order to comply with them. They have to advertise; they have to show that there is no work force available.

Even with all these hurdles to clear, what we have found is that Legal Services Corporation in almost every area and every State, has filed all kinds of actions to block any approval of these worker programs. The result is none, virtually none, have been approved. Less than 1 percent of the potential need for migrant workers, giving people jobs here in the United States to work, have actually been approved by the Labor Department. What we hear time and again from farm organizations is they just do not initiate the process because they know they are going to be blocked by the Legal Services Corporation.

I want to finally discuss where the author proposes to find offsets for restoring this money to the Legal Services Corporation. The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has told us the money does not really come out of the Border Patrol, that this is really a shift from one account to the other.

I will acknowledge that this is true. But there is a definite cut in the National Instant Crime Check system for the FBI, there is a definite cut in the Federal prison system, and there is a definite cut in the judicial services.

Mr. Chairman, these funds are absolutely vital in order to carry out the legal system for those who need it most. Who needs it most except those who are the most impoverished? If we do not have a judicial system that works to put criminals behind bars, who is going to suffer? Those who are the most poor. If we do not have a judicial system that has the staff to process cases, who is going to suffer? Those who are the most poor. If we do not have a system to do crime checks, who will be the victims of crime? Those who are the most poor.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we defeat this amendment. I urge that we keep the cuts that the committee has judiciously imposed on the Legal Services Corporation.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee for yielding

time to me, and for bringing this excellent amendment to the House, which I strongly support.

The Serrano-Ramstad-Delahunt amendment would avoid a devastating 53 percent cut in Federal support for the Legal Services Corporation. This money is desperately needed in our communities, and we must support the Serrano amendment.

I heard the majority leader speak, questioning the reliability of case statistics offered by the Legal Services Corporation. I would like to share with him and the House some case statistics from the Legal Aid Society of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, where I come from.

In 1995, they received about $300,000 in Federal money for their legal aid program. This year they are receiving under $200,000, a one-third cut. If this bill goes through unamended, they will realize another $100,000 reduction in funding, so a two-thirds reduction from 1995 in Federal support.

This has a very real impact on the quality of legal services offered in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, as it obviously does in every county throughout this country. They have had to reduce their caseload in my county by over 250 cases out of a couple of thousand, and if these funds are further reduced, as the bill proposes, another 200 or 300 cases will be reduced from their annual caseload.

I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) talk about where are the States in volunteerism? In my county, the county commissioners have offered up more money as the Federal Government has reduced funding. The Bar Association has offered up money and pro bono time to make up for Federal cuts. But they cannot take the place of the Federal money, and the caseloads are going down.

The gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) said we should punish the bureaucrats. This is not about punishing bureaucrats. The bureaucrats will not be punished, it is the people that receive and need the legal services that will be punished. Who are these people? They are about two-thirds women: poor women; women that need help with protection from abuse cases; women that need help with consumer protection cases; women that need help with employment problems, financial problems, foreclosures. These are the people that the majority would punish if this bill is unamended and if the cuts are passed as the bill proposes.

We have a principle in this country of equal justice for all. To achieve that, we need equal access for all to the courts. We must pass this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. The Legal Services Corporation is important to assisting vulnerable people in our society. This is a little bit of what I will address.

Women and children are among the vulnerable who, without assistance, often find themselves in abusive situations that they cannot control. The impact of these situations is significant, and it could well result in homelessness and the loss of necessary financial resources for food, maintenance, and health care.

To give one example from my own district, which is Montgomery County, Maryland, as a result of domestic violence and in fear for her safety and that of her five children, a woman left her husband of 15 years. He had been the primary support for the family.

She was able on her own to obtain housing, although it was neither decent nor safe. Still, because of her financial situation, she was threatened with eviction. Local legal services helped her to get Section 8 housing, and the family was able to relocate to decent housing with adequate space. This stabilized the family during a very disruptive and unsettling time.

Millions of children are the victims of abuse from their parents and others who are responsible for their care. This abuse goes on somewhere in the country every minute of the day, and Legal Services in Maryland represents children who are neglected or abused, such as neglect or abuse which ranges from a child being left alone by a parent, not being provided a nutritional meal, to physical or sexual abuse that results in severe injury and, all too often, death.

Legal Services has helped the infant that has been abandoned at birth, the child who is left unattended, the child who is beaten, burned by cigarette butts because he would not stop crying, or scalded by hot water to teach him a lesson. These children are vulnerable, and without the protection of the law they would be endangered and lost.

Legal Services advocacy on behalf of children assures that they will not be the subject of abuse, and it helps to secure services for children, such as housing support, health care, food, educational programs, and necessary counseling.

The work of Legal Services on behalf of families and children touches at the heart of what we value most in this country: decent housing, adequate health care, food, a safe environment. Because of the importance of safety in our society, Legal Services programs have supported legislation to prevent abuse and protect the abused.

In general, the States are not allocating funds for civil legal services for poor citizens. Without this federally funded program, the most vulnerable members of our society will not have the ability to get inside the courtroom door to seek judicial protections of their rights. We must assure that sufficient funds are available. This amendment restores some of the amount that Legal Services needs, not even the total amount that could be used.

I certainly urge support for this modest amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who has been patiently waiting for over 2 hours to speak.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I, too, am offended by the false reports which are alluded to by my colleagues. It is repugnant that any agency should submit information to the government which is anything less than accurate.

I can understand why some would be so offended about the abuses cited. However, I am even more offended by poverty, poverty which locks people out of opportunities for justice, poverty which humiliates people when they cannot be represented, poverty which makes people invisible when courts would take action in their absence; poverty which would deny the poor legal representation.

How many of those who have been in this Chamber can imagine what it is like to need an attorney but have no access to help because one cannot afford it? Indeed, if a Member of Congress is subject to legal process in the performance of his or her duties, he or she will receive legal assistance from the Office of General Counsel at no cost. How could we deny those who we represent, who have much less recourse, how could we deny them access or claim to the resources of the country?

Mr. Chairman, there is a level of condescension and condemnation of the poor and judgment which is inappropriate here, because this is not only about whether we will see full legal services for the poor and whether Legal Services for the poor will survive. Moments like this instruct us as to the health of our democracy and its ability to survive.

At a time when Members of Congress are prepared to give 70 percent of a multi-billion dollar tax cut to the top 5 percent of the people who make over $200,000, this Congress should be more gentle with the have-nots on such basic issues as legal representation.

Somewhere in America there are poor and working poor who are concerned about whether they will have representation on issues of consumer debt, defective products, insurance coverage denial, assistance on family violence, eviction defense, illegal lockout defense, utility cutoff defense, housing discrimination defense, disability benefits defense.

Legal Services is there for them, and this Congress ought to be here for Legal Services. The poor have a right to a decent legal representation. The poor already are at a disadvantage in all legal situations. They tend to lack education; they tend to lack knowledge of the system; they tend to be, because of the sting of poverty, a bit disorganized.

We will be challenged by a higher test here, and which resonates with a

very old question that was put forth about 2000 years ago: When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was thirsty, did you give me water?

Let me add in that spirit, as we move towards the 21st century, when I was poor and I needed help, did you give me access to legal assistance? Let this Congress meet that test. Vote for the amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

It seems to me that here we are once again, the same old wine with a new bottle; the same lemon, just a new twist; the same target, the poor, a new weapon: Take away not just legal representation, but take away hope, take away faith, take away belief in a system. Take away the idea that you, too, can receive justice, notwithstanding the size of your wallet or your pocketbook or your purse.

There is a legal assistance office down the hall from my district office, and I see people go in with their heads down, wondering what is going to happen. But then I see them turn around and leave, and they are walking differently. They now have hope. They have spoken with an attorney. They have spoken to someone who seemed to understand their plight, to know what they are going through, to know what it is all about.

□ 1600

I have seen people in Housing Court, no lawyer, no attorney, wondering what is going to happen. I have seen them in Juvenile Court. No attorney, no lawyer, not knowing.

I say to my colleagues today that we have an opportunity to reverse a trend. Rather than attack the poor, let us give aid and comfort to the development of our judicial system by helping everybody in this country know that they, too, can receive justice. Let us vote in favor of the amendment and extend justice to all.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of the amendment which freezes Legal Services funding essentially from last year. But I rise more importantly in support of John McKay whose name has been taken in vain here today.

John McKay is from my State, an excellent lawyer with a great background in history in our State. He decided to come out of private practice and come to Legal Services to head it up, to bring it back to its core mission. So I have taken a bit of concern and offense at people who have discredited John McKay.

John McKay is a decent, honorable, certainly not a deceitful man. He is a good lawyer and good person trying to do a tough job.

Now, Legal Services Corporation has its problems. It has had its problems in the past. It has allegations of problems today. John McKay is trying to fix those problems. He is not the cause of the problem. He is trying to fix them.

So he is a good person with a tough mission, and we ought to help him accomplish that mission to bring this Legal Services Corporation nationally back to its core mission of helping people who are poor.

In my State of Washington, the Legal Services Corporation is doing a fine job. I have had Justice Richard Guy of the Supreme Court come to my office. Attorney Bill Hislop, who is head of our Bar Association in Spokane, Washington; Jim Bamberger who has worked very hard for Legal Services; Nancy Islip, these are good people trying to make the core mission of Legal Services effective.

I have had my problems with Legal Services. I have had good conversations with these people who are in charge in my State. I think they have been very responsive.

The farm community is less burdened by the Legal Services Corporation practices of the past than they are today. That is progress. That is progress at the hands of John McKay.

If one is poor in this country and one is hungry, our government provides one with food. One can get it immediately. If one does not have housing, the government helps one. But if one has legal problems, one cannot go to law school and get help.

The Legal Services Corporation provides the poor with this kind of help, and we ought to insist on accommodation by this corporation, but we ought to support them.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

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

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this amendment to restore funding for the Legal Services Corporation. I represent a district in the San Joaquin Valley of California that, despite the good economic times in our State and our Nation, is plagued by 14 percent unemployment.

I represent many people who are poor and, therefore, do not have the ability to access our judicial system. Their only option, oftentimes, is legal assistance through the Legal Services Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, if a low-income elderly person is unfairly evicted from their home, if a young mother is unable to collect child support or is a victim of abuse and must go to the courts to intervene, they have no opportunity if they cannot afford legal representation.

I find it somewhat ironic that the same week that this Congress will be considering a huge tax cut bill of almost $800 billion, that Republicans think is important to cut funding, or some Republicans think it is important for cut funding for one of the most important programs that assist the poorest of our citizens.

The Legal Services Corporation fills our constitutional obligation to provide the poor with competent legal representation. Our country was founded on the principles of equal opportunity. If we turn our back on the poorest families and deny them access to due process, we are trampling on the principle of equal justice under the law.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has the right to close.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, let me first say that I understand that there have been some concerns about the offsets to pay for this change. Whenever we have a bill that is as difficult as this one, it is very difficult to come up with offsets. I certainly understand the concern about those offsets.

However, those offsets, as we know, are not cast in stone right now. I commit myself to all of those Members, especially my ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), that I will continue to work with the chairman to make sure that the offsets later on and in conference are acceptable to as many people as possible.

But I repeat, it is very difficult to come up with this kind of a change, this kind of an amendment and, at the same time, be able to come up with offsets that will make people happy.

Having said that, let me just say that so many of the speakers today have spoken the truth; that, if there is a program, if there is an agency, if there is a concept that speaks to the core of who we are as a Nation, it is the Legal Services Corporation.

To suggest that someone under our system of law and our system of government cannot get the proper help, the proper representation simply because they are poor, that is outrageous, should not be tolerated, and should never be brought up at all.

Sure, there have been problems with that agency at times. There have been problems with every single agency. But we have not decided to get rid of all agencies we have problems with. My God, there have been problems with Congress, and no one would suggest getting rid of Congress. Although there are some people who suggest getting rid of Congress, but we are not going to pay attention to them.

My point is that what we do best in our society, in my opinion, is to help

those who find it difficult to help themselves. All of us want to take care of the middle class. All of us want to keep our economy growing so that people at the top can hopefully generate some wealth for the rest of the Nation.

But if one cannot walk into court with proper representation because one is too poor to do so, and this Congress is somehow responsible for that happening to that person, then we have a lot to be ashamed of.

This is an issue that comes up every year; and every year, people on that side of the aisle try to destroy this program. This program should not have been funded at this level. I should have been able to find $50 million more, maybe $100 million more to cover the people that are needed.

But story after story after story indicates that this is a program that serves the have-nots in our society. They are the people that we have to protect.

As I look at the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and I see behind him our flag, I realize how many times we get up on this floor on amendments to protect the physical well-being of the flag. Well, I suspect that the flag stands for more than itself. It stands for taking care of all Americans.

I think if that flag could speak to us today, it would tell us that we need to take care of the poor. In this case, that is what we are doing. That is why I think my colleagues should support this amendment, and this amendment should not be about a partisan fight. It should be a bipartisan effort.

Let us do what is right. Let us support the amendment and give us a very strong vote.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment. Cutting the funding of the Legal Services Corporation to $141 million would be a disaster for families living in poverty across this nation.

Legal Services attorneys deserve our thanks. They help our poorest and most vulnerable citizens navigate the complicated bureaucracy of our court system in search of justice and fairness.

Many of my colleagues may not think of Legal Services as a women's issue, but it is. More than two-thirds of the clients served by Legal Services are women. The funding cuts in this bill will force Legal Services to abandon many of the critical legal services that it provides to poor women, particularly victims of domestic violence.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 25 years, Legal Services have held the courthouse doors open to clients seeking legal protection from abusive spouses. In fact, family law—which includes domestic violence cases—makes up over one-third of the cases handled by legal services programs each year.

In addition to helping domestic violence victims, the lawyers at the Legal Services Corporation help poor women to enforce child support orders against dead-beat dads. They also help women with employment discrimination cases.

Slashing funding for Legal Services means barring the door of the courthouse for tens of thousands of women who have nowhere else to turn for help.

As the Legal Services Corporation celebrates its 25th Anniversary, we must not abandon these women to violence and abuse and greater poverty. Please support Legal Services, protect poor families and vote for the amendment.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is with very strong reservations that I support Mr. Ramstad's amendment to the Fiscal Year 2000 Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Appropriations Act that restores $109 million in funding to the Legal Services Corporation.

As a practicing attorney in Georgia for over two decades, I had the opportunity to view firsthand the multitude of services provided by public legal services personnel throughout my state. While I have been critical at times of the Georgia Legal Services Program, they do provide indigent citizens of my state needed legal services.

While I support the legal services provided to the indigent by the hard working men and women of programs like the Georgia Legal Services Program, I rise today to register my deep dissatisfaction on the actions of individuals within the Legal Services Corporation.

Last year on October 21, Congress approved $300 million for the Legal Services Corporation, a $17 million increase that I supported. At the time of this vote, Congress was relying on the accuracy of legal services case statistics provided by the Corporation. As a result of subsequent audits and investigations, it is evident that for months prior to this vote Corporation officials knew that the case numbers given to Congress were both false and inflated, deliberately withholding that information from Congress. This is absolutely inexcusable and those providing false information to Congress should be fired immediately.

With regard to the serious mismanagement at the Legal Services Corporation, I would like to associate myself with the report of the Appropriations Committee. In their report to accompany H.R. 2670, the Committee raised serious concerns about the case service reporting and associated data reports submitted annually by the Corporation to the Congress. Additionally, the Committee found that substantial inaccuracies in these submissions, as documented by the Corporation's Office of Inspector General and the General Accounting Office, and directed the Corporation to make improvement of the accuracy of these submissions a top priority.

To continue receiving my support and provide assurances that the Corporation is proactively addressing its problems, I support the Committee's directive that the Corporation submit its 1999 annual case service reports and associated data reports to Congress no later than April 30, 2000 in order to provide my colleagues with the information necessary to consider the Corporation's budget for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment to restore $109 million in funding for the Legal Services Corporation. But even with this increase, there would only be $250 million available for LSC programs across the country. This would still be insufficient to meet our needs across the country, but it is a step in the right direction.

Even with this year's funding level of $283 million, Legal Services' resources are over-extended. We must send a more positive signal to the dedicated staff who stretch every dollar to provide basic legal services for the poor.

Many of our legal protections today came from the cases made possible by Legal Services. Protections such as due process, voting rights, property rights, women's rights, and many other areas came from Legal Services Corporation litigation. On a day to day basis, Legal Aid bureaus across the country help ensure that individuals have access to the most basic legal services.

In today's society, whenever a single person's rights are violated, everyone is in danger. To guard against such infringement, people need competent and timely legal advice. For the less fortunate, this is no different. LSC affords them the ability to protect their rights just as anyone else.

What are we construing here? Voting rights, employment right, access to education, freedom from discrimination, due process . . . the list goes on. What price tag can we put on these most precious commodities of our democracy?

I urge my colleagues to raise the level of LSC funding. I ask my colleagues to vote their CJS pocketbook for freedom.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, there are no further speakers on this side of the aisle, and I yield back the balance of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 242, noes 178, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

AYES—242

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Ganske
Ackerman	Condit	Gejdenson
Allen	Conyers	Gekas
Andrews	Costello	Gephardt
Bachus	Coyne	Gilman
Baird	Crowley	Gonzalez
Baldacci	Cummings	Gordon
Baldwin	Danner	Green (TX)
Barcia	Davis (FL)	Greenwood
Barrett (WI)	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Becerra	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)
Bentsen	DeFazio	Hastings (FL)
Berkley	DeGette	Hill (IN)
Berman	Delahunt	Hilliard
Berry	DeLauro	Hinchey
Biggert	Deutsch	Hinojosa
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Hoeffel
Blagojevich	Dicks	Holden
Blumenauer	Dingell	Holt
Boehlert	Dixon	Hooley
Bonior	Doggett	Horn
Borski	Dooley	Houghton
Boswell	Doyle	Hoyer
Boucher	Edwards	Hulshof
Boyd	Ehlers	Hutchinson
Brady (PA)	Engel	Inslee
Brown (FL)	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Brown (OH)	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Camp	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Farr	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Fattah	Jones (OH)
Capuano	Filner	Kanjorski
Cardin	Forbes	Kaptur
Carson	Ford	Kelly
Castle	Fowler	Kennedy
Chambliss	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Clay	Franks (NJ)	Kilpatrick
Clayton	Frelinghuysen	Kind (WI)
Clement	Frost	

Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—178

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Cannon
Chabot
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Latham
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Quinn
Radanovich
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Vitter
Walden
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bilbray
Cox
Cramer
Jefferson
John
Lantos
Largent
McDermott
Peterson (PA)
Shaw
Slaughter
Stenholm
Tanner

□ 1628

Mr. DICKEY changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. STARK, HOUGHTON, and BACHUS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 370, I was unavoidable detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Stated against:

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Chairman, on Roll No. 370, the Serrano amendment to the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (H.R. 2670), I intended to vote ''no.''

□ 1630

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York Mr. ENGEL for a colloquy.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage in a colloquy with my colleague from New York (Mr. SERRANO), ranking member of the subcommittee, along with the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS).

Mr. Chairman, today I wish to express my support for the New York Botanical Garden. The district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) and mine encompass a large portion of the Bronx in New York. The New York Botanical Garden has been located in my district. It is currently located in the district of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) which borders mine.

Mr. Chairman, those who have been to New York know that the Botanical Garden is considered by many to be the jewel of the Bronx as well as an institution renowned for its support and development of advanced research and graduate studies in plant biology.

I, along with 17 of my colleagues from New York, have urgently requested that $5 million be appropriated for construction of a new plant studies research laboratory at the New York Botanical Garden. The Botanical Garden is currently recognized as a premier institution in botanical research in the United States.

The facility which houses advanced botanical studies laboratories, however, has become obsolete. A new facility is desperately needed to continue to attract top scientists and researchers from around the world.

As I am sure the chairman and ranking member are aware, $1 million has been included in the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill of the Senate. I urge them to maintain or increase this level of funding during the conference committee.

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

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for expressing his support for the Botanical Garden and want to assure him that funding for the new facility is of high importance to me.

The Botanical Garden has been instrumental in maintaining our place as a world leader in plant research. Without this new plant research facility, the Botanical Garden may lose its preeminent status in botanical studies, forcing many of its scientists and scholars to conduct that research in countries with adequate facilities.

I want to reassure my colleague from New York that maintaining or increasing the $1 million in the Senate appropriations bill for the new plant studies research laboratory is of the highest priority with this Member.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I understand the interest of the two gentlemen, including the ranking minority member. I will be pleased to work with them as we go through this.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.