

Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Ford
Fowler

Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frist
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Manzullo

Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCullum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Metcalfe
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon

Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton

Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Tucker
Upton
Vento
Viscosky
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watts (OK)

Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—61

Allard
Andrews
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Clay
Collins (IL)
Conyers
Coole
Dellums
Dingell
Engel
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Frank (MA)

Graham
Gutierrez
Hancock
Hefley
Hinchee
Kaptur
Lofgren
Maloney
Manton
Markey
McDermott
Meehan
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Nadler
Neal
Olver
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Pickett

Rangel
Roth
Rush
Sanders
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Towns
Velazquez
Volkmer
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Yates

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus
Bateman
Collins (MI)
Forbes

Greenwood
Harman
Hilliard
Jefferson

Moakley
Reynolds
Rose
Williams

□ 1718

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Bachus for, with Mr. Moakley against.

Mr. ROTH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the House voting device did not record my vote on final passage of the Transportation appropriation bill.

I intended to vote "no" on final passage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent earlier this afternoon for several votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 566, the Wolf amendment.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 567, the Coleman amendment.

I would have voted "no" on rollcall 568, the Andrews amendment.

I would have voted "no" on rollcall 569, sustaining the ruling of the Chair.

And, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 570, final passage of the Transportation appropriations bill.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear immediately after the votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 21, I missed roll call vote 546. Had I been present I would have voted "nay." On Monday, July 24, I missed five rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 2002, the Transportation appropriations of fiscal year 1996. On rollcall votes Nos. 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, July 24, during rollcall No. 556, the Miller of California amendment to the Young of Alaska substitute, and 557, passage of H.R. 70, Alaska oil bill, I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on 556 and "no" on 557.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 198 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 198

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered by title rather than by paragraph. Each title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 198, the rule for the fiscal 1996 Commerce, Justice, and State appropriations bill, is a "plain Vanilla" rule needing little in the way of explanation. It is an uncomplicated, open rule, a fair rule. Despite concerns that some Members have been taking a little advantage of some of the previous open rules, the Rules Committee has not placed limits on time, the number of amendments, or procedural motions. Nor will you find any extraordinary waivers included in the rule.

Of course, due to the perennial problem of enacting authorizing bills prior to the consideration of appropriations measures, we have provided the standard waivers for violations of clause 2 and 6 of rule XXI contained within the bill. Members may be interested to know that the Rules Committee is actively exploring ways to avoid this problem—and related problems with the budget process—in the future.

The Subcommittee on Legislative and Budget Process together with the Subcommittee on Rules and Organization of the House are in the process of holding hearings to examine the 1974 Budget Act and what improvements can be made to it. It is my hope that future Congresses will be immune from routine waivers of House rules because of an awkward budget process.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, this rule continues the successful practice of giving the Chair the right to give priority in recognition to those Members who have printed their amendments in the RECORD. This procedure, without infringing on the rights of any Members, has helped to raise the level of debate in this body by allowing Members to be fully prepared for amendments and issues that arise on the floor.

So I urge Members to support this rule so we can proceed with the consideration of the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. This important legislation provides funding for three Cabinet-level departments—although Congress may be eliminating one of them, the Department of Commerce—and funding for numerous related agencies. Under this rule, any Member will be able to offer amendments to make cuts, or changes in the bill's funding priorities. For instance, I intend to support an amendment offered by my friends, Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. HEFLIN, to eliminate funding for the Economic Development Administration.

The EDA is another example of a targeted Government program that over

the years has strayed so far off-target that it's time in this gentleman's view to end it and begin again. Another area of special concern to all taxpayers, and especially those in my district of southwest Florida, is the money provided State Department in this bill for peacekeeping efforts and the United States diplomatic mission in Haiti. I look forward to appropriate debate on these topics.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague from Florida has described this is a simple rule to allow for the consideration of the State/Commerce/Justice appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. The rule is essentially open although it does waive clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI allowing unauthorized appropriations and reappropriations in the bill. This is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because the House has not yet provided authorizations for most of the agencies in the bill. The rule also allows a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

While I plan to support this rule, I am concerned with some of the provisions of this bill. In the area of crime prevention, the bill zeros out a number of important crime prevention programs popular with local policemen and our constituents. For example, the Community Oriented Policing Services Program, known as the COPS program, is eliminated. This program funds new policemen and would eventually put 100,000 new officers on the streets. The COPS program has already provided funds for more than 20,000 new officers throughout the United States, including in my own district of Dayton, OH. It has won the praise of police chiefs and sheriffs from all around the country who contend the program is non-bureaucratic and visionary.

This program and other prevention measures are expected to be folded into a \$2 billion general law enforcement block grant. The problem with this, Mr. Speaker, is that funds could be used on anything from street lights to public works projects and will not necessarily have to be spent on crime prevention. In addition, the funding under this block grant is contingent upon another bill becoming enacted. I really do not think this is fair treatment to our constituents, who have heard us promise, time and time again, that we will help local communities fight crime.

Another problem in the area of crime is a reduction of funds for the violent crime reduction trust fund and the bill's lack of support for crime fighting initiatives such as drug courts and violence against women countermeasures. While I understand the committee expects these programs to be picked up through the block grant, I believe that

many of them will be shrunk and even eliminated. This is not what the American people want to see in the area of crime prevention.

To its credit, the committee did retain funds in this bill for the Department of Commerce, although the Department's budget is greatly reduced. The Commerce Department is the only Cabinet-level department that works with American businesses and can help our companies compete in the global marketplace. I do not believe funding should have been eliminated for the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] which helps stimulate new technologies among U.S. companies. Therefore, I offered an amendment to the rule to allow Representative MOLLOHAN to offer a floor amendment on this. Unfortunately, my amendment lost on a partisan vote.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not express my concern with the bill's restrictive language on the use of funds for peacekeeping missions. I believe we regularly need to evaluate our participation in peacekeeping missions, and make sure other countries do their part. However, language in this bill could seriously interfere with the President's ability to conduct foreign policy. This could hurt us and damage our relationships with other countries at a time in which we need multinational cooperation with respect to troubled spots in the world.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I will support this rule which was reported out of committee with no opposition. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

□ 1730

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Rules met to consider the rule on this bill, I specifically requested that three amendments be made in order which otherwise would not be in order under the anticipated rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make the House aware of these amendments, and to sensitize the House to the fact that, first, the amendments were not made in order, and second, what I plan to do in the alternative.

Mr. Speaker, each one of these amendments spoke to major policy issues, in my opinion, and consequently, merited a rule allowing them to be offered during consideration of the Commerce, Justice, State bill. However, they were not.

The first would have related to the COPS Program, a program which is now ongoing. It was authorized in last year's crime bill. There are approximately 20,000 police officers, or probably more like 25,000, approaching that anyway, officers out there on the streets across America under the COPS Program.

This is a 3-year commitment that the Federal Government has made to these

communities, I am sure, in every single congressional district in the country, and it is a program that is working tremendously well. It is administratively very efficient, and substantively the information we are getting back is very useful and very well received in communities as a concept: community policing. It is a good program in fighting crime. That program is up, it is operating, those policemen are on the street, and the commitment is made.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, in this bill before us, that program is not funded. Those commitments, under this bill, cannot be made. The program that was funded was the block grant program, which was passed by the majority in the first part of this year. It was anticipated by the majority that the block grant program would replace the COPS Program, even though the COPS Program is operating very well, and it is in midstream.

Therefore, what we have is a program that is up and operating, doing well, not being funded in this bill. This new program that is not even authorized; it is simply somebody's legislative initiative at this point, being funded under the bill. That is a problem. That is a problem which I tried to address with an amendment that would fund these programs in the alternative.

My amendment that I asked be made in order by the Committee on Rules would have funded the block grant program, if that became law. If the block grant program was not authorized, it would take that money and continue funding the COPS program. Unfortunately, that amendment was not made in order. I, therefore, am going to be forced, as we proceed, to make a motion to strike the block grant funding that is in the bill, and substitute funding for COPS. I would have preferred to proceed in the more bipartisan way.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, relates to the Byrne Program. I intend to offer an amendment to take just \$30 million from the total \$50 million incarceration of illegal aliens fund, move it over to the very popular Byrne program; \$30 million which will enhance that community funding, community police funding, in the very popular Byrne Grant Program for all of our communities. Again, I requested an amendment which would have enhanced the Byrne grant program significantly by merging it with the total amount available for the incarceration of illegal aliens. That amendment was not approved.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I requested authority under the rule in the Commerce title of the bill to restore funding to the very successful, and think strategically very important Advanced Technology Program. This program was initiated under the Republican administration, the Advanced Technology Program is strategic in the sense that it looks at emerging economies and says that the United States ought to be doing what its counterparts, its competitors around the world

are doing: funding technology initiatives. That amendment was not made in order, and under the rule, Mr. Speaker, I can only offer an amendment which strikes restrictive language on ATP, which I plan on doing.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK].

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I have such an opportunity to thank my colleagues across the aisle, and particularly to congratulate the new leadership. Had I known what new vistas would open to us under this new leadership, I might have considered this much earlier.

I received this morning, as did all of my colleagues, a nice communication from Mr. Livingood, our Sergeant at Arms. Mr. Livingood has informed me that he has taken a renewed interest in manners, or, excuse me, matters of protocol, and has announced that he has hired Pamela Gardner "Muffy" Ahearn as the director of protocol for the U.S. House of Representatives at, I would imagine, about \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year, for which we could hire a couple of policemen. She has extensive professional experience in dealing with foreign dignitaries. I do not know about us here, but with foreign dignitaries, embassies, and high-ranking government officials with all issues of protocol, she is going to help us.

If Members have been worried about wearing white shoes after Labor Day, correct titles and forms of address and introductions, determining the order of precedence, for example, in California, illegal aliens are no longer eligible for medical care or education, but legal aliens may be, and a legal alien who served in the military might be. It is very important that Members know that, proper seating by rank, appropriate gifts and exchange thereon.

The Speaker is going to let us vote on lobbyists giving us gifts. We will have a lot of gifts and we will need Ms. Ahearn to give us the protocol on what we do when we get these gifts from lobbyists; cultural traditions and taboos; dietary restrictions and preferences, I am sure the Speaker will be interested in that one; appropriate toasts following a meal; and language interpretation requirements.

When Members are making protocol arrangements, for example, if the junior Senator from Oregon were worried about filling out his spousal identification card, he should make it out to the bearer, I would suppose, but Ms. Ahearn can in fact advise us on those matters. When we visit schools, the children who no longer get school lunches, should they sit at the same table with those Republican children who bring their lunch from the local caterer? This will be interesting to

know, and very helpful for us, as we carry on our business.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the Republicans are dealing with the serious matters of this House as they eliminate funding for school lunches, as they destroy Medicare. It will be interesting to know how we write those letters of condolence to the seniors who will no longer have Medicare available to them, and letters of congratulations to those rich seniors who will get the benefit of the \$245 billion in tax cuts. We cannot write that, I am sure, looking too longingly at it. However, all of these things are matters which each of us here in the House should be concerned about.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I understand the gentleman. We just heard from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], who was talking about the bill, how we are doing away with the COPS program, we are doing away with significant funding for the Violence Against Women Act, we are doing away with all sorts of things in this bill. However, the gentleman is telling us we have now hired our own in-house Miss Manners?

Mr. STARK. Yes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman know, has there been a lot of misbehaving? Have people been dressing poorly on the floor? I notice the gentleman gave me a copy, and I got one in my office, too. It talks about toasts. Have people been giving inappropriate toasts here? What is this?

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, if I were this lady, I understand she makes \$62,000 a year, she should drink a toast to the Speaker. That is a pretty nice salary for advising many of us who need help with our manners. I certainly could use some assistance in that, and the gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, did this go to both sides of the aisle, or is it just the Democrats that are considered in such lack of protocol?

Mr. STARK. I believe this letter was sent to all Members, and I am sure that in the most bipartisan spirit we all will have our manners and our protocol dressed up.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. If the gentleman will yield further, I think it might be interesting. I just worry that maybe many of the interns will be out there creatively thinking of questions for our new "Miss Manners" or "Miss Protocol" or whoever this is, and I would hope that maybe Roll Call or someone could print the questions and answers. This could be very interesting.

Mr. STARK. I would think under the Freedom of Information Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, may I make a parliamentary inquiry? I think this is very useful, and I think it has an appropriate time for discussion in the

well, but we are trying to talk about the rule on Commerce, Justice, State, which is the scheduled business for this moment. I do not want to call a point of order on the gentleman, but am I on the right track?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's point is well taken, and besides that, the time of the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] has expired.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that we will be considering amendments to the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill that would effectively abolish the Commerce Department. Only a few weeks ago the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight said proposals for the abolition of the Department of Commerce and other departments would be coordinated through the committee.

The problem is that the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has held no hearings on any legislative proposal to abolish the Commerce Department, and has not voted on any such proposal.

Regardless of whether you do, or do not, think the Department of Commerce should be abolished, you should vote against these amendments.

The Appropriations Committee has already cut 20 percent from the Commerce Department's administrative budget. Now, Chairman CLINGER wants to cut an additional 25 percent. A 45-percent cut would effectively abolish the Commerce Department.

A cut of this magnitude would withhold funds the National Weather Service relies on to operate its weather satellites. Funds could be withheld that are needed to provide for the monitoring of textile and apparel imports so that our Government can tell when other countries are violating their textile and apparel agreements with us.

We should not be making these kinds of decisions as a floor amendment to an appropriations bill. Both the Commerce Committee and the Science Committee—the committees of principal jurisdiction over the Commerce Department—have failed to act on legislation abolishing the Department. In fact, the Commerce Committee held its first hearing on the subject just this week.

Further, business groups have expressed their opposition to dismantling the Department, in the manner proposed by this amendment. Dennis Picard, chairman and CEO of Raytheon, Michael H. Jordan, chairman and CEO of Westinghouse, and seven other business leaders said the following in a recent letter opposing abolishing the Department:

Proposals to eliminate the Department of Commerce can only appear to be inherently antibusiness at a time when our industries face a global challenge as great as any time in our nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment. If we want to abolish the Commerce Department, we should take the time to do it the right way.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman made a very important point. What we are seeing happening on this floor is all sorts of legislation on appropriation bills where we really have not had hearings, and decisions are being made of such tremendous magnitude.

I wanted to talk a bit, too, about the Violence Against Women Act. As Members know, we had hoped for about \$120 million or more. That was what everybody thought was coming when we voted 421 to 0 on this bill. What we have seen in my area is domestic violence spilling out onto the street. I have all sorts of incidents where it may have started in the home, but what transpired was it spilled out onto the street, and many people were harmed.

I also must say that the COPS program has worked very well in my area. We have been very, very pleased to see that working. I am very saddened to see that that may be cut.

□ 1745

The Commerce Department has done a tremendous job in increasing exports in my area. We can attribute about a 30-percent increase in jobs just because of Commerce's work on that. We may have an amendment that cuts that.

I think that was the concern of the gentleman from California when he read this letter that we all got in our office today, is that the issue of priorities is one that troubles all of us.

We are glad that this rule is open. I am glad that there is an attempt hopefully to save legal services, but maybe that will not happen, either.

There are so many things happening here every day that people are not able to digest, that to suddenly read that we are going to have a protocol office that is going to talk to us about dietary restrictions and manners and our table menus and place cards is a little troubling. I think that was the perspective that we wanted to put into it. I understand that is not in this bill.

We are having a rule, it is an open rule, we can offer a lot of amendments but we are very apt to lose them on a whole lot of things that have really made a difference in America. It is not like the money is not being spent. It is always being spent somewhere. That was our point. I am sorry if people got upset on that side. It is really rather extraordinary. I am pleased the gen-

tleman from California brought it up and put this letter in the RECORD. I think all of us might look at that and scratch our head and say, "What does this really mean?"

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Perhaps she is not aware that this is a position that in the sergeant at arms under her party as the majority was called the director of special events. There are no significant changes. It is simply that it was vacant when the leadership changed. Perhaps the gentlewoman is also not aware that her leadership on House Oversight, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], and the other members of the Committee on House Oversight on her side of the aisle supported unanimously the continuation of this position.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing that out. I just want to say that, no, we did not know that and I think these are new duties that have been added in my understanding.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, as we began the debate on this rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] had brought up the fact that his amendment to this bill was denied because he wanted to restore funding to the Clinton COPS Program. In this bill we are denied funding for the Clinton COPS Program.

There is going to be an amendment later today offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] which will take \$2 billion from the \$3.2 billion in block grants to fund the Clinton COPS Program. The program to date is very efficient, it is a model of efficiency, it is effective, it is up, it is running and it is working. As the application form we can see being placed forward here, it is a two-page form.

All you do, police officers around this Nation fill out this form, there is a fax number you can actually fax it in to the Department of Justice to get your grant approved. You do not need grant writers, you do not need consultants. It is a model of efficiency. The administrative cost for the COPS Program is 1.5 percent. Under the proposed block grants by my friends on this side of the aisle, it is 2.5 percent. If we take a look at the Senate block grant program, it is 15 percent for administrative costs. Here is a program that is up, it is running, and we have over 20,000 police officers on the street within the first year. The application, fill it out, fax it in.

One of the big complaints we hear is there is no flexibility in the Clinton COPS Program. We are on round 2 of COPS MORE. COPS MORE stands for making officer redeployment effective. Today \$41,700,000 was released for police officers to be put into civilian

help, to be put in for equipment, to be put in overtime. All the flexibility that local police officers say they need, you find it in the COPS MORE Program. We are on round 2. There will be 3 more rounds yet this year.

The other problem I have with this bill is when we requested and the Department and the President requested over \$10 million for rural law enforcement. This bill strikes out the \$10 million for rural law enforcement officers. Twenty-five percent of this country lives in rural areas. I was a police officer, a city police officer, a State police officer. I worked in rural areas. I have worked in the big city. Crime does not respect if you live in a rural area or in a big city. If a criminal is going to make an attack upon you, they don't care if you are Democrat or Republican, if you come from a big city of a

little city. We have money here. We need it for the COPS Program.

Underneath the current proposal put forth by the majority, there is no money whatsoever to hire one police officer. There is a wish, there is a hope. That is why police officers around the country support the Clinton COPS Program.

Earlier today we had a press conference. The Fraternal order of Police support it, National Association of Police Organizations, International Brotherhood of Police Officers, International Union of Police Associations, Police Executive Research Forum, National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Officers, National Troopers Coalition, National Sheriffs Association, National Black Police Officers Association, Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, Major Cities

Chiefs, and U.S. Conference of Mayors all support the COPS Program. I urge Members to support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just wanted to comment that we understand the authorization-appropriations cycle is a little bit out of whack. As I said in my opening remarks, we are trying to work that out so we do not have these problems.

I think we have got a very fair rule here. We have heard a lot of discussion about issues we are going to talk about in the bill, but I have not heard any opposition to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following data for the RECORD:

THE AMENDMENT PROCESS UNDER SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE,¹ 103D CONGRESS V. 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 24, 1995]

| Rule type | 103d Congress | | 104th Congress | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | Number of rules | Percent of total | Number of rules | Percent of total |
| Open/Modified-open ² | 46 | 44 | 38 | 73 |
| Modified Closed ³ | 49 | 47 | 12 | 23 |
| Closed ⁴ | 9 | 9 | 2 | 4 |
| Totals: | 104 | 100 | 52 | 100 |

¹ This table applies only to rules which provide for the original consideration of bills, joint resolutions or budget resolutions and which provide for an amendment process. It does not apply to special rules which only waive points of order against appropriations bills which are already privileged and are considered under an open amendment process under House rules.

² An open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule. A modified open rule is one under which any Member may offer a germane amendment under the five-minute rule subject only to an overall time limit on the amendment process and/or a requirement that the amendment be preprinted in the Congressional Record.

³ A modified closed rule is one under which the Rules Committee limits the amendments that may be offered only to those amendments designated in the special rule or the Rules Committee report to accompany it, or which preclude amendments to a particular portion of a bill, even though the rest of the bill may be completely open to amendment.

⁴ A closed rule is one under which no amendments may be offered (other than amendments recommended by the committee in reporting the bill).

SPECIAL RULES REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, 104TH CONGRESS

[As of July 24, 1995]

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| H. Res. 38 (1/18/95) | O | H.R. 5 | Unfunded Mandate Reform | A: 350-71 (1/19/95) |
| H. Res. 44 (1/24/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 17 | Social Security | A: 255-172 (1/25/95) |
| | | H.J. Res. 1 | Balanced Budget Amdt | |
| H. Res. 51 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 101 | Land Transfer, Taos Pueblo Indians | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 52 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 400 | Land Exchange, Arctic Nat'l Park and Preserve | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 53 (1/31/95) | O | H.R. 440 | Land Conveyance, Butte County, Calif | A: voice vote (2/1/95) |
| H. Res. 55 (2/1/95) | O | H.R. 2 | Line Item Veto | A: voice vote (2/2/95) |
| H. Res. 60 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 665 | Victim Restitution | A: voice vote (2/7/95) |
| H. Res. 61 (2/6/95) | O | H.R. 666 | Exclusionary Rule Reform | A: voice vote (2/7/95) |
| H. Res. 63 (2/8/95) | MO | H.R. 667 | Violent Criminal Incarceration | A: voice vote (2/9/95) |
| H. Res. 69 (2/9/95) | O | H.R. 668 | Criminal Alien Deportation | A: voice vote (2/10/95) |
| H. Res. 79 (2/10/95) | MO | H.R. 728 | Law Enforcement Block Grants | A: voice vote (2/13/95) |
| H. Res. 83 (2/13/95) | MO | H.R. 7 | National Security Revitalization | PO: 229-100; A: 227-127 (2/15/95) |
| H. Res. 88 (2/16/95) | MC | H.R. 831 | Health Insurance Deductibility | PO: 230-191; A: 229-188 (2/21/95) |
| H. Res. 88 (2/21/95) | MC | H.R. 830 | Paperwork Reduction Act | A: voice vote (2/22/95) |
| H. Res. 92 (2/21/95) | O | H.R. 889 | Defense Supplemental | A: 282-144 (2/22/95) |
| H. Res. 93 (2/22/95) | MO | H.R. 450 | Regulatory Transition Act | A: 252-175 (2/23/95) |
| H. Res. 96 (2/24/95) | MO | H.R. 1022 | Risk Assessment | A: 253-165 (2/27/95) |
| H. Res. 100 (2/27/95) | O | H.R. 926 | Regulatory Reform and Relief Act | A: voice vote (2/28/95) |
| H. Res. 101 (2/28/95) | MO | H.R. 925 | Private Property Protection Act | A: 271-151 (3/2/95) |
| H. Res. 103 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 1058 | Securities Litigation Reform | |
| H. Res. 104 (3/3/95) | MO | H.R. 988 | Attorney Accountability Act | A: voice vote (3/6/95) |
| H. Res. 105 (3/6/95) | MO | | | A: 257-155 (3/7/95) |
| H. Res. 108 (3/7/95) | Debate | H.R. 956 | Product Liability Reform | A: voice vote (3/8/95) |
| H. Res. 109 (3/8/95) | MC | | | PO: 234-191; A: 247-181 (3/9/95) |
| H. Res. 115 (3/14/95) | MO | H.R. 1159 | Making Emergency Supp. Appropriations | A: 242-190 (3/15/95) |
| H. Res. 116 (3/15/95) | MC | H.J. Res. 73 | Term Limits Const. Amdt | A: voice vote (3/28/95) |
| H. Res. 117 (3/16/95) | Debate | H.R. 4 | Personal Responsibility Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (3/21/95) |
| H. Res. 119 (3/21/95) | MC | | | A: 217-211 (3/22/95) |
| H. Res. 125 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 1271 | Family Privacy Protection Act | A: 423-1 (4/4/95) |
| H. Res. 126 (4/3/95) | O | H.R. 660 | Older Persons Housing Act | A: voice vote (4/6/95) |
| H. Res. 128 (4/4/95) | MC | H.R. 1215 | Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995 | A: 228-204 (4/5/95) |
| H. Res. 130 (4/5/95) | MC | H.R. 483 | Medicare Select Expansion | A: 253-172 (4/6/95) |
| H. Res. 136 (5/1/95) | O | H.R. 655 | Hydrogen Future Act of 1995 | A: voice vote (5/2/95) |
| H. Res. 139 (5/3/95) | O | H.R. 1361 | Coast Guard Auth. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (5/9/95) |
| H. Res. 140 (5/9/95) | O | H.R. 961 | Clean Water Amendments | A: 414-4 (5/10/95) |
| H. Res. 144 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 535 | Fish Hatchery—Arkansas | A: voice vote (5/15/95) |
| H. Res. 145 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 584 | Fish Hatchery—Iowa | A: voice vote (5/15/95) |
| H. Res. 146 (5/11/95) | O | H.R. 614 | Fish Hatchery—Minnesota | A: voice vote (5/15/95) |
| H. Res. 149 (5/16/95) | MC | H. Con. Res. 67 | Budget Resolution FY 1996 | PO: 252-170; A: 255-168 (5/17/95) |
| H. Res. 155 (5/22/95) | MO | H.R. 1561 | American Overseas Interests Act | A: 233-176 (5/23/95) |
| H. Res. 164 (6/8/95) | MC | H.R. 1530 | Nat. Defense Auth. FY 1996 | PO: 225-191; A: 233-183 (6/13/95) |
| H. Res. 167 (6/15/95) | O | H.R. 1817 | MilCon Appropriations FY 1996 | PO: 223-180; A: 245-155 (6/16/95) |
| H. Res. 169 (6/19/95) | MC | H.R. 1854 | Leg. Branch Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 232-196; A: 236-191 (6/20/95) |
| H. Res. 170 (6/20/95) | O | H.R. 1868 | For. Ops. Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 221-178; A: 217-175 (6/22/95) |
| H. Res. 171 (6/22/95) | O | H.R. 1905 | Energy & Water Approps. FY 1996 | A: voice vote (7/1/95) |
| H. Res. 173 (6/27/95) | C | H.J. Res. 79 | Flag Constitutional Amendment | PO: 258-170; A: 271-152 (6/28/95) |
| H. Res. 176 (6/28/95) | MC | H.R. 1944 | Emer. Supp. Approps. | PO: 236-194; A: 234-192 (6/29/95) |
| H. Res. 185 (7/11/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 235-193; D: 192-238 (7/12/95) |
| H. Res. 187 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1977 | Interior Approps. FY 1996 #2 | PO: 230-194; A: 229-195 (7/13/95) |
| H. Res. 188 (7/12/95) | O | H.R. 1976 | Agriculture Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 242-185; A: voice vote (7/18/95) |
| H. Res. 190 (7/17/95) | O | H.R. 2020 | Treasury/Postal Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 232-192; A: voice vote (7/18/95) |
| H. Res. 193 (7/19/95) | C | H.J. Res. 96 | Disapproval of MFN to China | A: voice vote (7/20/95) |
| H. Res. 194 (7/19/95) | O | H.R. 2002 | Transportation Approps. FY 1996 | PO: 217-202; A: voice vote (7/21/95) |

| H. Res. No. (Date rept.) | Rule type | Bill No. | Subject | Disposition of rule |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| H. Res. 197 (7/21/95) | 0 | H.R. 70 | Exports of Alaskan Crude Oil | A: voice vote (7/24/95) |
| H. Res. 198 (7/21/95) | 0 | H.R. 2076 | Commerce, State Approps. FY 1996 | |

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.,
Chairman.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other

purposes, and that I may be permitted to include tabular and extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1752

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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