

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, October 14, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

Rabbi Alvin K. Berkun, Tree of Life Congregation, Pittsburgh, PA, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, as we begin our day of deliberations in this the House of Representatives of the United States of America, we pause to acknowledge You and pray for peace.

According to the 2,000-year-old volume written by the ancient rabbis, "The Ethics of Our Fathers," the world rests on three things: on truth, on justice, and on peace. All three are connected and intertwined.

The goal of the first two is to bring about the third, peace.

To the Jewish sages of old, peace was God's very name. Peace. Shalom, the ideal toward which we must all strive.

In Jewish tradition, the word "Shalom" has a much wider meaning than it does in its English equivalent, the word "peace," for in the Hebrew context the word "peace" touches on the work that is done here. It refers to the welfare of all. It implies a sense of security, contentment, and sound health.

The Prophet Isaiah taught that Shalom would be opposed to the dissatisfaction and unrest that evil can cause.

May we be inspired by one of the greatest of Jewish sages, a contemporary of Jesus, Rabbi Hillel, who said, "Love peace and pursue peace."

May the inspiration of our Judeo-Christian heritage inspire all of us as we work together to make of our Nation a beacon of hope, a symbol of freedom, and a harbinger of peace for all. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KLECZKA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that the Chair will recognize 15 Members on each side for 1-minute requests.

The Chair first recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE], the sponsor of today's guest Chaplain.

### A WELCOME TO RABBI ALVIN K. BERKUN

(Mr. COYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to welcome Rabbi Alvin K. Berkun to the U.S. House of Representatives. I want to extend to Rabbi Berkun the appreciation of the House for serving as guest Chaplain.

Rabbi Berkun is the sixth rabbi in the 129-year history of the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh. Since coming to Pittsburgh from his native Connecticut, where he served as rabbi in New Haven for 15 years, Rabbi Berkun has become an active leader in the Pittsburgh community. He is founder and a board member of the Community Day School. Rabbi Berkun was a founder and served as president of the conservative movement's Rabbinical Assembly Region of Southern Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky. He has also been president of the Rabbinic Fellowship of Greater Pittsburgh. He was presented with the Rabbinic Leadership Award at the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Welfare Federations.

Rabbi Berkun is also well known throughout the Pittsburgh area as a leader in the civic and religious life of our community. He has served as a member of the Carnegie One Hundred and the Religious Leadership Forum. He is a member of the steering committee of the Citizen League of Southwestern Pennsylvania. He serves as a participant in the Black/Jewish Dialogue and the Presbyterian/Jewish Dialogue. Rabbi Berkun is to be commended for his efforts to increase understanding between all faiths and all members of our American community.

Rabbi Berkun was ordained by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, from which he holds an honorary doctor of divinity degree. He also holds a master of Hebrew literature degree. He attended the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and is a graduate of the University of Michigan's Near Eastern Studies Department.

Rabbi Berkun served his Nation's military service in the Chaplain Corps

as a U.S. Navy lieutenant. Rabbi Berkun has taught seminars in the former Soviet Union with refuseniks. Rabbi Berkun and his wife, Flora, are the proud parents of Elizabeth, Jonathan, and Rebecca.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Rabbi Berkun for offering words of inspiration to the House today. Let us act on Rabbi Berkun's admonition that we all "love peace and pursue peace."

### WORLD CHAMPION PHILLIES

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker—

The playoffs are over. The verdict is in. As I said last week, the Phillies would win. Atlanta was tough, they tried their best, but against the Phillies it was no contest. The Tomahawks were silenced, the Braves ended up meek.

There's no doubt in our minds the Phils are at their peak!

Schilling was great, Mr. MVP.

In setting the tone, he was the key.

Mitch lived up his usual style.

Worrying us, thrilling us all the while.

Six games it took to beat the Braves.

Atlanta chops—no! Philly waves!

Rag tag, gamers, call them what you will.

Heart, guts—a dream to fulfill.

Now it's off to Toronto, the World Series is here.

The Phillies are a-poppin, final victory is near.

The Blue Jays will try

They'll put up a fight,

But they can't win the Series.

It's not in the cards, it's just not right.

Phils in seven—more thrills, more chills.

World Champions, team of destiny—America's Phils!

□ 1010

### RUBE GOLDBERG HEALTH CARE

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a diagram of the Clinton health care bureaucracy.

Rube Goldberg never had it so good.

The Clinton health care plan is an amazingly complex effort to achieve simplicity.

In fact, this effort to cut down on bureaucracy will create 59 new Federal bureaucracies, expand 20 others, while imposing 79 new Federal mandates.

Rube Goldberg, of course, is famous for building overly complex devices to catch mice.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

The Clinton health plan will catch patients in a maze of Government regulations, higher costs, and lower quality.

Mr. Speaker, the President spoke eloquently about the need to cut down on Government bureaucracy when it comes to health care, and we need real health care reform, so I urge him to live up to his rhetoric and to rethink his Rube Goldberg health care trap before he brings it to the Hill.

**CWO MICHAEL DURANT OF BERLIN, NH, WELCOMED HOME FROM SOMALIA**

(Mr. SWETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and celebration that I am able to stand and welcome back my constituent, CWO Michael Durant of Berlin, NH.

His release this morning was a joyous event that culminated 10 days filled with anxiety and fear. The strength that Michael showed throughout this ordeal and the way his family and hometown came together, rallied support for him, and drew upon their faith, was truly of heroic proportion.

Once again New Hampshire citizens have demonstrated the solid granite from which they are hewn. They are a united community in times of trouble, without cracks or seams.

As Michael makes his way homeward, and Laurie, his wife, flies to meet him in Germany, I want to extend my deepest felt appreciation and congratulations to all those who made his release possible. From Michael himself, to his family, to the community of Berlin, Ambassador Oakley, President Clinton and former President Jimmy Carter, the International Community of the Red Cross, military and State Department officials, and all others who helped, they deserve credit for an outstanding effort.

Americans have demonstrated, yet again, that even when facing the most difficult of trials, we can pull together and overcome any odds.

**THE HOUSE REPUBLICAN CRIME BILL OFFERS A STRATEGY TO PROTECT SCHOOLS, NEIGHBORHOODS, AND CHILDREN**

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, by the year 2000, every school in America free of drugs and violence and offering a disciplined environment conducive to learning—this is the sixth of our national education goals, adopted by this House yesterday.

I point out to my colleagues that our schools cannot reach this goal alone.

Today students are greeted in the morning by metal detectors and police officers.

Attorney General Reno calls youth violence our greatest crime problem. The House Republican crime bill, H.R. 2872, would directly address this worsening reality. Tougher penalties for violation of the Gun-Free School Zones Act, community policing grants, enlisting neighborhood responses to crime, and stiffer penalties for criminal street gangs, together form a coordinated strategy to protect schools, neighborhoods, families, and children. How can we expect our Nation's students to get the quality educations they deserve when backpacks no longer carry just books, rulers, and bag lunches, but guns and knives.

**THE HEALTH SECURITY PLAN: A SIMPLER SOLUTION**

(Mr. VISCLOSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, opponents of reform claim that the President's health security plan will be complex and create more government bureaucracy. Not true.

Nothing could be more confusing, bureaucratic, top-heavy and regulatory than the current system. Health care costs are skyrocketing, fraud and abuse thrive in a maze of loopholes and fine print, and doctors and patients alike are awash in a sea of bureaucracy and red tape.

Under the President's proposal, Government will set standards, guarantee security, and then get out of the way. It will simplify the system, reduce paperwork, eliminate duplication, and put consumers in the driver's seat.

The far-right Republican fringe should be ashamed of itself. Look at their plan—if we could get the details. It does nothing to cut insurance company redtape. Nothing to standardize forms. Nothing to simplify billing or eliminate fine print. It leaves the insurance companies in the driver's seat—and all Americans at risk of losing coverage at any time.

Let us get real; let us give the President a chance.

**LACK OF ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT FOR NPR RECOMMENDATIONS**

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, the President and Vice President stood at a crowded White House ceremony to introduce what they promised to be a major commitment toward reforming the management of the Federal Government. That an-

nouncement was followed by countless television appearances and photo opportunities where even more promises were made to make the Government even more efficient.

A few days later, I delivered the Republican response to the President's weekly radio address on reinventing government. I stated then that "President Clinton \* \* \* [could] look to congressional Republicans as partners in their effort to streamline the Federal Government." Most Republicans stand ready to vote yes to implement recommendations of the National Performance Review.

In my radio address, I challenged the President to submit a legislative package implementing the NPR recommendations to Congress within 30 days. Nearly 5 weeks have passed since those recommendations were released. What has the administration to show for its efforts? Not a single bill has been introduced by the President, not a single monogram detailing their recommendations have been delivered to Congress, not a single vote has been cast in support of the National Performance Review. Only hollow promises stand now where Bill Clinton had once promised to make this issue one of his highest priorities.

A unique opportunity has been lost to enact these reforms quickly. I hope that the White House did not use this costly reinventing Government exercise just as a political tool—that they really mean to support these ideas and make Government more efficient. To date, there is little proof of their efforts.

**IT IS TIME FOR THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO TELL THE TRUTH ABOUT DEMJANJUK**

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, John Demjanjuk was released from jail in Israel but is now in jail in America in his own home.

And I understand the deep feelings of the Jewish community about what is taking place, but I think it is time now for the Justice Department of the United States to tell the truth.

They now say, my colleagues, that there is no evidence against John Demjanjuk, the same group that called him "Terrible" for many years. I think that there is evidence, evidence that our Justice Department suborned the perjury of Otto Horn, the Nazi guard who lied through his teeth in Cleveland.

I think there is also evidence that our Justice Department perpetrated a fraud, a hoax, on the courts of Israel and America, and I think there is also other evidence that they ran roughshod over the rights of Demjanjuk.

My colleagues, when the constitutional rights of a citizen like Demjanjuk can be thrown aside, the constitutional rights of every American are on the table. I ask, Where is Congress? Why don't you act on the resolution I have submitted? What are you afraid of? The truth?

#### MILITARY INTERDICTION NECESSARY TO KEEP DRUGS OFF OUR STREETS

(Mr. SHAW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, this week the Senate considers the Defense appropriations bill, which includes funding for military drug interdiction. I want to alert Members that military interdiction faces possible elimination unless its supporters act fast.

Senate report language promises "to adjust funds appropriated in this account if the bottom up review so recommends." Following recent news reports that the Clinton administration considers military interdiction a failure, this looks and smells like a set-up.

The fact is military interdiction works. Since 1990 DOD has helped disrupt more than 335 tons of drugs—17 billion dollars' worth—bound for our country. These seizures would not have occurred without military help, and for every \$1 we've spent, we've kept 20 dollars' worth of drugs off our streets.

Mr. Speaker, we will never rid our society of crime if we simply surrender to the drug lords. Military interdiction is too important and too successful to be killed in the fine print of a spending bill.

#### GIFT BAN FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

(Ms. SCHENK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Speaker, as many of my freshman colleagues, I came to Washington this year with the hope and the desire to help restore trust in Government. One way to begin doing so is to enact a strict ban on gifts for Members of Congress.

When I was a cabinet secretary in the executive branch of California's government a decade ago, we operated under a gift ban. We called it the two-hamburgers-and-a-Coke rule.

□ 1020

Like the bill before this House, it restricted the value of gifts we could receive. It worked in California, and it will work in this Congress.

A gift ban helps give reassurance to citizens that their representatives are working for the public interest, not for their self-interest.

Many Americans think accepting gifts from lobbyists is a—let's face it—form of bribery. We need to stop that perception. We must restore the faith of citizens in the way we conduct their business. A gift ban starts us down that important road.

#### THE 1990'S: A TIME OF GREED

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, during the budget debates this year, President Clinton and his friends here in Congress repeatedly condemned the 1980's as a time of greed—symbolized by hostile corporate takeovers.

Well, the President has certainly put the shoe on the other foot.

Thanks to the Clinton administration, if the 1980's were known as the decade of corporate takeovers, the 1990's will be known as the decade of Government takeovers.

Most ambitiously, the President is plotting a whole-scale takeover of this Nation's \$900 billion health care industry.

That includes the hospitals, the insurance industry, the pharmaceutical industry, and everything else associated with health care.

Now, that is the kind of hostile takeover that would make Henry Kravis, Ross Johnson, and T. Boone Pickens look like amateurs.

If hostile takeovers added dramatically to private debt in the 1980's, just think what Government takeovers will add to the national debt in the 1990's.

As the stockholders in our Government, it is the American taxpayer who will get stuck with the bill.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just like the 1980's, the 1990's will also be remembered as a time of greed—only now it's Government greed.

Once the Clinton raiders finish with health care, who knows who or what will be next.

#### CHANGE FOR THE BETTER

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, most Americans say "keep Government out of our lives!" But the Clinton health plan calls for bigger and more intrusive Government and lots less personal choice. That is what we see now that the smoke from the White House PR machine is clearing and the fine print of the Clinton health plan comes into focus. People want change for the better, not change for more Government. If you had not noticed, nobody in America thinks that Government is managing much of anything very well.

But change for better can be made in health care by overhauling malpractice rules, by reducing paperwork and reforming insurance markets. I am troubled by the First Lady's refusal to move ahead on these points now. To this, Mrs. Clinton said "no." Not maybe; not we're open—just "no" by insisting on her whole plan. She and the President risk losing this opportunity for doable real reform today—a risk most Americans are not willing to take while we still wait for the Clinton health bill from the White House now 6 months overdue.

#### KNOCK OUT SUPER COLLIDER FUNDS FROM CONFERENCE REPORT

(Mr. SLATTERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, today the conference committee on the energy and water appropriations bill will meet. Our constituents have been calling on us to cut spending, and this bill contains the largest spending cut the House made in any of the appropriations bills: the superconducting super collider [SSC].

Two-thirds of the House voted to cut this project and save taxpayers as much as \$10 billion. By an overwhelming 280 to 150 vote the House said "We can't afford this budget busting item."

Unfortunately, the Senate included funding for the SSC in their version of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the House must stand tough. We deserve to have a separate up-or-down vote on the super collider as an item in disagreement with the Senate when this conference report comes back.

I urge the House leadership and conferees to structure the report to allow such a vote. If we do not have such a vote, I call on all 279 of my colleagues who joined me in opposing this project on the House floor, to vote again to prevent any more money from being wasted on the super collider.

We must be prepared to vote against the entire conference committee report if it contains funding for the super collider.

#### TRIBUTE TO J.P. HUMPHREYS

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, on October 6, 1993, a very good friend of mine, Mr. J.P. Humphreys of Joplin, MO, passed away.

In addition to being a friend and constituent, J. Humphreys was a brilliant businessman, a dedicated community leader, and an all-around great American.

As a businessman, J. Humphreys became president of a small, two-plant company in 1960 and it is now a major national firm, with seven manufacturing plants and more than 1,000 employees.

He was a tireless community leader, serving as president of the Joplin Chamber of Commerce, chairman of the board for the First Community Church, and as leader of many other civic groups.

Always a patriot, J. served valiantly and honorably as a Marine Corps bomber pilot during World War II. As a citizen, he was politically active and an outspoken defender of freedom.

He lived his life according to what he called the freedom philosophy, a set of principles of morality for human action.

J.P. Humphreys was definitely a leader, a man who made a difference during his time here with us. He will be missed by his many friends, business associates, family, and this Member of Congress.

#### POLLY KLAAS ABDUCTION

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 12-year-old Polly Klaas was enjoying a slumber party with two friends at her home in Petaluma, CA, when a man, wielding a knife, entered Polly's bedroom through an open window. The man tied up and gagged Polly's two friends, and then kidnaped Polly.

Mr. Speaker, Polly was abducted from her home almost 2 weeks ago. Since that tragic evening, Polly's family, the police, the FBI, and volunteers have been working nonstop to find Polly—but not one lead has been uncovered.

Mr. Speaker, Polly needs our help, and we are running out of time. I urge my colleagues to include Polly's picture and the sketch of her abductor in their next mailing to their district.

Mr. Speaker, there is a number to call for people who have any information about Polly. That number is 800-272-0012. I would impress upon my colleagues the importance of urging their constituents to use this number if they have any information that could help reunite Polly with her family.

Our efforts could put an end to this awful nightmare. Please help the Klaas family bring Polly home.

#### VOTE AGAINST SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, within the week this body, the people's House,

Republicans and Democrats alike, are going to be put to a test, and that test is going to determine whether we have been honest with ourselves and honest with the American people when we said we want change, that we are not going to do things the same old way, that we are truly serious about deficit reduction, that we are not going to continue to mortgage our children's and grandchildren's future, and that we are going to cut unnecessary wasteful spending. That test will come on the energy and water development appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this House, by an overwhelming 280 to 150 vote, voted to terminate the superconducting super collider, a massive expenditure that started out costing \$4.4 billion, which is less than 20 percent complete, and is now estimated to cost over \$13 billion.

We said we do not want it in the interest of the American people and yet a conference report that will come to us provides \$640 million completely ignoring the will of the House. The vote is going to come within the week and we must reject it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pay attention to this one. This is the moment of truth. We have had the sanctimonious sermons about deficit reductions, about change. Now we can put our votes where our mouths have been. Now we can truly demonstrate to the American people that we are masters of our own destiny, that change will come, that deficit reduction will be honest.

□ 1030

#### A TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

(Mr. APPELEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPELEGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am mad as hell. Where is justice?

Monica Seles, the best tennis player in the world, was maliciously stabbed in the back for the purpose of maiming her by a German, to dethrone Monica from the No. 1 position in tennis, to help his fellow countryman to become the No. 1 player. And the irony is that it worked. Steffi Graf now is the No. 1 tennis player in the world.

They took the man before the courts, and the German judge said he expressed remorse and went on to sentence this man and, get this, sentenced him to a 2-year suspended sentence for trying to destroy a life.

The judge should have thrown him in the jug and tossed the key away. The deed was heinous and justice was a travesty.

God willing, Monica will be back on the courts and will be, again, one day, No. 1.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DONALD MUNSON

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a great American, a fine legislator, and a true friend to the citizens of western Maryland, State Senator Donald Munson.

Senator Munson recently was named Legislator of the Year by the Maryland Classified Employees Association for his successful efforts to keep the Western Maryland Center Hospital from being privatized. In fact, Don Munson has been working to keep the western Maryland center in public hands since 1974 when he was first elected. His dedication serves as an inspiration to all of us in public life.

This is the first time this honor has been bestowed on a lawmaker from western Maryland, and is a good example of the type of impact one can have on an important issue over a given length of time. Don Munson stayed close to the issue all of these years, and this recognition of his efforts and diligence by the Maryland Classified Employees Association is a reflection of the respect, affection, and admiration so many of us in Maryland have for Senator Munson.

Western Maryland is truly fortunate to have Don Munson on our side.

#### CRISIS IN HAITI

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to commend President Clinton for his swift action in reinstating comprehensive sanctions against the Haitian military and police and the tiny economic elite who bankroll them.

The actions by General Cedras and Colonel Francois that led to the delay in landing United States and Canadian trainers and technical support forces are only the most recent outrages in a rising tide of violence and intimidation.

The United States has a responsibility. For years we backed a succession of supposedly friendly military-backed dictators. Presidents Bush and Clinton promised to return to power President Aristide—a heroic priest who won two-thirds of the votes in the last election.

Earlier this year, our President refused entry to thousands of Haitian refugees. We turned them back at sea. However, we promised the return of President Aristide.

President Aristide can restore order and democracy, and the Haitians will have no need to take to the sea in an attempt to escape oppression and terrorism. We need to support the President. The time is now.

## WITHDRAWAL FROM SOMALIA

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the good news today is that CWO Michael Durant has been freed by his Somalia captors and that American forces are no longer targeting warlord Aideed. The bad news is how much the administration has politicized our mission in Somalia.

First they disregarded recommendations of our military commanders against targeting Aideed. Then, requests for heavy tanks and armor were overruled, resulting in the disaster of October 3—when 18 American Rangers were killed and 75 wounded.

Now we learn the administration is sending up to 3,000 more troops to Somalia—in addition to the forces already there.

Mr. Speaker, the administration still hasn't learned an important lesson about Somalia. The only practical solution is for Congress to set a date for withdrawing American troops from Somalia.

I intend to offer legislation to set the date January 31, 1994, for pulling our troops out of Somalia. I ask my colleagues to support me in this effort.

## CONSTITUTIONAL DELINEATION OF POWER

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some confusion about the delineation of power and responsibility between the President as Commander in Chief and the constitutional obligations of this Congress and its warmaking authority.

The constitutional powers of the President as Commander in Chief to introduce U.S. Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances is exercised only pursuant to a declaration of war, specific statutory authorization, or a national emergency created by an attack upon the United States, its Territories or possessions or armed forces.

There is no declaration of war. Neither this body nor the other body has authorized the deployment of troops in Somalia.

There is no national emergency. President Clinton must meet his obligation under the War Powers Act and submit a written request for authorization to the Congress defining the scope, duration and, most importantly, the objectives of our military operation in Somalia.

Congress, we must stop ducking our responsibilities and vote to authorize

this deployment or bring the troops home.

## INVEST IN AMERICA

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, American workers be alert. If you think your pension funds are safe and are being used wisely to help Americans, listen—please listen.

A public pension fund conference was held in Red China in September—the first of its kind—and an American who determines how funds from pensions for public workers are invested revealed that he had \$500 billion to invest—and he was looking at placing it in China—according to an article in the New York Times.

Organizers admitted they are investigating how to increase their marginal investing in Asian mutual funds, while the Times article said they also are looking specifically at China.

Mr. Speaker, we are handing American pension money to a country that ignores human rights—that pays slave wages—and providing that nation with cash infusion to come back and compete with those very people who are paying into the pension funds.

Funds represented in the conference are: The New York City Comptrollers Office, the California Public Employees Retirement System, and the Dallas Employees Retirement Fund. All America may well be shortchanged by these groups. American business needs financial infusion to keep our workers above the poverty line. We need to invest in America and not in slave labor and human rights violators.

## THE SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to sit here and listen to some of the things and understand it differently and not speak out on behalf of America.

Let us not fool ourselves. Cutting the super collider project will not save one penny. It will simply close down a project and shift the spending to some place else.

Voting down this project simply kills the greatest research project in these times. It is a project that will help us to create jobs, to put people to work, to keep people working, to come along with breakthroughs in health care that will ultimately cut the cost of the care, and discover other projects for energy conservation and energy alternatives.

It is really very foolish for us to continue to vote on emergency extensions

of unemployment benefits and then shift other spending away from a project that can bring jobs and keep jobs. We are still spending but yet not eliminating the necessity of emergency funding for unemployment compensation.

It does not make sense. Do not be fooled by the rhetoric. This money earmarked for the SSC will not be saved. We are here to attempt to find jobs and keep jobs and keep America working. We must not just spend and yet not maintain a strong work force. The project is more than 20 percent complete. If we are to stay on the cutting edge of technology and maintain global competitiveness, then we must continue to find a way to keep this necessary project alive and strong.

□ 1040

## URGING CONSIDERATION OF THE ISTOOK RESOLUTION

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I speak today on Resolution 238, the Istook resolution regarding the House post office. I find it interesting to see how hypocritical we as a body in Congress can be when we investigate every other department or agency of the Government, but we are always slow to do it to ourselves. In 1987 we voted 416 to 2 to set up a special committee to investigate Iran-Contra, but now we cannot do it because we are being told by our leadership and Members that if we do it will interfere with the Justice Department investigation. Is that not convenient?

Last year the House committee, a task force that actually investigated the post office scandal, said they could find nothing, and they complained about the Justice Department interfering with Congress. However, today, we hear Congress is interfering with Congress. However, today, we hear Congress is interfering with the Justice Department. It is nothing more than an excuse not to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I say we bring the Istook resolution to the floor. Let us clean up our own house. Justice must not play favorites. Justice must be blind.

## HAVE YOU SEEN THIS PLAN?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post reports a recent poll found that 70 percent of Americans believe the President has not told the whole story on his health care plan. When asked how much they knew about the Clintons' health care plan only 17 percent said they knew a lot. Eighty-three percent said they knew little or almost nothing about it.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that I presume the 17 percent that say they know a lot about the plan must reside in the White House that will not release the plan. I am equally convinced that 83 percent that know little or nothing about the plan must reside in Congress, because no one here has seen it.

Weeks ago the President came to this very floor to address the Congress and the Nation to describe his health care plan. Congress has even had hearings, but as yet there have been no sightings. This thing is harder to find than Waldo.

If the administration's policy of pronouncement and pause, of describe and delay, keeps up, expect to see the President's health care speech on milk cartons with the caption: "Have you seen this plan?"

#### LOBBY DISCLOSURE/GIFT BAN

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, what are we trying to accomplish with the legislation we are proposing to expand lobby disclosure requirements and to ban gifts? We are not saying that Members of Congress have sold their votes for a good dinner or a free round of golf. I do not know anyone here who would ever do that. We are not saying Members of Congress are routinely showered with gifts and lavishly entertained by lobbyists. We all know that life here is usually more gritty than glittering, and there are few among us who have not ourselves given away unwanted gifts. What we are saying is that we must dispel the impression people have that Congress is up for sale. We must let them know the truth.

As long as the business of lobbying is carried on behind a curtain, the public will suspect us of selling their right to honest and open Government for a mess of pottage from Ridgewell's. As long as the sealed gift packages enter our doors, our constituents will suspect us of selling out their interests—even if we know those boxes only contain a bag of peaches and a box of cookies. Let us invite the public in. Without these new rules and new limits, the public will continue to have legitimate reasons to suspect that we have something to hide. We have to let them know that we do not.

Let us pass this legislation requiring disclosure by lobbyists and banning gifts.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD FORM A VETERANS CAUCUS

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very fitting that an Army general should be sitting in the Speaker's chair, because I come with glorious news, partially glorious news.

In about a half a century of news-magazines, never have all three major magazines had the same cover. This is

the handsome but tortured face of CWO Michael Durant, who was released today in Somalia. Our one and only missing or captured American is now back in the loving arms of his comrades. The last body of the 18 Americans murdered in Somalia on October 3 arrived at the mortuary at Dover Air Force Base last night.

Mr. Speaker, I just got off the phone. I am not allowed to release his name, they are still confirming his identity, but it is a given. I have his name right in front of me here, because there is only one man missing. This is the man whose mother, and her name is, amazingly, Mary, identified the tortured body of her son 9 days ago, live, in color, on American television. It reminds me as a Christian of the fourth station of the cross, Jesus meets his mother, Mary.

Now we come, Mr. Speaker, to what it says in the copy of these news magazines: "Trapped in Somalia: What in the World Are We Doing?; An Anatomy of a Disaster in Somalia; Somalia, What Went Wrong?"

Mr. Speaker, I have never said this, but I believe the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] and I and all the other veterans of this House and the other Chamber, the veterans only, should have a caucus and advise Clinton what to do in Somalia, Haiti, Abkhazia, Bosnia, and the 300 hot spots around this world where human beings are killing other human beings. What is our role? Let the veterans in both Chambers work it out.

#### ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND MUSEUMS AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 264 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 264

*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. 2351) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Museum Services Act. 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 Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time speci-

fied in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against the amendments printed in the report for failure to comply with clause 7 of rule XVI are waived. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary one-half hour of debate to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], 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.

□ 1050

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 264 is the rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2351, the Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1993, reauthorizing for 2 years the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. Under the recommended rule, the bill is considered as read and only the three amendments printed in the report to accompany the rule would be in order.

The amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the report; each amendment is debatable for 20 minutes, with the time equally divided between the proponent and an opponent. The amendments are not divisible and they are not subject to amendment.

In addition, all points of order against the amendments are waived for germaneness. Finally, Mr. Speaker, the rule provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is certainly not without controversy, and that is partly because the bill for which it structures debate deals with one of the more controversial, and contentious, subjects that the Congress considers: Federal funding for the arts and the perennial debate over the definition of art that attends it.

Mr. Speaker H.R. 2351 is a short-term authorization bill that contains no permanent changes in the law and the Committee on Education and Labor therefore requested that no amendments dealing with content restrictions or other substantive changes in the law be in order, and that the house be permitted to vote instead on a simple, 2-year extension of the authorizations for these agencies.

For that reason, the Committee on Rules recommended that only those amendments printed in the report be made in order. These amendments are alike in that they address only the issue of funding for the three independent agencies reauthorized by H.R. 2351.

The first amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE], would abolish funding for the National Endowment for the Arts entirely. The second, to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], would reduce the authorization levels for the three agencies, the third, to be offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], would freeze the State grant to those States that substitute Federal money for State funding.

Mr. Speaker, in requesting this rule, the Education and Labor Committee argued that Congress made significant changes in the operations of these agencies in 1990 and that the results of these modifications should be reviewed before any further are considered.

In addition, the committee felt that the new administration and it recently appointed heads for these agencies should be allowed to review the operations of the agencies and assess their activities before any further statutory changes are made.

Indeed, the new agency heads, who have enjoyed wide bipartisan support, may find it necessary to ask Congress to make substitute changes in the enabling statutes, making a simple reauthorization plan for now more relevant than ever.

In fact, the Rules Committee received a letter from the NEA addressing the issues discussed during the hearing on H.R. 2351 and which states that the new administration plans a comprehensive review of the NEA's authorizing statute.

Mr. Speaker, the House has not been without the opportunity to act in a deliberative manner on this matter; in fact, most recently, in July of this year, the House debated two amendments dealing with NEA funding, accepting one for a 5 percent cut in spending and rejecting another that proposed to cut off funding entirely for the endowment. The Committee on Rules took all these matters into consideration in recommending this rule. I urge my colleagues to adopt House Resolution 264 so that we may proceed today with consideration of the simple reauthorization of these three agencies, leaving the debate over content restrictions—which is an entirely valid one of course until the new leadership at the agencies has had the opportunity to study the agencies and define

areas where improvements should be made.

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

Mr. Speaker, during testimony for the rule on H.R. 2351—the Arts, Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1993—we were asked by the chairman of the Education and Labor Subcommittee to delay discussion of certain “substantive policy issues” until this straight authorization expires 2 years from now. For that reason, today we have a modified closed rule that makes in order only three amendments—two of which focus narrowly on appropriate funding levels for the NEA, the NEH, and museums and one which makes a technical correction.

We will have a chance to debate whether any Federal funds should support the arts, humanities, and museums—and we will discuss a 40 percent cutting amendment.

But under this rule we won't have debate on the related issue that many Americans are most concerned about—how Federal money for the arts, humanities, and museums is being used. We won't have a chance to define what constitutes the type of quote art unquote that Federal dollars support and what the parameters are for obscenity. I think this is a missed opportunity. Several amendments were offered in committee on this subject, but under this rule these legitimate proposals designed to clarify our policies will not be heard.

I am particularly troubled that we will not speak to the issue of preventing this money from being channeled to illegal aliens. While some might view this as an obvious point, we recently saw a case in California where Federal arts dollars were in fact handed out to illegal aliens.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I expect today we will have a lively debate about the merits of Federal funding for arts, humanities, and museums. Although I believe there is merit to some reasonable level of Federal support for these programs, I have supported and will continue to support efforts to cut back funding levels for the arts. I certainly recognize the enormous budget crisis we face—and I know that all programs will have to be scaled back.

I have also supported efforts to tighten up the rules on how this money is spent, and to penalize the NEA for instances of poor judgment—repeated poor judgment. So I will support the Dornan amendment, cutting 40 percent from this bill—as a fiscally prudent measure. I hope this sends a message. I must note, though, that I am somewhat troubled by his argument about

penalizing other agencies for past lapses in judgment—since his 40 percent cut is not only targeted at the NEA, but at the NEH and museums as well—neither of which has, to my knowledge, awarded Federal funds to obscene or immoral projects.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is better than it might have been but worse than it should have been. I think the public good would have been well served by an open rule and broad debate on this subject—and today's modified closed rule precludes that result.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question so that we may bring this bill back under an open rule. Then we can debate these vital content issues.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD rollcall votes in the Rules Committee on proposed amendments to the rule on H.R. 2351, as well as information on open versus restrictive rules in the 103d Congress.

The information referred to follows:  
ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE RULE ON H.R. 2351, THE ARTS, HUMANITIES, AND MUSEUMS AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1993

1. Open rule—This amendment in the nature of a substitute provides for an open rule with one hour of general debate.

Vote (Defeated 3-5): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

2. Hunter (CA)—Prohibits awarding of funds from the NEA and the NEH under the following circumstances: projects of a patently offensive nature as defined by the Supreme Court's Miller test; projects which degrade women, minorities, or children; and programs which give funds to illegal aliens.

Vote: (Defeated 3-5): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

3. Rohrabacher (CA)—Prohibits NEA and NEH grant funding from going to any program that benefits illegal aliens.

Vote (Defeated 3-5): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

4. Bachus (AL)—Prohibits awarding of funds from the NEA for projects which promote, disseminate, or produce materials that depict, or describe in a patently offensive way, sexual or excretory activities or organs, or religion or religious symbols.

Vote (Defeated 3-5): Yeas—Solomon, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Hall, Slaughter. Not Voting: Frost, Bonior, Wheat, Gordon, Quillen.

Note: The individual amendments would be printed in the Rules Committee report, would not be subject to amendment, would be debateable for 20-minutes each, and appropriate points of order would be waived.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d Cong.

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 246-176. A: 259-164. (Feb. 3, 1993)
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D-1; R-18)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: 248-171. A: 249-170. (Feb. 4, 1993)

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d Cong.—Continued

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 243-172. A: 237-178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 248-166. A: 249-163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: 247-170. A: 248-170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	A: 240-185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (1-D not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	PQ: 250-172. A: 251-172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D-8; R-12)	9 (D-4; R-5)	PQ: 252-164. A: 247-169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D-1; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 244-168. A: 242-170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149, Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Rescission Act of 1993	8 (D-1; R-7)	3 (D-1; R-2)	A: 212-208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308-0 (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173, May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D-1; R-5)	6 (D-1; R-5)	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251-174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D-19; R-32)	8 (D-7; R-1)	PQ: 252-178. A: 236-194 (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D-6; R-44)	6 (D-3; R-3)	PQ: 240-177. A: 226-185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D-4; R-3)	2 (D-1; R-1)	A: 244-176. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D-20; R-33)	27 (D-12; R-15)	A: 294-129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D-11; R-22)	5 (D-1; R-4)	A: 263-160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401-0 (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261-164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 218, July 20, 1993	O	H.R. 2530: BLM authorization, fiscal year 1994-95	NA	NA	
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D-8; R-6)	2 (D-2; R-0)	PQ: 245-178. F: 205-216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D-8; R-7)	2 (D-2; R-0)	A: 224-205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D-109; R-40)		A: 246-172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237-169. A: 234-169. (Sept. 13, 1993).
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			A: 241-182. (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D-3; R-9)	1 (D-1; R-0)	A: 213-191-1. (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A: 238-188. (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D-0; R-7)	3 (D-0; R-3)	
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D-1; R-2)	2 (D-1; R-1)	
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D-7; R-7; I-1)	10 (D-7; R-3)	A: Voice Vote. (Oct. 13, 1993).

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ: Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH-103D CONG.

Congress (years)	Total rules granted <sup>1</sup>	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Per-cent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Per-cent <sup>3</sup>
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	38	10	26	28	74

<sup>1</sup>Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

<sup>2</sup>Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

<sup>3</sup>Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Oct. 13, 1993.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

This legislation is a simple, short, only 2-year extension of the authorizations for the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Institute for Museum Services, and the National Endowment for the Arts.

Our subcommittee, and the full committee, in concurrence with the administration, made no policy changes in these three agencies. We want to see how our legislative changes of 2 years ago are working. And in the interests

of giving the agencies appropriate time to work through the very significant changes we made, including the changes that now disallow the NEA to fund obscenities, we thought a 4-year track record would give the Congress a good opportunity to then come back, beginning immediately after we pass, and hopefully this legislation is signed into law, to come back and review how the agency is working in anticipation of a longer reauthorization in the next Congress.

□ 1100

I want to make it clear that the administration supports and has recommended this 2-year extension.

The gentleman from California has explained to the membership that there will be some amendments offered by our colleagues to this legislation.

Normally, a 2-year extension of existing law would simply be considered under suspension, but none of us are unmindful of the fact that even though we enacted very significant reforms for the National Endowment for the Arts a couple years ago, that agency remains the subject of controversy. Much of the controversy is based on works that the NEA has not funded; but nonetheless, the agency is still the subject of controversy.

So I thought we ought to bring the bill, not under an extension, but to the floor and allow our colleagues to work their way, including an amendment to just end the agency, so we are allowing that.

I think we are correct not to allow substantive policy changes in either of the Endowments or the Institute of Museum Services until they have an appropriate time to deal with the

changes which we placed on them just a few years ago.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. If this rule is adopted, the American people will be denied the opportunity to hear the debate on how the National Endowment for the Arts spends their tax dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the sponsorship of some of the projects now being funded by the National Endowment for the Arts is totally opposed to the will of the people.

We are talking here about sponsorship, about Federal support for projects that you and I and other Members of this body would not hang in our homes. In fact, the House rules would deny them being exhibited here, yet the taxpayers of this country are being called upon for 2 more years to fund these types of projects.

Now, the gentleman from Montana wrote a letter to the Membership and he said in that letter, mailed yesterday:

I realize that this is a controversial issue. Members have differing opinions on it; however, as we debate the issue, let us keep the debate based on facts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the problem is that the gentleman from Montana has taken the position that we will not debate this issue. We will not debate my amendment.

Mr. Speaker, my amendment is a simple amendment. It simply says this, that the National Endowment for the Arts will not fund, with the American people's money, projects or programs

that depict or describe in a patently offensive way sexual or excretory activities or organs; or depict or describe in a patently offensive way religion or religious symbols.

We know what we are discussing here. We are discussing obscenity. We are discussing pornography. We are discussing sacrilegious works that the American people have continued for 10, 15 years to pay for.

The gentleman from Montana in his letter to our colleagues wrote, and said again on this floor, that we are not funding these projects; but in fact, Mr. Speaker, we are funding these projects. We have funded them since 1990.

I would like the opportunity under an open rule to discuss these projects. I will mention only two today as time permits, one now and one a little later.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Montana, wrote the Membership about the NEA and said that the NEA did not grant money for a film which was to portray two 12-year old young girls engaged in lesbian activity.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, before me now I have that grant. I have in my hand the grant application approved by the National Endowment for the Arts which the gentleman from Montana says does not exist.

In fact, we did approve that project, and the taxpayers of the United States paid \$27,700 to fund this film.

Let me read from the grant application that was approved by the National Endowment for the Arts:

This work will be created for up to 5 performers, with 2 girls black and white about 12 years old as the main characters.

And these young ladies were engaged in sexual conduct with each other.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to debate whether or not that happened and whether we ought to fund this.

I would like to offer an amendment which would stop that funding.

The gentleman from Montana says that we did not fund Mr. Witkin, but in fact, Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the April edition of *Vanity Fair* which in fact describes page after page of art objects produced by Mr. Witkin.

A medical professor in his home State of New Mexico described his art work as worse than Jeffrey Dahmer.

It is almost unspeakable that the American people have no right to put an end to this foolishness and this nonsense. If this rule is affirmed, if you vote "yes" on this rule, if you vote "yes" on the previous question, they will not get the opportunity to do what *Vanity Fair* says we have funded Mr. Witkin, who they say is kinkier than Robert Mapplethorpe at his kinkiest.

In fact, he went to France to do some of this art work because it involved desecrating the bodies of the deceased, and that is illegal in the United States; so he went to France to produce some of his works.

It says in the *Vanity Fair* article that we have funded these projects, and

the former Chairman of NEA has written an apology to Senators for the funding of these projects.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need to fund these projects. We need a vote in this House to end this foolishness. Over 90 percent of the American people say, "Don't fund this obscenity. Don't fund this sacrilegious art."

This is a matter of respect and sensitivity to their opinions.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly outrageous that Members, like the gentleman from Alabama, would come to the floor and claim things that are not so.

Let me just say this as clearly as I can. The National Endowment for the Arts did not fund what the gentleman claims they did. No tax money was used to fund those things.

Now, anybody can rise up on this floor because of our rules and make claims that are outrageously incorrect and inaccurate, as the gentleman from Alabama is doing; but he is wrong—w-r-o-n-g. He is wrong.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS] to respond.

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I wrote a letter to our colleagues in which I outlined five projects that the National Endowment for the Arts had funded. One of the people we funded and in the April 1993 edition of *Vanity Fair*, it points out, in fact the former Chairman of the NEA has admitted that we did fund Joel Peter Witkin. They report that he has received, and I am going to quote from *Vanity Fair*:

Witkin was recently awarded his fourth National Endowment for the Arts grant.

□ 1110

The former Chairman wrote a letter just last month; I have that letter in my hand, August 3, 1993, to a U.S. Senator in which she says:

I have just received information that one of the photographic fellowship applications I approved last September was awarded to an individual whose work appears to use shock quality.

She goes on and quotes from the April 1993 issue.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have read the actual grant request which was approved by the National Endowment for the Arts.

And I will say this about the other two projects which he said did not exist:

The Whitney Museum received a \$65,000 direct grant from the NEA for the independent students program which put on the exhibit which included some very famous works including "Bullwhip" by Mapplethorpe; many

Americans know about that, and Serrano's "Piss Christ."

Also the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] says we did not fund the 1990 Pittsburgh gay and lesbian film festival, but in fact the former Chairman of the NEA now says we did.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the other side has no additional speakers at this time, so I yield 4 minutes at this point to the distinguished and unique gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and let us see if I can be unique.

To my dear colleagues on the other side I ask: Do you understand why we have to start cutting money? Why we have to make this a purely fiscal issue?

Now I do not know about my colleagues on the other side, but I like the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I sure like my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS]. However, I am embarrassed when I hear one gentleman accuse the other of not being factually correct, especially when I happen to know that the gentleman on my side is factually correct. The problem is that money is fungible. These so-called elitist artists are getting money to do one thing, like buy electricity, pay the cleaning people, pay the carpenters to set up the exhibits. This allows the elitists to use other money to exhibit the scum. I know that my dear colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], is uncomfortable defending Serrano's "Christ" in urine. I refuse to use the artistic title for that. I know he does not like to defend this scatological, blasphemous, and pornographic garbage, but PATRICK knows, as we speak, we are funding three pornographic homoerotic art festivals.

Mr. Speaker, this is why there should be an open rule, so the American people could determine whether BACHUS speaks the truth or WILLIAMS speaks the truth.

So, I say to my other dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN], TONY, you grew up like me in New York, and you represented Beverly Hills for much of your career. He and I both come from areas where most of the money is generously given by patrons of the arts and where most of NEA money goes today. I will state the figure four times today; \$9.32 billion, Mr. Speaker, is generously given by private citizens to the arts and humanities in this country. If private citizens want, under the first amendment, to fund garbage, and 99.999 percent do not, then let them do it. But the Government shouldn't be involved in that.

Recently, I was in the home of our Ambassador to France, the lovely Ambassador Pamela Harriman. I stood awestruck before a Van Gogh in a drawing room of the U.S. Ambassador's taxpayer-owned home, and I looked at

a picture simply called *Roses*. Remember Van Gogh never sold a painting while he was alive. His brother, Theo, was sending money down from Holland while Vincent cuts off his ear and then blew his brains out. But what an artist. What an artist out of all that pain.

I am looking at *Roses* in Ambassador Harriman's home. If she needed some pin money and put it on the market, here is about what she could get:

This year Van Gogh's *Wheat Fields* sold for \$57 million. In 1990 Van Gogh's portrait of Dr. Gauchet sold for \$82.5 million. In that same year Renoir's *Au Moulin de la Gallette* sold for \$78.1 million. Put all of that together and you get about \$47 million more than what we are arguing about here.

To take away from the people in what Manhattan and Beverly Hills call *Fly Over America*, and I say to my colleagues, You know when you fly from Newark, or JFK, or LaGuardia to LAX, you fly over the rest of this country, you fly over Alabama, and, yes, you fly over Montana sometimes, PATRICK. To take money away from these Americans that the elites only fly over and spend it on disgusting art, is an insult to taxpayers.

Let us get real. Let us cut 40 percent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have 30 seconds to make my monetary case. I say to my colleague, Here's what's going to happen, TONY.

Instead of passing out ten-dollar bills signed by three creepy artistes on the border of Mexico, they will pass out a five and a one. That is what my 40-percent cut does. Instead of getting a \$50,000 grant to run a porno homoerotic film festival, they will only get \$30,000. That is the 60 percent that I am leaving in there if my 40-percent cut passes.

Let us cut 40 percent.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, we cannot compete with the kind of testimony that the gentlemen on the other side have presented, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSEN]. We are clearly well endowed with an overabundance of California participation today for which we are most grateful.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule which is part of the ongoing attempt by the Democrat leadership to thwart the efforts on the part of the Republican minority, our efforts to prevent Federal funds from going to illegal

aliens. I had an amendment that would have prevented any funds from this piece of legislation from being used for illegal aliens. That was not permitted by this rule. This then becomes a vote on whether or not efforts like my own to prevent taxpayers' dollars from going to illegal aliens should be permitted on the floor.

Illegal aliens are siphoning off billions of the taxpayers' dollars. They pay very little into the system, but they take these precious billions from a myriad of programs. I would like to see those who are here illegally cut off from these Federal dollars in one single act, but that is not how the House leadership wants it to be. So, we have to decide whether illegal aliens get Federal funds on a program-by-program basis. Therefore, the vote on this rule will be a major test of Congress' commitment to the Federal taxpayer.

My amendment, which this rule does not allow me to offer, states that none of the funds authorized for NEA or NEH may be used to provide funds to illegal aliens.

It is current NEA policy that direct grants be made only to U.S. citizens or resident aliens. However, there is no similar prohibition on how grantees can spend the grants they get from NEA. Thus NEA funds have found their way into the hands of foreign nationals, including those who have entered our country illegally.

The most famous example of this involves an NEA funded program in San Diego, CA, in which the artist handed out crisp \$10 bills to those illegally crossing the United States-Mexico border. After the fact, the NEA tried to recover some money on the grounds that \$10 bills did not qualify as materials under the terms of the grant, a rather dubious contention, given that materials funded under NEA grants have come to include virtually any object or substance known to man.

The NEA did not cite a prohibition against giving money to illegal aliens, because there is no restriction on grantees handing out grant money to whoever they want. In fact, the whole point of the NEA-approved project, called "The Border Project: Two Cities/Dos Ciudades" was to fund projects and artists on both sides of the border, specifically including Mexican nationals.

At a time when illegal aliens are flocking to the United States to take advantage of a wealth of Federal benefits, the symbolism of this so-called art of handing out taxpayer money to illegal aliens sends the wrong message. So, one provision of my amendment requires grantees of NEA or NEH grants to certify that none of the funds received from these endowments will be given to illegal aliens.

We, the Congress, have the ultimate responsibility of insuring that the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars do not go to support those who are in our coun-

try illegally. I urge a "no" vote on the rule in order that I may offer my amendment to this bill.

□ 1120

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues as well as my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], that the National Endowment for the Arts regulations prohibit them from providing money to illegal aliens. Their own regulations say that the awards and grants can be given only to citizens who are permanent residents.

Now, it is true that the Museum for Contemporary Art in San Diego received an NEA grant, and it is true that one of their subgrantees in effect was involved in a project that handed \$10 bills to people as the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] described.

However, that is outside of NEA regulations, so NEA disallowed the cost of that, which was approximately \$4,500, from being charged to them. They have not paid it, because it is against their regulations to do so.

So the reason the gentleman was not permitted by the Committee on Rules to offer his amendment was twofold: First, we did not want to make policy and substantive changes; and, second, the NEA does not and cannot by their own regulations do what the gentleman would prohibit them from doing in the law.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, I am a little bit fed up with all this bashing of the arts. I want my colleagues on that side of the aisle to know that there are colleagues on this side of the aisle who are just as sensitive to the value of the arts in America as you are.

Mr. Speaker, the arts are not some luxury of the privileged few. Let me read from an editorial in this morning's *New York Times*. It is entitled "Art Is No Luxury." This is just one excerpt.

In 1992, the arts and other cultural activities in the metropolitan region generated almost \$3.5 billion in wages and salaries and royalties, a 10 percent increase over the last decade. They were responsible for 107,000 jobs, ranging from starring on stage, to making ballet slippers, to catering for movie crews. And their total economic impact, counting expenditures by art institutions, their suppliers, wage earners, and visitors, generated \$9.8 billion, sorely needed bucks, in the metropolitan area. Nearly 25 percent of that money came from tourists who said they had come to New York or lengthened their stays there to go to museums, and galleries, and theaters, and concerts.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just in New York, which is my home State, where

the arts have a positive impact. It is in Chicago, and in Los Angeles, and in Atlanta, and in all the urban centers across the country. And it is not just in the big cities, it is small town U.S.A. where families and kids are exposed to the theater and fine music and art of all kinds.

Are there abuses in the NEA, of course there are, and we should eliminate the abuses. But, for goodness sake, do not try to kill the agency that brings so much to the enrichment of life in America. If you want to vote to kill the NEA, do so. And I suggest that we have that vote, and we will, later on today. But I will tell you, those who vote to kill the NEA, I am going to take their names and I am going to send them all a sympathy card, because they have missed something special in life if they have not been touched by the arts in America.

Mr. Speaker, culture is good for an advanced society. It is good for America. Let us be responsible in the discharge of our duties. Let us not just pander to some of the interests that are shortsighted and refuse to deal with facts. The arts are good for America, and we ought to proudly support them in this Congress, which is the representative body for the American people.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BACHUS].

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there has been mention of Chairman Jane Alexander and her appointment to the National Endowment for the Arts, and I applaud her appointment. I know her as a fine actress.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of this body that we are a nation of laws and not people, and NEA Chairmen have come before us for some 10 years and assured us that these practices would not continue.

We did try in 1990 to tighten the law, but we were unsuccessful, and those projects continued.

So I would simply urge my colleagues, let us make a substantive change. Let us pass this amendment, and let us stop these abuses.

If you love the arts, you should be for this amendment. David Gergen, in an editorial some 2 years ago, said the taxpayers have a right, if they are going to fund this, to demand standards. That is what my amendment is about. It is sponsorship, not censorship.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], suggested that the problem has been taken care of in the National Endowment for the Arts, and that is why my amendment to prevent illegal aliens

from receiving any of the dollars that come through the National Endowment for the Arts is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, if it was not necessary, there would not be the opposition to having this amendment on the floor. The American people are too smart to take that kind of an answer. It is not necessary, why oppose the amendment? Let us just have it on the record that we oppose illegal aliens getting any of these dollars.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the reason why my amendment was not permitted. My amendment was not permitted because of politics on this side of the floor. You will find this in issue after issue after issue, that the Democratic Party is unwilling to say that taxpayer dollars should not be going to illegal aliens.

□ 1130

And there will always be some excuse for not permitting us even to vote on the issue. Members will find this in the very next debate, I think, we have on this floor.

It is a very similar issue. The American people better pay attention on who is siding with them and who is siding with the best use of their tax dollars.

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

We have heard a lot of testimony today that we want to take 2 years just to see how things are working. That sort of reminds me of the catastrophic health legislation that we passed. It did not take 2 years to figure out we had a bad piece of legislation that was not doing the job adequately, and this body responded very well, as did the other, by getting rid of that program.

I suspect that we have seen enough problem areas that we ought to be making the fixes now in the NEA management side of things to prevent some of these problem areas from coming forward. I believe we can do that. I do not think that anybody is really talking too much about substantive policy changes on the NEA in this area. I think it is talking about better controls so that we get better use of the taxpayers' dollars. As it turns out, today we can only talk about just sending money. The only debate really today, under the allowable amendments, is how much money are we going to send. It is not going to be what are the regulations for the use of that money.

That is what the American people are asking us to do. I, frankly, think that by a debate on those points that the NEA would profit, both literally and figuratively. I think America would be assured that we are doing our jobs on their behalf, that we are not waiting on bureaucrats to decide in 2 years how they like the program, that we are responding to what they are saying today.

I think, if anything, we have proven in the last 40 minutes or so that there really is controversy and good debate to be had on these subjects, if only the Committee on Rules would have made it in order.

I guess it comes down to this: On the previous question, if Members support the previous question, then they believe we have no business debating what types of projects we fund with Federal tax dollars.

If they join me in voting no on the previous question, they believe this body has a responsibility today to debate the proper use of taxpayers' funds.

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

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

First of all, I want to thank our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for his very thoughtful remarks regarding the support of the arts.

Second, to say to my very good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], that I do take some personal offense as well as institutional offense at the concluding remarks that he made.

The gentleman knows that there is no person on this floor, no person in this body who cares more about the general problems that he described than this gentleman from California who is speaking now. I believe he is trivializing a truly important issue about benefits to illegals.

The gentleman knows in this particular case our friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has pointed out that under current law, individuals must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States to receive grant money from the NEA, from the NEH, and from the INS.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] himself, in his Dear Colleague letter of a couple weeks ago, says, and I quote him, "It is current NEA policy that directs grants to be made only to U.S. citizens or resident aliens."

A few dollars not funded by the NEA found their way into the hands of illegals. That has been stopped. That was not paid for by American taxpayers.

I would say again to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER], he is trivializing a very important issue. He is correct that billions of dollars of benefits paid for by Americans taxpayers get into the hands of people who are here in this country illegally, but for him to speak out about a few thousand dollars which were not paid for by Federal funds against and contrary to the law and to regulations of the Endowment itself, I think, as I said, unnecessarily trivializes the whole issue and makes it much more difficult to deal with the serious problems than, in fact, he mentioned.

Finally, let me say that it is always interesting and good to listen to our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. I am particularly glad that we made his amendment in order so that we will be able to listen to him again on a little bit later today, debating his amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993.

H.R. 2351 would provide a simple 2-year extension for three agencies, the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, and Institute for Museum Services. The Committee on Education and Labor decided not to reauthorize these agencies for the customary 5 years because none of the three had sitting Chairs. It would be inappropriate to undertake a full review of these agencies without the recommendations of the new administration.

The rule provides for consideration of three amendments. One would abolish the NEA. Another would reduce authorized spending for the NEA, NEH, and IMS. The third would freeze grants to States that reduce their arts funding in expectation of receipt of Federal funds.

I applaud the Rules Committee for its judgment. It is perfectly proper for the House to consider them, regardless of whether we approve or reject them.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it would be appropriate for the House to consider other amendments that would change the structure of the NEA. The Committee on Education and Labor decided not to adopt any changes in these agencies, including changes advocated by their supporters. Until the new Chairs have a chance to evaluate their domains and report to the Congress, we should leave them be.

I again thank the Rules Committee and urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to rule XV, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes a recorded vote, if ordered, on the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 240, nays 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—240

Abercrombie	Gutierrez	Parker
Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Andrews (ME)	Hamburg	Payne (NJ)
Andrews (NJ)	Harman	Payne (VA)
Andrews (TX)	Hastings	Pelosi
Applegate	Hayes	Penny
Bacchus (FL)	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Baessler	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Barca	Hinchey	Pickett
Barcia	Hoagland	Pickle
Barlow	Hochbrueckner	Pomeroy
Barrett (WI)	Holden	Poshard
Becerra	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Bellenson	Hughes	Rahall
Berman	Inslee	Rangel
Bilbray	Jefferson	Reed
Bishop	Johnson (GA)	Reynolds
Blackwell	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Bonior	Johnson, E.B.	Roemer
Borski	Johnston	Rose
Boucher	Kanjorski	Rostenkowski
Brewster	Kaptur	Rowland
Brooks	Kennedy	Royal-Allard
Brown (CA)	Kennelly	Rush
Brown (FL)	Kildee	Sabo
Brown (OH)	Klecza	Sanders
Bryant	Klein	Sangmeister
Byrne	Klink	Sarpalius
Cantwell	Kopetski	Sawyer
Cardin	Kreidler	Schenk
Carr	LaFalce	Schroeder
Chapman	Lambert	Schumer
Clay	Lancaster	Scott
Clayton	Lantos	Serrano
Clement	LaRocco	Sharp
Clyburn	Laughlin	Shepherd
Coleman	Lehman	Sisisky
Collins (IL)	Levin	Skaggs
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Condit	Lipinski	Slatery
Conyers	Lloyd	Slaughter
Coppersmith	Long	Smith (IA)
Costello	Lowey	Spratt
Coyne	Maloney	Stark
Danner	Mann	Stokes
Darden	Manton	Strickland
de la Garza	Margolies-	Studds
Deal	Mezvinsky	Stupak
DeFazio	Markey	Swett
DeLauro	Martinez	Swift
Dellums	Matsui	Synar
Derrick	Mazzoli	Tanner
Deutsch	McCloskey	Tauzin
Dicks	McCurdy	Tejeda
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson
Dixon	McHale	Thornton
Dooley	McKinney	Thurman
Durbin	McNulty	Torres
Edwards (CA)	Meehan	Torricelli
Edwards (TX)	Meek	Towns
English (AZ)	Menendez	Traficant
Eshoo	Mfume	Tucker
Evans	Miller (CA)	Unsoeld
Farr	Mineta	Valentine
Fazio	Minge	Velazquez
Fields (LA)	Mink	Vento
Filner	Moakley	Vislosky
Fingerhut	Mollohan	Voikmer
Flake	Montgomery	Waters
Foglietta	Moran	Watt
Ford (MI)	Morella	Waxman
Ford (TN)	Nadler	Wheat
Frank (MA)	Natcher	Whitten
Frost	Neal (MA)	Williams
Furse	Oberstar	Wise
Gejdenson	Obey	Woolsey
Geren	Olver	Wyden
Gibbons	Ortiz	Wynn
Glickman	Orton	Yates
Gonzalez	Owens	
Gordon	Pallone	

NAYS—185

Allard	Barton	Boehner
Archer	Bateman	Bonilla
Armey	Bentley	Browder
Bacchus (AL)	Bereuter	Bunning
Baker (CA)	Beverly	Burton
Baker (LA)	Bilirakis	Buyer
Ballenger	Billey	Callahan
Barrett (NE)	Blute	Calvert
Bartlett	Boehlert	Camp

Canady	Horn	Portman
Castle	Houghton	Pryce (OH)
Clinger	Huffington	Quillen
Coble	Hunter	Quinn
Collins (GA)	Hutchinson	Ramstad
Combest	Hutto	Ravenel
Cooper	Hyde	Regula
Cox	Inglis	Ridge
Cramer	Inhofe	Roberts
Crane	Istook	Rogers
Crapo	Jacobs	Rohrabacher
Cunningham	Johnson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
DeLay	Johnson, Sam	Roth
Diaz-Balart	Kasich	Roukema
Dickey	Kim	Royce
Doolittle	King	Santorum
Dornan	Kingston	Saxton
Dreier	Klug	Schaefer
Duncan	Knollenberg	Schiff
Dunn	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Kyl	Shaw
English (OK)	Lazio	Shays
Everett	Leach	Shuster
Ewing	Levy	Skeen
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Smith (MI)
Fields (TX)	Lewis (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Fish	Lightfoot	Smith (OR)
Fowler	Linder	Smith (TX)
Franks (CT)	Livingston	Snowe
Franks (NJ)	Machtley	Solomon
Gallely	Manzulio	Spence
Gallo	McCandless	Stearns
Gekas	McCollum	Stenholm
Gilchrest	McCrery	Stump
Gillmor	McHugh	Sundquist
Gilman	McInnis	Talent
Gingrich	McKeon	Taylor (MS)
Goodlatte	McMillan	Taylor (NC)
Goodling	Meyers	Thomas (CA)
Goss	Mica	Thomas (WY)
Grams	Michel	Torkildsen
Grandy	Miller (FL)	Upton
Greenwood	Molinaro	Vucanovich
Gunderson	Moorhead	Walker
Hall (TX)	Murphy	Walsh
Hamilton	Myers	Weldon
Hancock	Nussle	Wilson
Hastert	Oxley	Wolf
Hefley	Packard	Young (AK)
Herger	Paxon	Young (FL)
Hobson	Peterson	Zeliff
Hoekstra	Pombo	Zimmer
Hoke	Porter	

NOT VOTING—8

Engel	Hansen	Neal (NC)
Gephardt	McDade	Washington
Green	Murtha	

□ 1201

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. BEVILL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 195, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—225

Abercrombie	Baessler	Bilbray
Ackerman	Barca	Bishop
Andrews (ME)	Barlow	Blackwell
Andrews (NJ)	Barrett (WI)	Bonior
Andrews (TX)	Becerra	Borski
Applegate	Bellenson	Boucher
Bacchus (FL)	Berman	Brewster

Brooks  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant  
Byrne  
Cantwell  
Cardin  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coppersmith  
Costello  
Coyne  
Darden  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Dooley  
Durbin  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Engel  
English (AZ)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Fingerhut  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamburg  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hoagland  
Hochbrueckner  
Holden  
Hoyer

Hughes  
Inslee  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecicka  
Klein  
Klink  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
LaFalce  
Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Lehman  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowe  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Margolies-  
Mezvinsky  
Markey  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McCloskey  
McCurdy  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Morella  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Parker  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)

Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Roemer  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sangmeister  
Sawyer  
Schenk  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Sharp  
Shepherd  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Slatery  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stokes  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stupak  
Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Koibe  
Kyl  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Machtley

Manzullo  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
McMillan  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mollinari  
Moorhead  
Murphy  
Myers  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Paxon  
Penny  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Ravenel  
Regula  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Royce

Santorum  
Sarpallus  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Weldon  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—13

Carr  
Gephardt  
Green  
Hansen  
Hayes

Livingston  
McDade  
Murtha  
Neal (NC)  
Roybal-Allard

Serrano  
Washington  
Wilson

□ 1210

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Hansen against.

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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Pursuant to House Resolution 264 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. 2351.

□ 1211

## 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. 2351) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Museum Services Act with Mr. SERRANO 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 Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be recog-

nized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

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

Mr. Chairman, today we begin debate on H.R. 2351, a bill that reauthorizes the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Institute for Museum Services.

This is a simple 2-year extension of existing law. It makes no substantive changes in existing law. We merely authorize funding for these three agencies at the levels requested by the President in his fiscal year 1994 budget request.

Let me begin by quickly giving a little background on these three agencies. The National Endowment for the Arts is an independent Federal agency created in 1965 to encourage and support the arts in the United States.

The National Endowment for the Humanities is an independent Federal agency, also created in 1965 to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities.

The Institute of Museum Services is an independent Federal agency which was created in 1976. Its purpose is to increase and improve museum services.

H.R. 2351 maintains all of the NEA procedural changes that Congress last made when it reauthorized these agencies in 1990. Among those changes is this change which we made for the National Endowment for the Arts.

We placed in the law this language:

Obscenity is without artistic merit, is not protected speech and shall not be funded.

I sponsored that language as an amendment. It was successfully secured by this House, considered and kept by the Senate, and the National Endowment for the Arts has followed it as nearly as I can tell to the letter since we put it in the law.

We also changed authority for the Chair of the National Endowment for the Arts to recoup misused NEA funds.

We totally reformed the NEA application procedures, peer panel review procedures, and fund dispersment procedures.

So H.R. 2351 continues the major initiatives in the NEA, the NEH, and the IMS, the Institute for Museum Services.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this simple 2-year reauthorization to my colleagues and hope you will support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the administration's proposal for a simple extension of the authority of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities for 2 years.

## NOES—195

Allard  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus (AL)  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Browder  
Bunning  
Burton

Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combust  
Condit  
Cooper  
Cox  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Doollittle  
Dornan

Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emerson  
English (OK)  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Fish  
Fowler  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Grams

The agencies authorized under the umbrella of the Foundation—the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and the Institute for Museum Services—have contributed richly to the pleasure and education of millions of Americans through their many cultural programs and initiatives.

The rich contributions of the Institute of Museum Services are less high profile than those of the Endowment for the Arts or the Endowment for the Humanities but still important. This is coming from a mother who dragged her children, possibly against their will, to every museum and historical exhibit within reach.

Of course, the National Endowment for the Humanities has brought us such fine contributions as Ken Burn's series, "The Civil War."

But since it is the National Endowment for the Arts that has drawn most of the attention, and the fire, over the past few years, let me briefly address its contributions.

Since its formation almost 30 years ago, the NEA has provided the public side of a very valuable public-private partnership to foster the arts.

Since its formation, the number of community orchestras has grown from 22 to 422. The number of professional dance companies has risen from 37 to 300.

The NEA has provided the critical support which allowed production of such American classics as the original "Driving Miss Daisy," "The Great White Hope," and a "Chorus Line."

The NEA has brought us the television programs "Live from the Lincoln Center," "American Playhouse," and "POV: Point of View."

All told, over 11,000 artists have received fellowships from the endowment. They've won 43 Pulitzer Prizes, 47 MacArthur Awards, 28 National Book Club Awards.

It has been the NEA's role to leverage, not replace, the private funding that is so necessary to allow this type of growth to occur.

However, these contributions have been accompanied by some controversy. I suppose this is understandable and perhaps, inevitable, when a diverse democracy like ours decides to set aside public funding for cultural programs.

I, too, have had deep concerns regarding the NEA grantmaking procedures. But, I submit that many, if not most of the controversies we will hear outlined on this floor today occurred before we adopted the important reforms in 1990.

As a matter of fact, I endorsed and voted for the withdrawal of funding over the Mapleshorpe scandals.

We owe a debt of gratitude to our late colleague, Paul Henry of Michigan, for his energetic advocacy of the 1990 reforms. While they are not per-

fect, they have gone a long way toward eliminating many of the well-publicized, offensive art that brought scandals into sharp focus on NEA grantmaking.

My inclination has been to support the administration's proposal for straightforward reauthorization. It is a practical, short-term solution to the fact that the authority for these Agencies expired on September 30 of this year. Moreover, new leadership for both the National Endowment for the Arts—Jane Alexander—and the Endowment for the Humanities—Dr. Sheldon Hackney—have only recently been confirmed.

The key to effective functioning will be the competency of the new Chairs and the consensus building skills Ms. Jane Alexander and Dr. Sheldon Hackney bring to their respective offices.

I want you to know that I had the pleasure of meeting with Jane Alexander recently. I was particularly impressed with her attitude about her chairmanship:

I will be hands on and firm. People have to know there are rules to get NEA grants and I will let them know what those rules are.

That's important because one of the most important reforms we enacted in 1990 was to increase the authority and responsibility of the NEA Chair. By doing so, we have also greatly enhanced accountability.

We will have someone to answer the questions about suspect projects such as the Art Rebate Program which is defunct in California. And, someone to take genuine responsibility.

There are some additional important issues that we would be remiss in not more closely examining as we move through this process toward a more permanent authorization.

For example, I am concerned about the continued potential for conflict of interest on the NEA peer panels, and quite frankly this concern extends to the NEH which conducts a nearly identical peer review process.

While the 1990 amendments instituted new policies to try to prevent conflict of interest on the NEA panels, we need to study whether these new guidelines are in fact working and whether they should be applied to the NEH.

In our hearing earlier this year, we received testimony from Leonard Garment, who along with John Brademas, cochaired the Independent Commission convened in 1990 to look at the NEA's guidelines and grantmaking procedures. The work of this Commission, which was a bipartisan endeavor, was very important and deserves our continued attention.

The Committee on Education and Labor will thoroughly review the recommendations made by the Independent Commission that were not incorporated into the 1990 amendments. Special stress should be placed on the con-

flict-of-interest questions and the statutory authority of the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, we have all, whether we are conscious of it or not, benefited from the contributions of the agencies authorized under this act. I hope my colleagues will join me in extending the life of the NEA, the NEH, and the Institute for Museum Service for the next 2 years.

If I don't vote for this not even my mother, my husband, or my children will vote for me.

□ 1220

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] who, parenthetically, is the Chair of the prestigious Congressional Arts Caucus and has been very helpful to us with this legislation, not only this year, but through the years.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation to reauthorize the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services, which have had such a dramatic and positive impact on communities of every size and in every corner of this Nation. In fact, I can think of no other Federal agencies or programs which have so directly and successfully improved the quality of life for all of our citizens—simultaneously educating our children, contributing to the economic vitality of cities large and small, and teaching us more about ourselves and who we are as a nation.

With this arts support comes an added benefit. The arts are extraordinarily effective at boosting local economies, often transforming once desolate areas and generating increased tourism, retail sales, and local business spending. The impact in nearly every State is no small matter. In Florida and North Carolina, for example, the economic impact of the arts in 1988 was found to be greater than \$1 billion in each State. In the city of San Francisco alone, the economic value of the arts to the local economy was between \$1.2 and \$1.3 billion in 1987. In Tennessee, the impact of the nonprofit arts industry was found to be \$114 million annually, providing employment for 2,500 people. Similar results are found throughout the Nation.

Those who attempt to portray cuts in the budgets of these agencies as effective deficit reduction are simply off base. All the combined spending of the Federal Government on every single arts agency, program, and institution amounts to just one five-hundredth of 1 percent of the Federal budget. More is spent on the military bands—about \$10 million more—than the entire budget of the NEA, which is charged with supporting every art form and promoting access to the arts for every citizen.

Economically, these agencies pull their weight and more. Every dollar

the NEA spends generates more dollars. In fiscal year 1993, for example, NEA seed money generated an 11-to-1 impact in private dollars.

But the effect of these arts agencies goes beyond the economic. The arts teach our children in a way that is unmatched. I can think of no greater means of fostering confidence, self-expression, and discipline in a child than experience in the arts—experience which translates into ability in every other academic area. As more and more of our young people are exposed to violence and drugs or drop out of school because of what they see as their own helplessness, the arts are a resource we cannot afford to waste.

Frankly, we have heard enough from opponents of the NEA who misrepresent the true work of the NEA. Just a few NEA-supported projects include the following:

The UrbanArts' Youth Works/Art Works Program in Boston which targets economically disadvantaged teens with arts workshops which reinforce ability in reading, writing and math.

The Substance Abuse and Violence Prevention Program in Kansas which created the First Step Dance Company for children of recovering substance abusing mothers as well as a program which provides arts classes for latch key kids.

The Youth At Risk Program in Boise, ID, which informs social service agencies how the arts can be used with juvenile offenders.

Of course, we are all familiar with the NEA's support of all of our local museums and symphonies and of touring groups—such as the internationally renowned Garth Fagan Dance Co. from my district—considered to be one of our first ambassadors to the world.

Mr. Chairman, the Crane amendment to eliminate all funding for these agencies would obviously wipe out all of this support. The Dornan amendment to reduce funding for each of these agencies by 40 percent would simply gut these agencies on a false altar of deficit reduction. This amendment would cripple those priorities which Congress took a great deal of time to identify in the last reauthorization—support for underserved areas, increased funding to the States, and arts education. I urge defeat of both of these amendments.

For those who have been mistakenly led to believe that the legislation does not address obscenity, let me state clearly and emphatically that that is patently false. The statute which this bill extends for 2 years clearly states:

Obscenity is without artistic merit, is not protected speech, and shall not be funded. Projects, productions, workshops, and programs that are determined to be obscene are prohibited from receiving financial assistance under this act from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Furthermore, this language is reinforced by a tightening of panel proce-

dures, increased oversight by the National Council of the Arts, and stringent conflict of interest laws, all of which were enacted in the 1990 reauthorization and will be extended by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to offer my support for this legislation and am proud to speak of the accomplishments of these agencies. This reauthorization legislation will allow us to look to the future, to the ways of making the arts a greater national priority. I am particularly pleased that the President has made such excellent choices in Jane Alexander, Sheldon Hackney, and Diane Frankel to lead these agencies. Under their leadership and through support for this legislation, the arts will take their place as the important resource they are for communities, our economy and our Nation.

□ 1230

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, many people talk about the negative grants by the NEA and I hope that the NEA will continue to make those grants with consideration to what is considered the moral climate of our country.

On a positive note in a small town in North Carolina, my hometown, NEA grants have been effective. Our county art museum, built with local money, has been helped twice in the last 8 years. Also our school system in trying to further the teaching of art was aided through the North Carolina Arts Council partly funded by NEA. We now are teaching art both in school and after school through our community schools system.

These grants have been very positive in the growth of quality of life in our community, thus helping in the economic growth there in attracting new industry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the bill. It should be obvious, as President Clinton has said, that the arts are an essential element of our American way of life, and that they contribute greatly to our well-being as a people—and to our economy. As such, the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Arts should be almost automatic.

It is common knowledge that the arts pump billions of dollars into our economy, that the arts are a revenue generator. According to the Port Authority of New York & New Jersey Alliance for the Arts, the total impact of the arts on the New York-New Jersey region in 1992 was \$9.8 billion, supporting 107,000 jobs and attracting over 3.5 million tourists who said their primary

reason for making or extending their trip was the arts. There is not a State in this Nation that has not benefited in tangible ways from the economic contribution of our arts industry.

We know by now that when we talk about teaching discipline, analytical and critical thinking, and problem solving, that the arts must be part of that conversation.

We know by now that when we talk about quality of life, the arts must be part of that conversation.

We know by now that when we talk about bridging the chasm that divides us by class or income or race, the arts must be part of that conversation.

We know by now that when we talk about competing on a global scale, the arts must be part of that conversation.

Today I address an even more important reason why support for the arts is crucial. The arts embody the ideals and values of this great Nation—the values of life, liberty, and freedom of expression. The arts are a key medium through which we express these ideals as a nation.

We have heard much about obscenity. I say that it is ridiculous that an intolerant few may set our agenda. We are in danger of allowing our precious cultural heritage to come under attack, to become marginalized. We are discouraging controversy when, instead, we should be encouraging the free exchange and communication of ideas. It is impossible to encourage creativity and new ideas without engendering some measure of controversy.

Most Members of Congress are not artists, and some do not understand a great deal about the artistic process. Well, I am not a surgeon, nor am I an artist. But I do know that what a surgeon does is important. And you don't have to be an artist to know that what an artist does is important.

Some Members ask, Why fund something we may not like or that offends our sensibilities? They fail to understand that worthwhile art is rarely popular with everyone. And innovation in art is never popular with everyone. What is, at first, considered outrageous routinely becomes mainstream—from Van Gogh to Elvis. Even Michelangelo's masterpieces could be considered obscene under the standards which some of the Members of this House would like to impose.

As a people, we do not always achieve our ideals, but they must always be our compass. The arts are an expression of a basic longing of the human soul.

Some Members contend some art—even some art funded in part by the NEA—is obscene. But standards of obscenity change; one person's obscenity is another's pioneering, breathtaking art. We must not strangle artistic freedom. Dance, music, theater, design and architecture, film and video, poetry, fiction, the graphic and visual arts—all of these are expressions of our basic

longing—and of our civilization and our Nation.

Let us ask ourselves, who are we as a nation? What will we leave behind for future generations? It is irrelevant whether we like certain art or not, even whether it offends our sensibilities. The question is whether we as a nation stand for freedom.

I say we must remember the inspiring words of President John F. Kennedy, when he envisioned an America that would command respect throughout the world, but only for its military and economic strength, but for its civilization.

President Kennedy said he was certain that after the dust of centuries has passed over our cities, we too will be remembered not for the victories or defeats in battles or in politics, but for our contribution to the human spirit.

When we impose restrictions on what today offends our sensibilities, we limit that contribution in ways we cannot fathom now, but which may be painfully evident tomorrow. We should be looking for ways to encourage the freest expression of the arts. Only then will it be most likely that some of what is created will prove to be of lasting value. And when future generations look back, let them say that we had the vision—grounded in good common sense and enlightened self-interest—to value the artists in our midst and to give them the freedom to practice their art.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be sharing this platform with the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. Chairman, I also endorse and support the National Endowment for the Arts. We talk here about morals, standards, ethics, and quality of life, things that keep us from being pulled down to the lowest possible common denominator, things that are all around us. So it seems to me that in terms of governmental involvement, we must walk as governmental officials along side by side with our other selves, individual citizens. It does not seem to me possible for us to be involved in things such as vocational education and at the same time not be involved in other forms of education, such as art.

Clearly, what the National Endowment is about is not supporting fly-by-night outfits. They are involved in support of basic, established institutions.

□ 1240

Let me give an example. The country that has probably approached this best of all is France. It has art enterprises

as a major part of its educational program for one simple purpose—to recognize and uplift people of all backgrounds and make them appreciate the quality and the dignity and the unusual characteristics of that great country.

Now, why am I personally involved in this debate? I come from a rural community. We here in Washington can go to the Kennedy Center, or the Folger, or to the Arena Stage. And in New York City, which is the major city in the State that I come from, we can visit the Metropolitan, or the Frick, or the Museum of Modern Art.

But where I live, this is not possible. Let me tell my colleagues a story. When I was growing up, the only art exposure I had was listening, literally, to Walter Damrosch on NBC radio in one of the classrooms in the public school which I was attending. Not so with my children. They know art, they appreciate a wide variety of cultural activities. Same school, same location. I never had that opportunity.

For example, in the area in which I live, two towns, Painted Post, and Elmira, had the London Ballet perform. In Chautauque—other events came to that great institution, such as an opera-musical theater program. In Newfield, a tiny little town outside of Ithaca, a folk arts program appeared. The Syracuse Symphony performed in towns my colleagues never heard of—Trumansburg, Auburn, and Moravia. The Acting Company of New York, an extraordinary outfit, has visited Olean.

Now these represent an enriching part of the life of younger children. They are important, but it seems to me that we are diverted many times by the porno issue, the Whitney, the Mapplethorpe, a variety of horror stories.

No one in this Chamber supports pornography in any form, clearly. This is a bogus issue.

Let me just quote for my colleagues something, as the demagogues come up here and talk about one terrible issue after another vis a vis art education and government involvement. France's Cardinal Richelieu, many years ago said, "give me six lines written by the most honorable of men and I will find an excuse in them to hang him."

Let us not hang this program, nor the people that support it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congressman WILLIAMS and his subcommittee for their work on this important legislation. In addition, I would like to commend Chairman FORD and the full committee for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

We live in a time—the nuclear age—that is, more often than not, complicated and surely very stressful. It is

a time when it seems that we have an increasing need just to stop and smell the roses. And it is the arts that allow us to do that. To the degree that we can hold onto ourselves, to produce something for the sake of its beauty—or the challenge of its energy—society is better off. Artists share their talents, their creativity, and their spirit, and we are a richer Nation for that.

Today we are traumatized with massive amounts of information; there is an invasion of our lives by sophisticated technology and computerization. We have transportation systems that can have us in distant places, experiencing different cultures within a day's time. We really do need the arts to maintain our sanity in such a fast-paced world.

It is through the arts that we make a statement about who we are and what we care about. It is through the arts that we are less limited in our ability to communicate with each another. We can communicate because we feel, see, touch, smell. Any and all of our senses are utilized to express ourselves—that is art.

Perhaps it's not politic to discuss the funding of arts from the point of view that it's all right for Government to empower its people to enjoy, to feel good, to expand their vision—but I choose to do that. I choose not to make economic arguments, though there are valid ones to be made. I choose not to defend artistic talent of individual artists who dare to dream, to challenge, to create their own style and image. Instead, I choose to congratulate our open, democratic Government for recognizing the place art has in each of our lives.

After all is said and done; after the shouting, screaming, negotiating, politicking—what's left is the pure joy of the creative spirit and the rainbow of talent and art it produces.

The NEA is the Government agency charged with the responsibility for sponsoring artistic development in this country. Each of us have our own likes and our dislikes. Perhaps we will not always concur with all the decisions for funding by the NEA. That would be an impossible requirement for any agency.

I believe our new chairperson, Jane Alexander, will provide the best possible leadership for the Endowment.

Jane Alexander is a highly talented and sensitive and caring human being, dedicated to the arts.

I urge my colleagues to support art as an important part of our culture, our history—who we are. I urge support of H.R. 2351 and a "no" vote on the Dornan amendment.

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

I just want to underscore something that our colleague from New York said. He referred to the obscenity issue or the pornography issue as a bogus issue.

I would like to repeat what was said in the opening statement, that there is reform language here that explicitly prohibits obscenity. Quoting from that reform language: "Obscenity is without artistic merit. It is not protected speech and shall not be funded."

I appreciate the reference of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will note that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] has 17 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, as a New Yorker and the proud representative of a district which is one of the Nation's top exporters of the arts and culture in America, I rise to voice my strong support for the National Endowment for the Arts and for the Institute for Museum Services.

I believe America must make investments in both our physical infrastructure and our cultural infrastructure.

We need bridges and highways to help move people from place to place.

We need art to transport us in a different way—to inspire us, to challenge us and, most of all, to give meaning to our lives.

NEA grants have enabled New York City's cultural treasures to be shared with people throughout our country.

NEA grant to touring dance companies have made it possible for the Merce Cunningham and Alvin Ailey dance companies to perform for people from New Hampshire to North Dakota. Aristotle defined art as "exhilaration."

For over 28 years, the NEA has given public support to artists, dancers, musicians who have exhilarated us and helped us to transcend boundaries.

It has done this cost-effectively, and at considerably less than is allotted in other industrial countries.

Society defines itself by the way it preserves and presents its culture as much as by its investments in new technologies.

There is something truly remarkable about a country that can build the finest and most professional military and at the same time produce the finest opera, ballet, art, literature, and music.

Fund the NEA.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

As I am sure most of my colleagues realize, I have an amendment, following the debate, that would, in effect,

terminate the National Endowment for the Arts. It is not predicated on any of the discussion about who is to judge art.

□ 1250

It is predicated upon basic constitutional principles. This issue did come up in Philadelphia during the debates, and Charles Pinckney from South Carolina introduced a proposal for national funding of literature, arts, and the sciences. He was overwhelmingly turned down by his colleagues that crafted our precious Constitution on the grounds that those were not legitimate functions of the National Government.

That was a consistent position taken by our Government until 1965, when during the guns and butter era of LBJ, Congress created the National Endowment for the Arts.

This debate is implying that it is either/or; that without the National Endowment for the Arts, we will not finance the arts in the United States. That is as fallacious as it can be. Last year the National Endowment spent \$174 million, and the private sector spent \$9.3 billion, I underscore billion dollars, to finance the arts. In addition to that, that was an 18 percent increase over 1991 levels of funding. It is not either/or.

My argument is not on the merits of art. If I sat on one of their boards, Andrew Wyeth would be the only one who would ever probably get any grant from me, but that is a personal concern. That is why government does not belong involved in this critical area. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. These are decisions to be made in a free environment where, if someone wants to peddle a bottle of urine with a crucifix in it and call that art, and some pervert is willing to pay for that, that is his business; but certainly that is not a warranted expenditure of taxpayer money.

I approve the guidelines that have been set up wholeheartedly to try and restrict some of these perversions, but the fact of the matter is, first and foremost, we are talking a constitution argument. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I come from western Wisconsin. I am uniquely privileged to have a very special constituent. His name is Garrison Keilor. He is, as I think everyone recognizes very quickly, the famous nationwide host of Prairie Home Companion. I bring that up because Garrison Keilor got his start through a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The difference between my philosophy on this and that of my friend and

colleague who just spoke is not in the general or generic concept of supporting the arts. I think, very frankly, we as private citizens should make those decisions, but much of that money that he talks about in support of the arts is, paying for tickets to the Kennedy Center for you, for me, when we go to those performances, and the Government should not pay for that.

What the National Endowment for the Arts does do which justifies its existence, it gives birth to artists. That cannot happen without some kind of an endowment that gives people who otherwise would not have an opportunity that opportunity to cultivate a talent which then, when cultivated, will succeed or fail in the private sector as private individuals choose to or not to fund that particular proposal. That is why we have an Endowment.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the Members today to ask the Members not to support business as usual in the Endowment. I am not asking anybody to do that on this or any other issue, but I am asking them to do two things. I am asking Members to support a simple 2-year reauthorization, which I think we have to do, because the alternative means no Endowment.

In the process of supporting that simple reauthorization, give the new chairperson of the Endowment, Jane Alexander, the opportunity she truly deserves to go out and build an understanding and a support for the Endowment across this country.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993. For more than a quarter of a century, the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and the Institute of Museum Services [IMS] have promoted creativity and excellence in the arts in this country, broadening the public's access to cultural affairs. Let us continue to lend our full support to such vital and successful organizations.

For the past few years, we have heard so much misinformation about these agencies from a vocal minority. I believe it is important for us all to remember the many more voices of the majority in support of these invaluable forces in the arts and humanities.

As we are well aware, the National Endowment for the Arts has been the primary target of this unfair criticism. The handful of controversial examples that have been touted as indicative of the NEA's efforts are no justification for reduced funding or censorship.

When Congress reauthorized the NEA in 1990, a number of changes were made to refine and improve this agency. Provisions were added that created greater accountability in the grant review process, and the NEA Chair was given increased authority to recoup NEA funds if grant money is misused. Further, arts education and arts projects in rural and artistically underserved areas were given new emphasis and support.

Let us be clear about this legislation: Obscenity is not art and cannot be supported with funds from the NEA. This agency awards

grants in a process which considers the diverse beliefs and values of the American public, while not creating an environment where only pastoral landscape paintings are safe enough for public sponsorship. I believe the NEA strikes a delicate balance of reaffirming our Nation's commitment to the arts while maintaining sensitivity to the nature of public sponsorship.

Throughout my State of California, the NEA, NEH, and IMS provide assistance to so many valuable programs. Funding provided to the California Arts Council's Artist in Residence Program enables artists of all disciplines to teach and share their art forms with people who might otherwise never have any direct contact with the arts. In my district, with the assistance of a grant from the NEA, the University of California at Davis was able to sponsor an arts and lectures series. These funds help to develop and promote diverse cultural events throughout northern California.

It is a commentary on the strength and the wisdom of a government which supports and nurtures the creativity of its artists. Every society needs its artists; they are its watchers, its critics, and its champions. The NEA, NEH, and the IMS nurture the arts and humanities in our country for a very small price. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting our Nation's rich cultural heritage and support H.R. 2351.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, although we are still an infant among most nations of the world, America has developed over the past two centuries a culture as interesting and unique as any in history. American art, music, theater, and film has made this country one of the most advanced and artistic cultures in the world. I can think of few ways to better teach the next generation of Americans about their history than to let them hear the music, read the literature, and see the films of the twenties, forties, sixties, et cetera. Art not only serves as a form of entertainment, it tells the American story.

We are all quite aware of the fiscal problems that continue to plague our economy. Unfortunately, the arts, like all segments of our society, must share in America's fiscal sacrifice. Like many of my colleagues, I do not support the NEA authorization bill before us. It simply does not cut enough. At a time when we cannot find the means to properly care for the elderly and provide homes for the homeless, while still attempting to eliminate our huge budget deficit, I cannot support the funding levels in this bill. We must prioritize spending and make difficult choices. We just cannot afford this level of NEA spending.

I oppose the Crane amendment abolishing the NEA totally. I fear that if we eliminate funding for the NEA this year, we will never be able to resurrect it. This would be an injustice not only to today's Americans, but to the next generation of young Americans who will not experience the many works of art we now enjoy.

Local symphonies and plays are some examples of the art the NEA provides. I encourage presentations of Beethoven, Bach, and other contemporaries like Gershwin. Our children could be deprived of the full value of these works if we eliminate funding for the NEA. That is why I oppose the bill as it stands

before us so that we may bring it back to the floor in a form that will permit the funding of morally responsible, worthwhile, and entertaining works of art while still maintaining the sense of fiscal responsibility the economic climate demands.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2351 and the arts in America. This bill will reauthorize the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and Institute for Museum Services [IMS] for 2 years. I support this legislation and oppose any amendments that would reduce its funding or eliminate the NEA completely.

My reasons for supporting this bill are based on the belief that the arts enrich, uplift, inspire, and unite us. Regardless of our backgrounds, occupation, age, et cetera, we can all come together to enjoy and appreciate the arts. The NEA is one of the organizations that successfully enables more of us to participate in and celebrate the rich talent of artists throughout our country. Since 1965, when the NEA was established, the number of professional theaters, orchestras, dance companies, and opera companies has multiplied greatly. The number of Americans that have enjoyed the NEA-sponsored work has also increased significantly. For less than a dollar a year per taxpayer, every day across the country, Americans enjoy special museum exhibits, radio programs, jazz music performances, dance shows, et cetera.

In the last 2 years, with the NEA's assistance, in my district in Illinois, students from Maywood, Berkeley, Bellwood, Oak Park, River Forest, and Westchester had an opportunity to attend special concerts by the world-renowned Chicago Symphony Orchestra. The Community Television Network in Chicago supported the neighborhood video program that reaches out to youth who have dropped out of public school and have little or no exposure to the arts. The free, outdoor Grant Park concerts continued to draw enthusiastic crowds; the annual Latino film/video festival was a success; professional minority artists participated in a formal training program; and the Art Institute of Chicago and the Chicago public schools joined in a collaborative museum education project. Mr. Chairman, the projects I just mentioned are only a handful of the worthwhile projects that the NEA has sponsored in Illinois and throughout the country.

The NEH has been just as successful in expanding opportunities for artists and audiences nationwide. In my district, the NEH sponsored a study project on the African oral tradition for elementary and secondary school teachers in Chicago, a citywide humanities festival, and other meaningful events.

Mr. Chairman, considering how little the national arts programs actually cost, and how much they provide to each of us and to society, H.R. 2351 is legislation that we cannot afford not to support.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crane amendment because I simply do not believe that sponsorship of the arts is the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Earlier this year, I sent a letter to President Clinton suggesting some very practical and

specific spending cuts, aimed at deficit reduction. Among these suggested spending cuts was a proposal to cut funding for the National Endowment for the Arts. I proposed this action, not because I am against art, but because I am concerned about the economic well-being of our country.

The fact of the matter is that American art can survive without the National Endowment for the Arts. In 1992 alone, \$9.3 billion was spent on the advancement of the arts by the private sector, and since 1989, private donations to the arts have increased by 36 percent.

Mr. Chairman, the \$120 million contained in H.R. 2351 for the NEA would represent less than 2 percent of all funding in America for the arts. Abolishing the NEA will not threaten the future of art in America; rather, it will take away only a small fraction of the total funding currently received through private financing.

With a \$4 trillion national debt, it is incumbent upon us to make the tough decisions by cutting all extraneous spending. With a President and a Congress at least publicly committed to deficit reduction, the immediate question that must be answered is: Do we really need to fund the National Endowment for the Arts?

The answer is a resounding "No." I urge my colleagues to exercise some fiscal responsibility and vote for the Crane amendment.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1993.

H.R. 2351 is the Clinton administration's proposal to reauthorize for 2 years and without change three agencies: the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities, and Institute for Museum Services. The authorization expired September 30. The bill provides appropriation authorizations of \$174,593,000 for the NEA, \$177,491,000 for the NEH, and \$28,777,000 for the IMS, consistent with the President's budget for 1994.

The administration submitted its proposal in May for a 2-year extension to allow a thorough review of these agencies by the administration, the agencies and the constituencies they serve, and the Congress. The administration believes, and I agree, that it would be inappropriate for Congress to alter the structure of these agencies without the suggestions of their new heads. We made a lot of reforms in the NEA in 1990. We need some time to measure their effects.

Over the next 2 years, we will receive the views of NEH Chairman Sheldon Hackney, NEA Chairwoman Jane Alexander, and next IMS head, nominee Diane Frankel, as they gain expertise in their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, the arts and humanities endowments have played crucial roles in enhancing and promoting culture throughout the United States for more than 28 years.

The NEA supported the nonprofit theaters that produced the last 11 Pulitzer Prize-winning plays. Since the agency was established, the number of professional dance companies, opera companies, and orchestras has exploded, vastly increasing Americans' access to the arts. The NEA's grants and services to nonprofit organizations and individuals in dance, design arts, folk arts, literature, media arts museums, opera and musical theater, and the visual arts have made a tangible difference in the development of cultural life in every State.

Similarly, the NEH, whose mission is to promote scholarly research, education, and public programs in the humanities, has provided grants to individuals, institutions, and organizations for projects concerned with history, literature, philosophy, languages, archeology, and other disciplines.

The Institute for Museum Services, created in 1976 to increase and improve museum services, has been just as successful over its shorter history. It has funded operating expenses and conservation activities for all types of museums, from aquariums, zoos and arboretums, to art, history, and nature centers.

It is evident that support for the NEH and the IMS is broad and bipartisan. Despite harsh attacks from a few critics who believe the broad mission of the NEA is undeserving of Federal investment, support for the Endowment also remains broad and bipartisan, as indicated by the House's vote in July, by 322 to 105, in favor of a \$175 million appropriation for fiscal 1994. That support is well-earned: the NEA has been instrumental in extending access to the arts nationwide.

For example, NEA grants have helped build a national network of State and local arts organizations that brings the arts to rural, inner-city, and other artistically underserved areas. The NEA funds tours in chamber music, opera, jazz, folk arts, museum special exhibitions, theater, and dance.

Many of the NEA's grants to big-city organizations benefit citizens in small towns across the country. For example, a jazz grant to pianist Judy Carmichael of New York City will support a series of 25 presentations illustrating the history and development of early jazz in high schools and colleges in 8 States. The AMAN Folk Ensemble of Los Angeles received a \$70,000 grant for touring, educational, and performance activities, resulting in residencies for the company in at least nine moderate and small towns in three States.

Mr. Chairman, with the NEA's support, the arts have become an important sector of our economy, as well as a way by which Americans express their creativity and appreciate and advance our artistic heritage. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support H.R. 2351 and the arts in America. This bill will reauthorize the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and Institute for Museum Services [IMS] for 2 years. I support this legislation and oppose any amendments that would reduce its funding or eliminate the NEA completely.

My reasons for supporting this bill are based on the belief that the arts enrich, uplift, inspire, and unite us. Regardless of our backgrounds, occupation, age, etc., we can all come together to enjoy and appreciate the arts. The NEA is one of the organizations that successfully enables more of us to participate in and celebrate the rich talent of artists throughout our country. Since 1965, when the NEA was established, the number of professional theaters, orchestras, dance companies, and opera companies has multiplied greatly. The number of Americans that have enjoyed the NEA-sponsored work has also increased significantly. For less than a dollar a year per taxpayer, every day across the country, Ameri-

cans enjoy special museum exhibits, radio programs, jazz music performances, dance shows, etc.

In the last 2 years, with the NEA's assistance, in my District in Illinois, students from Maywood, Berkeley, Bellwood, Oak Park, River Forest, and Westchester had an opportunity to attend special concerts by the world-renown Chicago Symphony Orchestra. The Community Television Network in Chicago supported the Neighborhood Video Program that reaches out to youth who have dropped out of public school and have little or no exposure to the arts. The free, outdoor Grant Park concerts continued to draw enthusiastic crowds, the annual Latino Film/Video Festival was a success, professional minority artists participated in a formal training program and the Art Institute of Chicago and the Chicago public schools joined in a collaborative museum education project. Mr. Chairman, the projects I just mentioned are only a handful of the projects that the NEA has sponsored in Illinois and throughout the country.

The NEA has been just as successful in expanding opportunities for artists and audiences nationwide. In my district, the NEH sponsored a study project on the African oral tradition for elementary and secondary school teachers in Chicago, sponsored a city-wide humanities festival, etc.

Mr. Chairman, considering how little the national arts programs actually cost, and how much they provide to each of us and to society, H.R. 2351 is legislation that we can't afford to not support.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993. This bill is a simple 2-year reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, and the Institute of Museum Services.

This reauthorization is necessary to allow funding to continue while the Congress takes a closer look at these programs and works with the administration to produce a more comprehensive reauthorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, some have chosen to use the debate on this bill, to elevate peripheral issues that are on the political radar of a small but vocal constituency. The emphasis on the issues of obscenity and pornography is overblown and simply a deleterious tactic to thwart all Federal support of artistic expression and cultural diversity.

During the reauthorization of these programs in 1990 we set forth a logical and deliberative process to deal with the issue of obscenity. We provided more assistance at the local level, where community involvement would help dictate how funds are spent, and we targeted funds to areas of specific need including rural communities, disadvantaged areas, and indigenous peoples.

We in the United States are fortunate to live in a country of diverse cultures. The arts, crafts, music, dance, legends, history, and other defining components of our cultures that each of us pass on to generations of children help to preserve the unique heritage of our forefathers and foremothers.

The National Endowments of the Arts, the National Endowment of the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services provides na-

tional leadership and the funds necessary to help our communities perpetuate the culture, arts, and history that has played a part in shaping each locality.

In a State like Hawaii where we have integrated into our daily lives elements of so many cultures—from the East and West—these Federal programs have assisted efforts to maintain our own traditions, practices, and arts, as well as foster greater learning and understanding about all aspects of the all cultures that have emigrated to the Hawaiian Islands.

In Hawaii moneys from the Federal arts and humanities programs have helped to preserve the once dying arts of the lauhala weaving and canoe carving. They have helped to teach young children of many races and cultural backgrounds the intricacies of the Hawaiian hula. They have helped educate the general public on the indigenous people of Hawaii and their plight to preserve their culture and regain their self-sufficiency. It has helped to preserve the unique culture of plantation life in Hawaii that brought diversity to Hawaii.

In your community NEA, NEH, and IMS may have helped sustain a local children's theatre, or a city symphony. Maybe it was folk art festival or a fine art museum. These programs touch each and every one of our communities.

Budget cutters and deficit hawks advocate sacrificing the preservation of arts and culture in the name of the budget deficit. They brand it as wasteful spending and congressional pork.

Reality is that the moderate amount of \$123 million in NEA funds provided to over 3,500 organizations in fiscal year 1992, leveraged an additional \$1.4 billion in private funds for the preservation of the arts.

Mr. Chairman, this is a smart investment that will reap many returns. Sometimes we forget about the most precious and promising resource in the United States; and that is our human capital. The National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services help us invest in our human capital. By preserving the past we foster opportunities for the future.

I urge the Members of House to support H.R. 2351, the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, freedom to create is one of the greatest benefits this Nation has provided. The National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services have been responsible for bringing the best of the arts and humanities to millions of Americans who, for reasons of geography or other factors, would otherwise not have this access.

One of the most valuable services provided by the NEA, the NEH and the IMS is that of education. Through each of its disciplines, art represents a distinct way of exploring and understanding our common humanity and surroundings. The arts enhance creativity and cultivate each student's ability to make informed aesthetic judgments. Properly integrated, arts education helps students develop an appreciation for individual arts disciplines, as well as for how those disciplines relate to other subjects. Appreciation of the arts transcends cultural, racial and ethnic barriers. Participants and observers are able to experience

the breadth of culture of the American society. Americans from all walks of life are enriched by the historical contributions of American immigrants and minorities in shaping America's evolving cultural heritage.

The National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] provides funding and support to thousands of outstanding programs, bringing arts to millions of Americans in communities across the country. The NEA has provided support for the touring of museum exhibits, dance companies, symphony orchestras, and theater performances in order to vastly increase the public's access to these forms of art. Its support of public television has also contributed to an expanded audience.

The NEA has helped to build a national network of arts institutions and public agencies which supports the arts in all 50 States and territories, and has presided over the single largest expansion of the arts in our Nation's history. The number of nonprofit arts organizations has grown from about 7,000 to about 34,000 over the past 28 years. This growth has increased the number of jobs, expanded tax bases, attracted tourists and businesses, and improved the quality of life in many American communities.

The National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] has been the Federal Government's primary vehicle for promoting the study and understanding of history, literature, philosophy, and other disciplines of the humanities throughout the Nation for almost 30 years. The American people recognize that knowledge of the humanities—the ideas, works and events that make up the record of human thought and experience—is not only personally rewarding to them as individuals, but critical to our shared civic life as a nation. NEH's outreach has included support for reading and discussion groups at libraries, museum exhibits at small and emerging institutions, and the creation of outstanding television programs such as the Civil War.

The Institute of Museum Services [IMS] has provided 15,000 grants in the past 15 years to museums of every kind and size around the country. These grants have provided an indispensable backbone of support for richer public programming and 87 percent of museums receiving general operating support grants from IMS have reported using them for educational programming.

Today, the NEA, NEH, and IMS reauthorization bill was voted on in the House of Representatives. The bill consisted of a simple reauthorization for 2 years in the amount of \$174.5 million for the NEA, \$177.5 million for the NEH and \$29 million for the IMS for fiscal year 1994. There were two amendments introduced to the bill that would have greatly reduced or eliminated funding for the NEA, NEH and the IMS. I opposed both amendments, and they were defeated. Thus the Congress has made a strong statement in support of the arts, recognizing the merit and importance of the arts to the growth of our Nation:

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 2351 is as follows:

H.R. 2351

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993".

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965.**

(A) FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 11(a)(1) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i) by striking "\$125,800,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$119,985,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995",

(ii) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows:

"(ii) Not less than 27.5 percent of the amount appropriated under clause (i) for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995 shall be for carrying out section 5(g)."

(iii) in the first sentence of clause (iii) by striking "For" and all that follows through "year," the last place it appears, and inserting "Not less than 7.5 percent of the amount appropriated under clause (i) for each of the fiscal years 1994 and 1995", and

(2) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B) by striking "\$119,900,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$130,573,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995".

(b) FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO MATCH NON-FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED.—Section 11(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(ii) by striking "\$13,000,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$16,955,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995",

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(ii) by striking "\$12,000,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$11,963,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995",

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(ii) by striking "\$15,000,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$13,187,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995", and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(ii) by striking "\$15,150,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$14,228,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995", and

(3) in the last sentence of paragraph (4) by striking "section 5(1)(2)" and inserting "section 5(p)(2)".

(c) FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENTS.—Section 11(c) of the National Founda-

tion on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "\$21,200,000 and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$24,466,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995", and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "\$17,950,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$20,727,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995".

(d) LIMITATION ON TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Section 11(d) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) by striking "exceed" and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting "exceed \$174,593,000 for fiscal year 1994.", and

(2) in paragraph (2) by striking "exceed" and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting "exceed \$177,491,000 for fiscal year 1994."

**SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO THE MUSEUM SERVICES ACT.**

Section 209 of the Museum Services Act (20 U.S.C. 967) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "\$24,000,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$28,777,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995", and

(2) in subsection (d) by striking "1993" and inserting "1995".

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments to the bill are in order except the amendments printed in House Report 103-264. Each amendment shall be considered in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question. Debate time for each amendment shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-264.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRANE: Beginning on page 2, strike line 2 and all that follows through line 22 on page 5, and inserting the following:

This Act may be cited as the "Humanities and Museums Amendments of 1993".

**SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATING TO THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES.**

(a) FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(B) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(a)(1)(B)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "\$119,900,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$130,573,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995".

(b) FUNDS AUTHORIZED TO MATCH NON-FEDERAL FUNDS RECEIVED.—Section 11(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(B) by striking "\$12,000,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$11,963,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995", and

(2) in paragraph (3)(B)—

(A) by striking "1993" the first place it appears and inserting "1995", and

(B) by striking "\$15,150,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$14,228,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995".

(c) FUNDS AUTHORIZED FOR ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT.—Section 11(c)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(c)(2)) is amended by striking "\$17,950,000" and all that follows through "1993", and inserting "\$20,727,000 for fiscal year 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995".

(d) LIMITATIONS ON TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED.—Section 11(d)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 960(d)(2)) is amended by striking "exceed" and all that follows through the period at the end, and inserting "exceed \$177,491,000 for fiscal year 1994".

### SEC. 3. TERMINATION OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.

(a) REPEALER.—Sections 5, 5A, and 6 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 954, 954a, 955) are repealed.

### SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Section 2 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 951) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (6) by striking "arts and the",

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (4) by striking "and the arts",

(3) in paragraphs (5) and (9) by striking "the arts and",

(4) in paragraph (7) by striking "the practice of art and",

(5) by striking paragraph (11), and

(6) in paragraph (12) by striking "the Arts and".

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 952) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (f), and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking "to foster American artistic creativity, to commission works of art",

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "the National Council on the Arts or", and

(ii) by striking "as the case may be",

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "sections 5(l) and" and inserting "section",

(ii) in subparagraph (A) by striking "artistic or", and

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking "the National Council on the Arts and", and

(II) by striking "as the case may be", and

(D) by striking "(d)" and inserting "(b)", and

(3) by redesignating subsections (e) and (g) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES.—Section 4(a) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 953(a)) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "the Arts and" each place it appears, and

(B) by striking "a National Endowment for the Arts",

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "and the arts", and

(3) in the heading of such section by striking "THE ARTS AND".

(d) FEDERAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES.—Section 9 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 958) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking "the Arts and",

(2) in subsection (b) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts",

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and",

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts", and

(ii) by striking "Humanities," and inserting "Humanities", and

(C) in paragraphs (6) and (7) by striking "the arts and".

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS.—Section 10 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 959) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "in them",

(ii) by striking "the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and", and

(iii) by striking "in carrying out their respective functions",

(B) by striking "of an Endowment" each place it appears,

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking "of that Endowment" the first place it appears and inserting "the National Endowment for the Humanities",

(ii) by striking "sections 6(f) and" and inserting "section", and

(iii) by striking "sections 5(c) and" and inserting "section", and

(D) in paragraph (3) by striking "Chairperson's functions, define their duties, and supervise their activities" and inserting "functions, define the activities, and supervise the activities of the Chairperson",

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking "one of its Endowments and received by the Chairperson of an Endowment" and inserting "the National Endowment for the Humanities and received by the Chairperson of that Endowment", and

(ii) by striking "(4)",

(3) by striking subsection (c),

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) by striking "Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the", and

(B) by striking "each" the first place it appears,

(5) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking "National Council on the Arts and the", and

(B) by striking "respectively", and

(6) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the", and

(ii) by striking "sections 5(c) and" and inserting "section",

(B) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(i) by striking "either of the Endowments" and inserting "National Endowment for the Humanities", and

(ii) by striking "involved", and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "that provided such financial assistance" each place it appears, and

(ii) in subparagraph (C) by striking "the National Endowment for the Arts or".

### SEC. 5. AMENDMENT TO SHORT TITLE OF THE STATUTE.

Section 1 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 951 note) is amended by striking "the Arts and".

### SEC. 6. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

(a) TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.—On the effective date of the amendments made by this Act, all property donated, bequeathed, or devised to the National Endowment for the Arts and held by such Endowment on such date is hereby transferred to the National Endowment for the Humanities.

(b) TERMINATION OF OPERATIONS.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall provide for the termination of the affairs of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Council on the Arts. Except as provided in subsection (a), the Director shall provide for the transfer or other disposition of personnel, assets, liabilities, grants, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds held, used, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with implementing the authorities terminated by the amendments made by this Act.

Page 5, line 23, strike "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 7."

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I introduced in my earlier remarks my basic thrust. I would remind all of my colleagues that upon election to Congress, the very first act of a newly elected Member is to stand in this Chamber, raise his right hand, and swear to uphold that Constitution, so help him God. I would urge my colleagues, if they have not reviewed some of the debate that went on in Philadelphia when the Constitution was being crafted, or debate subsequent thereto, to go back and examine that. Each one of us has an obligation to do so when he takes that sacred oath.

When I say the debates that went on, it was not confined strictly to the Philadelphia Convention. There was a very noteworthy Representative from the State of Virginia, Representative John Page, who in 1792, in addressing Congress, observed:

The encouragement which the General Government might give to the fine arts . . . might, if judiciously applied, redound to the honor of Congress, and the splendor, magnificence, and real advantage of the United States; but the wise framers of our Constitution saw that, if Congress had the power of exerting what has been called a royal munificence for these purposes, Congress might, like many royal benefactors, misplace their munificence; . . . might reward the ingenuity of the citizens of one State, and neglect

a much greater genius of another. . . . It is not sufficient, to remove these objections, to say, as some gentlemen have said, that Congress is incapable of partiality or absurdities, and that they are as far from committing them as my colleagues or myself. I tell them the Constitution was formed on a supposition of human frailty, and to restrain abuses of mistaken powers.

In some of the debates we have had on this subject, it has been that abuse of mistaken powers that has been the focus of the debate. That is not what I am concentrating on. What I am concentrating on, as I indicated before, is the constitutional question and whether we are upholding that oath we take when we get sworn in.

The fact is, further, though, that there is inevitably going to be discrimination when we involve Government in this kind of an enterprise. For example, last year there were almost 18,000 applications for grants from the NEA, and yet, because of limited resources, only about 4,000 grants were made. Who is to play the omniscient judge in making these kinds of determinations and know that he is not injuring one of those who did not receive a grant when he confers a grant on someone else?

In addition to that, the reference that Representative Page made in his remarks in 1792 about preferences to one State versus another, the fact of the matter is New York State, of course, gets the lion's share of the grants. More specifically, New York City. One, they argue that is a large State, and as a result, that allocation of these scarce resources is dictated. Explain to me, then, why Washington, DC, with a population about the size of a single congressional district, gets more in grants than the State of Illinois, my home State, Ohio, and Michigan combined.

There is a misallocation of these resources that will inevitably occur, and again, it goes back to the importance of leaving these decisions in the private sector where they rightfully belong, where the individuals who choose can make these decisions on a voluntary basis and have made them, and made them generously from the beginning of our Republic until the present moment, and infinitely more generously than our Government has been or is even capable of being in this area.

□ 1300

So, I would urge my colleagues to review these vital points and to uphold their constitutional obligation.

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

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I have long supported the National Endowment for the Arts. Unfortunately, controversy in recent years has overshadowed the fact that since its establishment in 1965, the

NEA has awarded over 90,000 grants, making the arts available to millions of Americans who might never have otherwise had the opportunity.

I believe that the NEA's record will only be strengthened under the chairmanship of Jane Alexander. The wide respect for her abilities is reflected by the fact that her nomination was unanimously approved by the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee and remarkably by the Senate as a whole. I was particularly impressed with her testimony that she will "be accountable and look forward to working with Members of Congress. My goal for the arts is that best reaches the most." Mr. Chairman, I share the respect shown Ms. Alexander, but confessions is good for the soul and I must admit my administration may be some what beneficial by the fact that she is my constituent. The 19th Congressional District of New York is proud of her and her activities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a new beginning in HEW under new leadership. Let us reauthorize NEA for 2 years without amendments that could cripple the effectiveness of the agency. At that time, it would be appropriate to evaluate the Endowment and the performance of Ms. Alexander.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the weakening amendments being offered to cut or eliminate funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting in favor of full reauthorization.

As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have had the pleasure to learn more about the Endowment, as the subcommittee and committee have debated and passed authorizing legislation. I was struck not only by the diversity of the activities the NEA offers, and by how far-reaching the impact of the NEA is, especially for small, rural, and hard-to-reach communities, but also by how cost effective the program is.

For those Members who are contemplating voting to cut funding for the NEA to save money, I ask you to think again after you have the facts. The NEA is one of the most powerful seed grant programs working today. In fact, it provides economic stimulus to many small communities.

In fiscal year 1992, the \$153 million in program funds invested by the NEA leveraged \$1.68 billion in contributions and funding from businesses, groups, individuals, and other sources. This means that for each \$1 invested by the NEA, \$11 in matching funds are produced. In turn, this creates a 20-fold return in jobs, services, and contracts.

Since the endowment's founding in 1965, the number of orchestras has in-

creased from 110 to 230; nonprofit theater companies have gone from 37 to 450; opera companies have grown in number from 27 to 120, and dance companies from 35 to 450. In California alone, the number of performing arts companies, museums, and arts organizations grew from 650 to over 1,400.

The counties of Marin and Sonoma, CA, which I am privileged to represent, have received over \$100,000 this year in support of the arts, for incredibly diverse programs.

For instance, the NEA awarded individual creative writing grants to the Headlands Center for the Arts located in Sausalito which has a terrific open studio program for visual artists. The wonderful Marin Symphony and Public Art Works Co. also received seed grants to bring their services to more people. The Antenna Theater in Sausalito, recently received \$20,000 to create a completely new type of production, which will combine elements from museum exhibits, radio theater, and audience participation.

Sonoma County benefits from endowment-funded opera performances in Santa Rosa, and public radio and television programs based in Rohnert Park.

All this costs the taxpayer 68 cents a year. The total Federal commitment to the arts is less than two ten-thousandths of 1 percent of our budget.

Being a member of the Budget Committee, I firmly believe cutting unnecessary and unworkable programs is vitally important. My colleagues, if you are serious about having some real impact in debt reduction, look elsewhere in the budget. The NEA is an excellent program that fits the criteria for deserving Federal support.

I urge my colleagues, especially in light of October being Arts and Humanities month, to vote no on the weakening amendments and yes to reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crane amendment.

Let me describe myself as a museum rat. Sometimes the word "rat" can have a positive connotation, as in tunnel rat in Vietnam where our courageous young guys would go down in the Viet Cong complexes. I was a museum rat because I grew up in Manhattan on the West Side, a few blocks south of the American Museum of Natural History. Every rainy day my brothers and I would walk a few blocks north and spend all morning, take a lunch break, spend all afternoon in that museum. We would see the 90-foot blue whale, the lion exhibit in the main hall. Teddy Roosevelt astride a horse with his Indian guide at his side, with all of the benches with inscriptions describing

him as a naturalist, conservationist, patriot, warrior, diplomat, politician.

My wife says that my happiest hours are spent in the Smithsonian's museum complex. The Holocaust Museum at the end of the Mall is another favorite of mine. I cannot get there enough. I am a history buff and a museum lover second to none.

Having so credentialed myself, let me tell Members why I am supporting the Crane amendment.

The NEA has no accountability whatsoever in the way it gives away money. The recent decision to give funding to three self-described homoerotic film festivals, films for homosexuals and lesbians, included a prohibition of use of funds for the exhibition. However, the funds can be used for related activities such as symposia and lectures attached to the festival. Therefore, you cannot argue with the fact that the money goes to support the film festivals. The money that would have gone toward symposia now can go to films of exotic content.

Now let us get intellectual here and arty, and let me give my colleagues a couple of quotes from acknowledged artists and writers.

Francois Truffaut stated, "Airing one's dirty linen never makes for a masterpiece." That would happen to include self-described art involving excrement, which with fungible money has been funded, no matter what you hear on that or this side of the aisle. Let us stop playing unfair intellectual games here, dancing on the head of a pin.

Here is Emile Zola: "My own art is a negation of society, an affirmation of the individual, outside all rules and demands of society." This epitomizes the sentiments of some members of the arts community who are on the U.S.A. dole.

Here is a quote from a fine columnist up in Boston, Don Feder:

Art is a reflection of a society's most profound aspirations \* \* \* Cultures exalt their highest ideals. In the Middle Ages, it was the diving. For the 18th and 19th centuries, it was man as Promethean hero. Today, it's the depraved, life as a freak show. Our cultural mavens wallow in the sordid, celebrate the nauseating, dwell on their imaginary persecution.

He just wrote that a few months ago.

Now, my colleagues, I am tired of trying to be an art critic, and try to separate out the one-tenth of 1 percent of the blasphemous, scatological, and hardcore pornographic scum from the fine NEA grants out of 100,000. I think we can do what the Constitution gives us as a guide. Leave the funding of the arts, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] said, to private citizens who last year donated \$9.32 billion, God bless them. We do not have to take \$174 million out of middle America, who do not want this garbage. It repels them and it should.

□ 1310

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the point needs to be made now, following my friend from California, that the NEA did not, did not fund the 1991 Pittsburgh International Lesbian and Gay Film Festival, either directly or indirectly; no NEA money.

Any film clip that my friend is upset about is not the result of NEA funding.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, and PATRICK, I will speak slowly: I was not speaking of Pittsburgh in 1991. I am speaking of now, right now, 1993. Under the interim chair, Ana Steele, three porno film festivals in New York, Los Angeles, and Pittsburgh were funded, PATRICK.

Mr. Chairman, let us get the truth on the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I tell my colleague that he may be upset then apparently about film festivals in the future that might be funded but they are not funding any now.

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

Our friend from Illinois argues each time the reauthorization comes up that we should support his amendment to eliminate the NEA on the basis, I think, that arts are not mentioned in the Constitution and that perhaps we might even be violating our oath of office around here if we vote for the National Endowment for the Arts.

I tell my colleagues that there is a lot of important things that the public is involved in through their National Government that are not mentioned in the Constitution, probably never contemplated by the Framers of that document.

Let me share just a few with you: the National Highway System that is not mentioned in the Constitution; land grant colleges are not mentioned in the Constitution; Yellowstone National Park is not mentioned in the Constitution; in fact, no national park is.

The gentleman's State of Illinois is not mentioned in the Constitution, never mentioned by the Framers.

What the Framers did have, however, was the foresight to make the Constitution a living document that could respond to changing times, and that document does call for a Federal Government that "promotes the general welfare."

I would contend that support for the arts is one way, and a very important way, for this Government to promote the general welfare of its people. But I do want to point out to my friend from Illinois and my colleagues that the Framers were not totally unaware of the need for Government to consider and assist the arts and artists.

Article I, section 8, clause 8 of the Constitution does provide for the promotion "of the progress of science and the useful arts."

So the Framers were not unconcerned about the arts.

And I might say that that concern, as evidenced by the fact that the arts are included in the Constitution, probably indicates that support of the arts was something that the Framers intended the Federal Government to play some part in, perhaps a prominent part.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, in rebuttal here: The quote the gentleman made from the Constitution goes beyond what he cited: "promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." It deals only with patents, nothing more.

James Madison, considered the architect of our Constitution, stated with regard to the general-welfare clause: "Whenever money has been raised by the general authority and is to be applied to a particular measure a question arises whether the particular measure be within the enumerated authorities vested in Congress." And clearly, the NEA is not.

Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in this debate since I came to Congress in 1984, and frankly I weary of the debate. If we are going to talk about the Government's use of taxpayer funding for the National Endowment for the Arts, I think we must address the constitutionality issue. It has been addressed here I think definitively by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE]. Once you get by the question raised by the constitutionality of the issue you must also address the question of the first amendment rights and censorship. That gets thrown around here a great deal.

I would ask you: Is it or is it not censorship to have a Government agency funded by the taxpayers of America to accept or reject applications, grants for artwork, and determine what is or what is not meritorious. If you are opposed to Government censorship of the arts and if you have any intellectual integrity whatsoever, you must be opposed to the existence of the National Endowment for the Arts.

Anything less than that is mere sophistry, a rationale to obtain the money.

If the money is more important than the integrity of the arts, then vote "yes" to reauthorize this Government agency. If integrity of the arts, integrity of the American people, integrity of the Government of this Nation is more important to you than money then vote "no"; very simple.

I say trust your integrity; do not trust the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names.

[Roll No. 499]

Abercrombie Chapman Fields (TX)  
 Ackerman Clayton Filner  
 Allard Clement Fingerhut  
 Andrews (ME) Clinger Fish  
 Andrews (NJ) Clyburn Flake  
 Andrews (TX) Coble Foglietta  
 Applegate Coleman Ford (MI)  
 Archer Collins (GA) Ford (TN)  
 Arney Collins (IL) Fowler  
 Bacchus (FL) Collins (MI) Franks (CT)  
 Bachus (AL) Combust Franks (NJ)  
 Baesler Condit Frost  
 Baker (CA) Conyers Furse  
 Baker (LA) Cooper Gallegly  
 Ballenger Coppersmith Gallo  
 Barca Costello Gejdenson  
 Barcia Cox Gekas  
 Barlow Coyne Geren  
 Barrett (NE) Cramer Gibbons  
 Barrett (WI) Crane Gilchrist  
 Bartlett Crapo Gilmor  
 Barton Cunningham Gilman  
 Bateman Danner Gingrich  
 Becerra Darden Glickman  
 Beilenson de la Garza Gonzalez  
 Bentley de Lugo (VI) Goodlatte  
 Bereuter Deal Goodling  
 Berman DeFazio Gordon  
 Bevil DeLauro Goss  
 Bilbray DeLay Grams  
 Billakis Dellums Grandy  
 Bishop Derrick Greenwood  
 Blackwell Deutsch Gunderson  
 Bliley Diaz-Balart Gutierrez  
 Blute Dickey Hall (OH)  
 Boehlert Dicks Hall (TX)  
 Boehner Dingell Hamburg  
 Bonilla Dixon Hamilton  
 Bonior Dooley Hancock  
 Borski Doolittle Hansen  
 Boucher Dornan Harman  
 Brewster Dreier Hastert  
 Brooks Duncan Hastings  
 Browder Dunn Hayes  
 Brown (CA) Durbin Hefley  
 Brown (FL) Edwards (CA) Hefner  
 Brown (OH) Edwards (TX) Herger  
 Bryant Emerson Hilliard  
 Bunning Engel Hinchey  
 Burton English (OK) Hoagland  
 Buyer Eshoo Hobson  
 Byrne Evans Hochbrueckner  
 Callahan Everett Hoekstra  
 Calvert Ewing Hoke  
 Camp Faleomavaega Holden  
 Canady (AS) Horn  
 Cantwell Farr Houghton  
 Cardin Fawell Hoyer  
 Carr Fazio Huffington  
 Castle Fields (LA) Hughes

Hunter Mfume  
 Hutchinson Mica  
 Hutto Michel  
 Hyde Miller (CA)  
 Inglis Miller (FL)  
 Inhofe Mineta  
 Inslee Minge  
 Istook Mink  
 Jacobs Moakley  
 Jefferson Molinari  
 Johnson (CT) Mollohan  
 Johnson (GA) Montgomery  
 Johnson (SD) Moorhead  
 Johnson, E.B. Moran  
 Johnson, Sam Morella  
 Johnston Murphy  
 Kanjorski Myers  
 Kaptur Nadler  
 Kasich Natcher  
 Kennedy Neal (MA)  
 Kennelly Neal (NC)  
 Kildee Norton (DC)  
 Kim Nussle  
 King Oberstar  
 Kingston Obey  
 Kleczka Olver  
 Klein Ortiz  
 Klink Orton  
 Klug Oxley  
 Knollenberg Packard  
 Koibe Pallone  
 Kopetski Parker  
 Kreidler Pastor  
 Kyl Paxon  
 LaFalce Payne (NJ)  
 Lambert Payne (VA)  
 Lancaster Pelosi  
 Lantos Penny  
 LaRocco Peterson (FL)  
 Laughlin Peterson (MN)  
 Lazio Petri  
 Leach Pickett  
 Lehman Pickle  
 Levin Pomo  
 Levy Pomeroy  
 Lewis (CA) Porter  
 Lewis (FL) Portman  
 Lewis (GA) Poshard  
 Lightfoot Price (NC)  
 Linder Pryce (OH)  
 Lipinski Quillen  
 Livingston Quinn  
 Lloyd Rahall  
 Long Ramstad  
 Lowey Rangel  
 Machtley Ravenel  
 Reed Upton  
 Mann Regula  
 Manton Reynolds  
 Manzullo Richardson  
 Margolies Ridge  
 Mezvinsky Roberts  
 Markey Roemer  
 Martinez Rogers  
 Matsui Rohrabacher  
 Mazzoli Ros-Lehtinen  
 McCandless Rose  
 McCloskey Rostenkowski  
 McCollum Roth  
 McCrery Roukema  
 McCurdy Rowland  
 McDermott Roybal-Allard  
 McHale Royce  
 McHugh Rush  
 McInnis Sabo  
 McKeon Sanders  
 McKinney Sangmeister  
 McMillan Santorum  
 McNulty Sarpalius  
 Meehan Sawyer  
 Meek Saxton  
 Menendez Schaefer  
 Meyers Schenk

Schiff  
 Schroeder  
 Schumer  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sharp  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Shepherd  
 Shuster  
 Sisisy  
 Skaggs  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Slattery  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (IA)  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (OR)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Snowe  
 Solomon  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Oxley  
 Strickland  
 Studds  
 Stump  
 Stupak  
 Sundquist  
 Swett  
 Swift  
 Synar  
 Talent  
 Tanner  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Tejeda  
 Thomas (CA)  
 Thomas (WY)  
 Thompson  
 Thornton  
 Thurman  
 Torkildsen  
 Torres  
 Torricelli  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Tucker  
 Underwood (GU)  
 Unsoeld  
 Reed  
 Valentine  
 Velazquez  
 Vento  
 Visclosky  
 Volkmer  
 Vucanovich  
 Walker  
 Walsh  
 Waters  
 Watt  
 Weldon  
 Wheat  
 Whitten  
 Williams  
 Wilson  
 Wise  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wyden  
 Wynn  
 Yates  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)  
 Zeliff  
 Zimmer

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Members will have 5 minutes on this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 326, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

AYES—103

Allard Gekas Orton  
 Archer Gingrich Paxon  
 Arney Goodlatte Penny  
 Bachus (AL) Grams Petri  
 Baker (CA) Greenwood Pombo  
 Baker (LA) Hall (TX) Quillen  
 Barcia Hancock Quinn  
 Bartlett Hastert Ravenel  
 Barton Hefley Roberts  
 Bliley Herger Rohrabacher  
 Boehner Holden Roth  
 Bonilla Hunter Royce  
 Bunning Hutchinson Sarpalius  
 Burton Hutto Sensenbrenner  
 Buyer Shuster  
 Callahan Inglis Skelton  
 Calvert Inhofe Smith (MI)  
 Canady Istook Smith (NJ)  
 Coble Johnson, Sam Smith (OR)  
 Collins (GA) King Smith (TX)  
 Combust Kingston Solomon  
 Condit Knollenberg Stearns  
 Cox Kyl Stenholm  
 Crane Laughlin Stump  
 Cunningham Levy Sundquist  
 DeLay Lewis (FL) Talent  
 Dickey Lightfoot Tanner  
 Doolittle Linder Tauzin  
 Dornan Livingston Taylor (MS)  
 Dreier Manzullo Taylor (NC)  
 Duncan McCandless Vucanovich  
 Emerson McCrery Walker  
 Everett McHugh Young (FL)  
 Ewing McKeon  
 Fields (TX) Moorhead

NOES—326

Abercrombie Clinger Foglietta  
 Ackerman Clyburn Ford (MI)  
 Andrews (ME) Coleman Ford (TN)  
 Andrews (NJ) Collins (IL) Fowler  
 Andrews (TX) Collins (MI) Frank (MA)  
 Applegate Cooper Franks (CT)  
 Bacchus (FL) Coppersmith Franks (NJ)  
 Baesler Costello Frost  
 Ballenger Coyne Furse  
 Barca Cramer Gallegly  
 Barlow Barlow Gallo  
 Barrett (NE) Barrett (WI) Danner  
 Barrett (WI) Darden  
 Bartlett Bateman de la Garza  
 Barton Danner de Lugo (VI)  
 Bateman Becerra de Lugo (VI)  
 Becerra Deal  
 Beilenson DeFazio  
 Bentley DeLauro Glickman  
 Bereuter Berman Dellums  
 Berman Bevil Derrick  
 Bevil Bilbray Deutsch  
 Bilbray Diaz-Balart  
 Billakis Bishop Dicks  
 Bishop Blackwell Dingell  
 Bentley Blute Dixon  
 Bentley Blute Dooley  
 Bereuter Bonior Dunn  
 Berman Bonior Durbin  
 Bevil Bilbray Edwards (CA)  
 Bilbray Diaz-Balart Edwards (TX)  
 Billakis Bishop Edwards (TX)  
 Bishop Blackwell Engel  
 Blackwell Blute English (AZ)  
 Blute Boehlert English (OK)  
 Bonior Bonior Eshoo  
 Borski Boucher Evans  
 Boucher Edwards (CA) Faleomavaega  
 Brewster Edwards (TX) (AS)  
 Brooks Engel Farr  
 Browder English (AZ) Fawell  
 Brown (CA) English (OK) Fazio  
 Brown (FL) Eshoo Fields (LA)  
 Brown (OH) Evans Filner  
 Bryant Faleomavaega Fingerhut  
 Byrne (AS) Hobson Houghton  
 Camp Farr Hochbrueckner  
 Cantwell Fawell Hoekstra  
 Cardin Fazio Hoke  
 Carr Fields (LA) Horn  
 Castle Filner Houghton  
 Chapman Fingerhut Hoyer  
 Clayton Fish Huffington  
 Clement Flake Hughes

□ 1339

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO). Four hundred and twenty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the

Inlee	Mineta	Schiff
Jacobs	Minge	Schroeder
Jefferson	Mink	Schumer
Johnson (CT)	Moakley	Scott
Johnson (GA)	Molinaro	Serrano
Johnson (SD)	Mollohan	Sharp
Johnson, E. B.	Montgomery	Shaw
Johnston	Moran	Shays
Kanjorski	Morella	Shepherd
Kaptur	Murphy	Sisisky
Kasich	Myers	Skaggs
Kennedy	Nadler	Skeen
Kennelly	Natcher	Slattery
Kildee	Neal (MA)	Slaughter
Kim	Neal (NC)	Smith (IA)
Kleczka	Norton (DC)	Snowe
Klein	Nussle	Spence
Klinsk	Oberstar	Spratt
Klug	Obey	Stokes
Kolbe	Olver	Strickland
Kopetski	Ortiz	Studds
Kreidler	Owens	Stupak
LaFalce	Oxley	Sweet
Lambert	Packard	Swift
Lancaster	Pallone	Synar
Lantos	Parker	Tejeda
LaRocco	Pastor	Thomas (CA)
Lazio	Payne (NJ)	Thomas (WY)
Leach	Payne (VA)	Thompson
Lehman	Pelosi	Thornton
Levin	Peterson (FL)	Thurman
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Torkildsen
Lewis (GA)	Pickett	Torres
Lipinski	Pickle	Torricelli
Lloyd	Pomeroy	Towns
Long	Porter	Trafiacant
Lowe	Portman	Tucker
Machtley	Poshard	Underwood (GU)
Maloney	Price (NC)	Unsoeld
Mann	Pryce (OH)	Upton
Manton	Rahall	Valentine
Margolies-	Ramstad	Velazquez
Mezvinsky	Rangel	Vento
Markey	Reed	Visclosky
Martinez	Regula	Voikmer
Matsui	Reynolds	Walsh
Mazzoli	Richardson	Waters
McCloskey	Ridge	Watt
McCollum	Roemer	Waxman
McCurdy	Rogers	Weldon
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Wheat
McHale	Rose	Whitten
McInnis	Rostenkowski	Williams
McKinney	Roukema	Wilson
McMillan	Rowland	Wise
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
Meehan	Rush	Woolsey
Meek	Sabo	Wyden
Menendez	Sanders	Wynn
Meyers	Sangmeister	Yates
Mfume	Santorum	Young (AK)
Mica	Sawyer	Zeliff
Michel	Saxton	Zimmer
Miller (CA)	Schaefer	
Miller (FL)	Schenk	

## NOT VOTING—9

Clay	McDade	Stark
Conyers	Murtha	Washington
Gephardt	Romero-Barcelo	
Green	(PR)	

□ 1349

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1350

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-264.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORNAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORNAN:

Page 2, line 14, strike "\$119,985,000" and insert "\$104,593,000".

Page 3, line 5, strike "\$130,573,000" and insert "\$107,491,000".

Page 5, line 17, strike "\$174,593,000" and insert "\$104,593,000".

Page 5, line 21, strike "\$177,491,000" and insert "\$107,491,000".

Page 6, line 3, strike "\$28,777,000" and insert "\$17,267,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

My amendment to H.R. 2351 is very simple. It would reduce by approximately 40 percent the authorized levels for the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and the Institute of Museum Services [IMS]. This 40-percent cut would force these three Federal programs to more efficiently and more carefully prioritize the money they give away. In real terms, these cuts would have only a minor impact on the function of these three programs. For example, instead of \$5,000 grants, there would be \$3,000 grants.

At a time when we are all trying to downsize, tighten belts, and share the pain, this reduction is reasonable and very necessary.

Over the next 10 years my amendment could save the taxpayers of our country about \$1.5 billion without a lethal decrease in the level of funding for cultural programs.

As everyone is aware, our Federal Government is suffering through a severe and growing financial crisis. It is up to us to bring some reason back to the spending patterns of this Congress. I believe that cutting 40 percent from these programs is one more step to help prioritize more effectively our national needs.

Notwithstanding the value of the arts, humanities and private museums in the United States, the Federal Government does not need to be subsidizing these activities at current levels. I must say that I am thankful for some of the work that has been the result of Federal subsidies to cultural programs, such as Ken Burns' brilliant Civil War series. However, in these times of our crushing fiscal crisis we must all reduce our demands on the Federal Government.

Furthermore, no one believes that the arts and humanities would crumble with a reasonable reduction in NEA, NEH or IMS funds. In fact, giving to the arts, humanities, and museums has never been greater. It's stunning how generous private benefactors have been.

According to the annual report on philanthropy, "Giving USA," the arts and humanities have seen an explosion

in giving in the last 10 years. In fact, the authors of this report wrote: "Not only did museums receive more gifts of art in 1991 than in previous years, many of the gifts were termed 'masterpieces'. Both the quantity and the quality of donated art soared." If we can't save some money when donations are soaring when will we ever save?

In fact, philanthropic giving to the arts, humanities and museums rose by \$500 million dollars from 1991 to 1992, bringing total private giving to \$9.32 billion. Obviously, with giving rising faster than inflation, the recession has not hit this vibrant area of our culture very hard.

By looking over the last 3 years, we also see huge sums of money changing hands in the art market. Van Gogh's "Portrait of Dr. Gachet" sold for \$82.5 million in 1990. In the same year, Renoir's "Au Moulin de la Gallette" sold for \$78.1 million. And just this year Van Gogh's "Wheatfields" was purchased for \$57 million. Combined, the sale price of these three paintings—\$217.6 million—totals far more than the amount we will be cutting next year from the NEH, NEA, and IMS.

In fact, since philanthropic giving is up so dramatically and the art market is so robust, there is no better time to wean the arts and humanities from their government subsidies.

Some may argue that we will be taking money away from education programs, but this is only a red herring to prevent credible deficit reduction. Last year, our citizens spent \$493 billion dollars on education, and philanthropic giving to education was \$14 billion. Our education goals will not be impacted in the least by a reduction in grants by 40 percent. Possibly this cut could give the affected agencies motivation to direct more of their resources toward the education of our youth instead of toward administration or debt reduction.

I am also confident that this 40-percent reduction will not have an adverse effect on the cultural institutions of our country. The Institute of Museum Services is a little known Federal agency. They exist in order to give money to museums throughout the country. This year they will give out over \$23 million to such struggling entities as the Metropolitan Museum of Art—where the endowment is valued at over \$550 million and their Matisse exhibit had record numbers of attendees. And why are middle class folks taxed to give money to the always popular Museum of Modern Art? These Federal funds will also go to the Tobacco Farm Life Museum, the Brick Store Museum, and the Latah County Historical Society. I know, and we all know, that we can reduce the amount of grants to these entities without major complaints from taxpayers.

Furthermore, in case Members have concerns, these IMS grants have nothing to do with our Federal commitment to our national museums and institutions such as the Smithsonian. Next year we will spend \$450 million supporting the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, the Commission of Fine Arts and other worthy cultural programs. That commitment can be justified because these institutions are charged with protecting our national treasures. The IMS, on the other hand, gives their money away exclusively to private sector museums who generally charge or can charge admission.

The National Endowment for the Humanities had excellent leadership under Lynn Cheney. However, the NEH must share the pain the rest of us are feeling, particularly when we consider where some of their money goes. In 1992, the NEH sent millions of dollars to Harvard, Princeton, and Yale. These three Ivy League institutions have a combined endowment of almost \$11 billion. In fact, Yale University is in the midst of a gigantic \$1.5 billion fundraising campaign. Maybe they could forego their taxpayer millions from the NEH and use some of their billions to finance what is now federally subsidized scholarship.

The National Endowment for the Arts, as always, is in a league of its own. Last year, the NEA gave out millions of taxpayer dollars for, catch this, deficit reduction, loan repayment, and the establishment of cash reserves. So the Federal Government goes deeper into debt, takes out loans to finance that debt, and depletes our cash reserves, while the NEA is throwing money around to private arts organizations to alleviate their debt, pay off their loans, and establish cash reserves for them. Can we afford this largesse? Not when we have a \$4 trillion—and growing—debt of our own to worry about. Let's clean up our own financial house before we try to pay off private sector debt. OK.

I believe this money would be best used reducing the Federal deficit. But if Members of Congress insist on spending this money, direct it toward the repair of our infrastructure, the defense of our Nation or allies, the reform of violence-prone children, or the search for a cancer or AIDS cure.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we need to attack our deficit with ferocity. As the renowned Russian writer Boris Pasternak said, "Art is unthinkable without risk and spiritual self-sacrifice." That's self-sacrifice on the artists' part, not the taxpayer's part. By weaning these private institutions from give-away subsidies of our Federal Government, we will be doing a favor to the taxpayers and the artists who complain about Federal control of Federal money.

I urge Members to vote for financial responsibility and real deficit reduction. Vote for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. HUNTER], where the artists were passing out \$10 bills. Under my amendment, they can pass out, as I have told my pal, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], a \$5 and a \$1, instead of a crisp \$10 bill to illegal aliens.

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

I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from California, BOB DORNAN, for giving me a chance to support very strongly his amendment and brag a little bit about a Western artist, Olaf Wieghorst, who, when he passed away 2 years ago, was considered the dean of western artists in America and one of the finest artists in the world.

I have brought Olaf Wieghorst's great rendition, entitled "His Wealth."

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

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the cameras to please come in for a closeup on that beautiful, obvious work of art.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, that is a show business background. I like that.

Let me say a word or two about Olaf Wieghorst. Olaf Wieghorst represented some of the things that we want to preserve in America. One of those values is the ethic of charitable giving.

If we tell our children, if we teach our children that charity is a job of government, that government should support artists, that it should give money away to people, then how are we going to teach our children that that ethic belongs to them and that their job is to be charitable and to be generous?

Any time anyone walked into Olaf Wieghorst's house, when he was 88 years old, he had been a cavalryman at the Big Ben. He had been a cowboy in the West, moved to San Diego in 1946 and became the highest priced artist, ultimately selling his paintings for a million dollars, any time anyone walked into Olaf Wieghorst's house, he would give them a lithograph, whether they were a plumber or a Congressman or somebody just visiting him. He believed in charity.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, how many grants did he get as a kid?

Mr. HUNTER. Olaf Wieghorst did not believe in government giving out hand-outs for any social service. He often said to me and other members of the community that that was bad and that giving away art was a province of the artist, that artists should be charitable. Government should not be involved in art.

Olaf Wieghorst went from being an artist, who had no skill at all, had no

lessons, to becoming one of the finest artists in the world.

Let us preserve the charitable ethic. Let us vote "yes" on the Dornan amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to some of my colleagues who wish to cut 40 percent off the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute of Museum Services which make grants to individuals and institutions throughout the country. I am not worried about the museums and the arts in some of the richer cities of America, but most of us do not come from the richer cities of America. We come from rural America. We come from mid-America. We come from the smaller cities of America.

I can recall, as a 5-year-old, going to the county seat, Hollister, CA, population 3,000. In the auditorium of the San Benito County High School there was a group of people dressed in tuxedos, as we would call them today. It happened to be a symphony. Its players played great, deeply moving music. This symphony was a project of the Works Progress Administration—the WPA.

□ 1400

It was the midst of the Depression and these talented men and women were supported by this Government to make the rounds and to change people's lives. They certainly changed my life. In high school I became a music major. I was going to devote my whole life to music. Although I did not do that, the joy of music and later the arts have enriched my life and the lives of those in my family.

If some of this discussion had occurred in the Privy Council to the Emperor of Austria in the late 1700's and the early 1800's, there would be no Beethoven, there would be no Mozart. They were subsidized by the governments of their time.

I urge my colleagues to support the continuation of this investment in the arts. This investment will help not simply the smaller museums, operas, symphonies, and theaters across this land. It will support the emerging individual artists and writers. I know the result will mean a new dimension in the lives of other 5-year-olds, other 85-year-olds and most in between.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my distinguished colleague from the city of my birth, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe we are spending this much time on this. The question to me is whether, after passing the largest tax increase in the history of this country, we should be telling our citizens that we are going to be giving away money to

support the arts. The question is whether, while we cut our military and place the Nation at risk, we should be financing fledgling painters and sculptors. The question is whether, while we search for a way to finance universal health care, we should be sponsoring film festivals, regardless of the contents.

Unlike some of my colleagues, I object to government expenditures on the arts not because I occasionally disagree with what is funded, and I do, but because we just cannot afford those expenditures right now. If the head of a family were to spend evenings at the symphony or at the theater while his children went hungry and the roof needed repair, we would label that behavior an outrage, but we do that as a country every day. It is wrong, and we can stop it by cutting the National Endowment for the Arts.

We cannot adequately fund programs to combat breast cancer, and we should not be funding this. Support the so-called Dornan amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2351, extending the authorizations for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 and in strong opposition to the Dornan amendment that would cut these programs severely. It should not be enough to be a lover of the arts, as I am, and as I know many of my colleagues are. If we are Members of Congress and we love the arts, the very least we can do is to support this modest appropriation.

Governments have always been patrons of the arts, from the times of emperors and kings to the rise of democratic republics today. Indeed, it is the mark of a civilized society that its government is a patron of the arts. The reason governments have supported the arts, in no small part, is because the arts are not self-supporting. If government falls away from the arts, we have art for the rich and often only the rich. This is perhaps the primary reason to support NEA, which has been a prime mover in carrying the arts to grass-roots communities, stimulating artists everywhere, and creating arts audiences throughout the country.

The concern about government censorship and location to some and not others betrays a misunderstanding of the selection process. Government does not choose the recipients of arts funding. Artists choose other artists. This is peer review at its best.

Further, it was suggested earlier in the debate that the District gets more arts funding than several of the States put together. That is quite simply because the District hustles. There are

not set-asides in the arts. Artists must be entrepreneurial to survive. They must not only be talented. They must be energetic and submit proposals and more proposals until they are successful. Energy and merit decide arts and humanities grants, not geography.

Mr. Chairman, it should be unthinkable in this economic climate to cut the funds for the already underfunded and hard hit arts and humanities. When this bill emerges from conference, a cut somewhere between 2½ and 5 percent will be incorporated, reflecting cuts in both the House and the Senate. Enough in this case is more than enough.

The economy of the 1990's has been especially cruel to the arts. The arts not only suffer severely during economic downturns; most live close to the line even when the economy has been good to the rest of us. At times like these, the arts need more support—not less.

Before the National Endowment for the Arts was established in 1965, there was only one great arts center—New York City. Washington, DC, despite its status as the Capital City, was not on any map of the arts. The NEA and the other arts agencies have helped create competition to New York by stimulating the arts even in small places on a grand national scale and by stimulating large, new audiences for the arts. Today, ground-breaking exhibits, plays and operas are as likely to come from Washington—or Texas—as they are to come from New York.

Most important, NEA funding knows no preferences. Brand new experimental groups successfully compete with well-known theaters for funding. I can't vouch for all of our appropriations, but NEA grants look a lot like America.

The arts and the humanities don't need lip service. They need their government to join the private sector as a patron of the arts. Please support the arts and the humanities. Vote for H.R. 2351.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Chair how much time remains on my side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter before me on behalf of the 250,000-member National Taxpayers Union, NTU. They say, "Dear Representative Dornan: On behalf of the 250,000 member National Taxpayers Union [NTU], I am pleased to offer our endorsement of your amendment to reduce the funding levels of the three organizations, NEA, NEH, and IMS.

"While NTU believes serious consideration should be given toward abolishing these agencies entirely," and we have just passed that point, "your

amendment will certainly put the NEA, NEH, and IMS on the right track to fiscal reality. In an age of budget deficits approaching \$300 billion and a national debt racing past \$4.2 trillion, taxpayers expect and deserve firm leadership and resolve on the part of Congress to cut unnecessary Federal spending."

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single Member in this Chamber who would not claim to be a patron of the arts, a lover of the arts. But we are talking about fiscal responsibility here. I can think of no finer work of art than a balanced budget.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I first want to set the record straight. Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] said, somewhat facetiously, that some of the money we save we can give to those immigrants in San Diego.

Mr. DORNAN. They are already getting it.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. They are not already getting it. That is why I want to set the record straight.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to understand that under this legislation, they cannot give money away to illegal immigrants. In that case, the money was disallowed. I want to point out, however, the financial situation here. This is not an appropriation bill, it is an authorization. The authorization bill this year was cut 5 percent from the previous year. This authorization level is at \$174 million, the actual NEA amount for 1993, and it is frozen for the next 2 years, so this represents an authorization level that is a 2-year freeze.

In that sense, including the 5-percent cut that we have already incurred, this does represent fiscal responsibility.

I also want to say that I do not think we really want to cut or increase admission for schoolchildren, the poor, and middle class, and deny them access to these wonderful valued programs.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds, because my good colleague, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA] may not be aware of this.

What the NEA did was, they sent a notice to these three phony artists in California that had already given away most of the money, crisp \$10 bills to some illegal aliens. Not all illegal aliens, but some. Under my bill, I repeat, the NEA could still give them a \$5 bill and a \$1 bill.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I do not want to give them anything. I do not want to give them anything, and they cannot, under this legislation.

Mr. DORNAN. I don't want to give them anything either. But in this case

there was phony bookkeeping by the NEA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] and his amendment to reduce the authorization of the National Endowment for the Arts.

My support for this amendment comes from a desire to have some fiscal responsibility injected into the programs we fund in this House.

We must concentrate our resources on what is absolutely necessary, imperative and essential and not on what is simply desirable. Is it absolutely necessary to continue to fund a program run with taxpayer dollars which supports material that I cannot show on the House floor, because according to House rules it offends the decorum of the House? Think of that, the Federal Government sponsors material that it cannot show in the peoples' House. But at the very same time this House continually underfunds breast and cervical cancer research.

In 1992, \$9.32 billion was spent by the private sector on the promotion, funding, and advancement of the arts and I believe a 40-percent cut in this program's authorization will be a victory for fiscal responsibility. It would give credence to our rhetoric to cut spending and hope to the folks back home that this Congress can make the votes to reduce the deficit.

We need to eliminate or reduce those programs that are not necessary, imperative and essential. Vote "yes" for the Dornan amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to restate what I said this morning. I hope my colleagues will hear me.

In the Federal budget we spend \$10 million more a year on military bands that are stationed right here in Washington than we do in every nook and cranny of the United States through the National Endowment for the Arts. If we are going to cut something, for heaven's sake, cut something that benefits fewer people than this very small amount that we do to try to uplift the spirits and to reach the people who are gifted and talented, and humanize the life in the United States.

Better we should cut the bands than we should cut the programs for schoolchildren in rural areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

All over America, local artists and local arts groups rely on the National Endowment for the Arts for essential support. In my district, these groups are struggling for survival and I know that is true across the Nation.

No one has ever questioned the work of these groups. They have enriched our community and the quality of life.

But this amendment will put many of them out of business. It will shut down deserving arts organizations all over this Nation, and it will do real damage to the cultural vitality of our Nation.

But that is not all. Abolishing the NEA would do damage to our local schools who rely on the endowment to expand arts education in difficult financial times.

This amendment would end that also. It would take funds out of our schools and away from our children.

And finally, this amendment would also undermine the economy of many areas of this country.

Just last week the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey released a study on the economic impact arts activities have on the New York economy. The findings are dramatic.

While the economy of the New York metropolitan region has suffered, one sector of the regional economy has grown—the arts.

Indeed, the arts directly employ over 40,000 people, and pump at least \$9.8 billion a year into the economy of the New York area.

An amendment to cut the NEA is an amendment to undermine an important growth area in our economy. The arts are a lifeline not just for the creativity of many New Yorkers, but also a lifeline for the economy of our region.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that any amendment that will harm our Nation's schools, damage our cultural heritage, and damage local economies, at the same time, does not deserve the support of this House.

□ 1410

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I inquire of the Chair the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] has expired, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of closing, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], and the gentleman from California can reserve that time to close debate.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank my colleague. He is a scholar and a gentleman as always.

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

My colleagues, let us understand now what this amendment does. This 40-percent cut cuts museums in America,

Federal funding for museums in America by 40 percent. It cuts the National Endowment for the Humanities and your State humanities councils would receive perhaps cuts of up to 50 percent if this amendment is passed. And, of course, it also cuts the National Endowment for the Arts, the agency that I think this amendment is really aimed at.

So let me speak to the arts part of this. Some believe that Federal support for the arts is not necessary because the arts are thriving, they are doing very well.

In the past 5 years, two dozen national theaters of acclaim have closed their doors because of financial difficulties. The New Theater of Brooklyn, the Actors Theater of St. Paul, the Academy Theater of Atlanta all have been forced to shut down, and 182 different theater companies in this country are running deficits and have had them more than double in just the past year. Touring companies have dropped by 40 percent in just the past 24 months. Cutting NEA will only accelerate that. Museums, such as the Detroit Institute of Arts, can only open half of their galleries at a time, and the others, such as the great Metropolitan Museum in New York City, have reduced hours for much of their exhibits. More than one-third of the museums in this country are running deficits, and the gentleman from California's amendment would make it worse.

Six of the Nation's preeminent dance companies, including the Geoffrey Ballet, Dance Theater of Harlem, and the North Carolina Dance Theater came very close to collapse recently, and the gentleman's amendment could make it worse.

I urge my colleagues, do not vote for this 40-percent cut for your museums, for the humanities, for the arts in your States. Reject the Dornan amendment. Vote "no."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Chairman, let me take 15 seconds to point up an act of courtesy that has become rare in this House but used to be standard comity and decency here. To use Chairman WILLIAMS' own words, in my exuberance, and because it is my amendment, I ate up my time and speakers. But his act of generosity in giving me the opportunity to close using a minute of his time is an example that I hope will be followed in this Chamber. PATRICK, I thank you sincerely.

I will close with this rebuttal to his last point. People who are sure of their positions are able to be generous and I know Mr. WILLIAMS is sure of his position. The Federal funding to nonprofit theaters is only 2.6 percent of all money used by nonprofit theaters. My amendment cuts 40 percent of 2.6 percent only. When I look at this pie chart

in this aforementioned "Giving USA" report on philanthropy, every other area that we draw from, the 96.4 percent, is absolutely going up, up, up. Corporations, foundations, individuals kick in almost 9 percent, single tickets, and subscriptions. The arts are doing all right. But we must be fiscally responsible here in this Chamber.

Again I thank the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for his generosity.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself that remaining time.

I would just again urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Dornan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take a few seconds to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for his kindness toward me, not only in this debate, but in the very rancorous debate and difficult debate of 3 years ago. Mr. DORNAN was a gentleman throughout. We disagreed, but he was very kind to me personally, and I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

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

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 151, noes 281, not voting 6, as follows:

(Roll No. 501)

AYES—151

Allard	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Doolittle	Kasich
Army	Dornan	Kim
Bachus (AL)	Dreier	King
Baker (CA)	Duncan	Kingston
Baker (LA)	Emerson	Knollenberg
Ballenger	Everett	Kyl
Barcia	Ewing	Laughlin
Barrett (NE)	Fields (TX)	Levy
Bartlett	Gallegly	Lewis (FL)
Barton	Gekas	Lipfoot
Bevill	Geren	Linder
Billirakis	Gilchrest	Lipinski
Bliley	Gillmor	Livingston
Boehner	Gingrich	Manzullo
Bonilla	Goodlatte	McCandless
Browder	Goodling	McCollum
Brown (OH)	Goss	McCrery
Bunning	Grams	McHugh
Burton	Greenwood	McHarris
Buyer	Hall (TX)	McKeon
Callahan	Hancock	Mica
Calvert	Hansen	Michel
Canady	Hastert	Miller (FL)
Chapman	Hayes	Molinar
Coble	Hefley	Moorhead
Collins (GA)	Hergert	Myers
Combest	Hobson	Nussle
Condit	Hoke	Oxley
Cooper	Holden	Paxon
Cox	Huffington	Petri
Cramer	Hunter	Pombo
Crane	Hutchinson	Porter
Crapo	Hutto	Portman
Cunningham	Hyde	Poshard
Deal	Inglis	Pryce (OH)
DeLay	Inhofe	Quillen
Diaz-Balart	Istook	Quinn

Ravenel	Smith (NJ)	Taylor (MS)
Roberts	Smith (OR)	Taylor (NC)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Thomas (WY)
Ros-Lehtinen	Snowe	Visclosky
Roth	Solomon	Vucanovich
Rowland	Spence	Walker
Royce	Stearns	Weldon
Sarpalius	Stenholm	Wolf
Schaefer	Stump	Young (AK)
Sensenbrenner	Sundquist	Young (FL)
Shuster	Talent	Zimmer
Skelton	Tanner	
Smith (MI)	Tauzin	

## NOES—281

Abercrombie	Foglietta	McDermott
Ackerman	Ford (MI)	McHale
Andrews (ME)	Ford (TN)	McKinney
Andrews (NJ)	Fowler	McMillan
Andrews (TX)	Frank (MA)	McNulty
Applegate	Franks (CT)	Meehan
Bacchus (FL)	Franks (NJ)	Meek
Baesler	Frost	Menendez
Barca	Furse	Meyers
Barlow	Gallo	Mfume
Barrett (WI)	Gejdenson	Miller (CA)
Bateman	Gibbons	Mineta
Becerra	Gilman	Minge
Beilenson	Glickman	Mink
Bentley	Gonzalez	Moakley
Bereuter	Gordon	Mollohan
Berman	Grandy	Montgomery
Bibray	Gunderson	Moran
Bishop	Gutierrez	Morella
Blackwell	Hall (OH)	Murphy
Blute	Hamburg	Nadler
Boehlert	Hamilton	Natcher
Bonior	Harman	Neal (MA)
Borski	Hastings	Neal (NC)
Boucher	Hefner	Norton (DC)
Brewster	Hilliard	Oberstar
Brooks	Hinchev	Obey
Brown (CA)	Hoagland	Olver
Brown (FL)	Hochbrueckner	Ortiz
Bryant	Hoekstra	Orton
Byrne	Horn	Owens
Camp	Houghton	Packard
Cantwell	Hoyer	Pallone
Cardin	Hughes	Parker
Carr	Inslee	Pastor
Castle	Jacobs	Payne (NJ)
Clay	Jefferson	Payne (VA)
Clayton	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Clement	Johnson (GA)	Penny
Clinger	Johnson (SD)	Peterson (FL)
Clyburn	Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (MN)
Coleman	Johnston	Pickett
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Pickle
Collins (MI)	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kennedy	Price (NC)
Coppersmith	Kennelly	Rahall
Costello	Kildee	Ramstad
Coyne	Kleczka	Rangel
Danner	Klein	Reed
Darden	Klink	Regula
de la Garza	Klug	Reynolds
de Lugo (VI)	Kolbe	Richardson
DeFazio	Kopetski	Ridge
DeLauro	Kreidler	Roemer
Dellums	LaFalce	Rogers
Derrick	Lambert	Rose
Deutsch	Lancaster	Rostenkowski
Dicks	Lantos	Roukema
Dingell	LaRocco	Roybal-Allard
Dixon	Lazio	Rush
Dooley	Leach	Sabo
Dunn	Lehman	Sanders
Durbin	Levin	Sangmeister
Edwards (CA)	Lewis (CA)	Santorum
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Engel	Lloyd	Saxton
English (AZ)	Long	Schenk
English (OK)	Lowey	Schiff
Eshoo	Machtley	Schroeder
Evans	Maloney	Schumer
Faleomavaega	Mann	Scott
(AS)	Manton	Serrano
Farr	Margolies	Sharp
Fawell	Mezvinsky	Shaw
Fazio	Markey	Shays
Fields (LA)	Martinez	Shepherd
Filner	Matsui	Sisisky
Fingerhut	Mazzoli	Skaggs
Fish	McCloskey	Skeen
Flake	McCurdy	Slattery

Slaughter	Thurman	Waters
Smith (IA)	Torkildsen	Watt
Spratt	Torres	Waxman
Stark	Torricelli	Wheat
Stokes	Towns	Whitten
Strickland	Trafiacant	Williams
Studds	Tucker	Wilson
Stupak	Underwood (GU)	Wise
Swett	Unsoeld	Woolsey
Swift	Upton	Wyden
Synar	Valentine	Wynn
Tejeda	Velazquez	Yates
Thomas (CA)	Vento	Zeliff
Thompson	Volkmer	
Thornton	Walsh	

## NOT VOTING—6

Gephardt	Murtha	Washington
Green	Romero-Barcelo	
McDade	(PR)	

□ 1436

Mr. STRICKLAND changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3, printed in House Report 103-264.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GUNDERSON

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, under the rule, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUNDERSON: Page 2, after line 6, insert the following:

(a) MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Section 5(g) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 954(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4)(C)—

(A) by inserting "(i)" after "(C)", and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(ii) Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, the amount allotted to a State for the current fiscal year under this subsection may not be greater than the amount so allotted to such State for the preceding fiscal year if—

"(I) the amount of State funds to be expended for such current fiscal year to carry out this subsection is less than the average annual amount expended by such State during the most recent preceding period of 3 fiscal years to carry out this subsection; and

"(II) the rate of the reduction in the amount of State funds exceeds the rate of reduction in the aggregate of all general fund expenditures to be made by the State in such current fiscal year.", and

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) by striking "(5) All" and inserting "(5)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), all", and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) All amounts allotted under paragraph (3) that are not made available to a State as a result of the operation of subsection (g)(4)(C)(ii) shall be allotted to the remaining States in equal amounts."

Page 2, line 7, strike "(a)" and insert "(b)".

Page 3, line 8, strike "(b)" and insert "(c)".

Page 4, line 24, strike "(c)" and insert "(d)".

Page 5, line 11 strike "(d)" and insert "(e)".

Page 5, after line 22, insert the following:

(f) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 1995, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall—

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] will be recognized for 10 minutes and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, in order to make sure that I do not use too much time, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this will be a long, drawn-out process. I think we have worked out the details of this amendment so that it can be accepted. It is not controversial.

Let me begin by thanking the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], for working with me in cosponsoring this amendment, because I think it articulates on a bipartisan basis exactly what we are trying to do.

Many of you will recall that in the last reauthorization we struggled to deal with the controversies. We did that by doing two things, one of which was to reform the grants process. The second was to literally increase the amount of money which went back to the States from 20 to 27½ percent.

□ 1440

When we held the hearings on the reauthorization, and I am committed to a simple extension to give Miss Alexander every opportunity to look at the agency and its programs before we do a more substantive reauthorization in a couple of years, I was alarmed to discover, however, that a significant number of States had decreased State support for the arts at the very time that the Federal Government, through this increased return of money to the States, had increased our Federal allocations.

Let me give my colleagues an example:

In 1991, Mr. Chairman, the NEA basic grants to the States increased by almost 25 percent, from \$21½ million to \$26.2 million, and yet 24 of the 50 States reduced their funding from the previous year. In 1993, despite the NEA basic grants increasing by 5 percent, 35 of the 50 States cut funding for the arts. Recognizing that this was happening, although we thought it was not the intent of our last reauthorization, we felt it would be important that we would simply put into this legislation the simple reauthorization; frankly, a clarification, that if a State cuts their support, funding for the arts, they are not going to receive an increase in Federal funding in the next year.

We are trying to send the signal: "You can't supplant State funds with Federal funds" and we are, frankly, trying to send the opportunity for our State art commissions to leverage to the maximum degree possible their State funding.

Mr. Chairman, we think this amendment accomplishes all of that without any kind of negative harm.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I'm offering has a very simple and straightforward objective. I do not think that the Federal Government, through the NEA, should be increasing its contribution to State arts programs when there is evidence that the States themselves are cutting back on their own commitment to the arts. Consistent with this view, the amendment which I am offering says that the NEA will not increase its direct grant to any State which has decreased its own funding for the arts from a 3-year average base level.

Mr. Chairman, I have worked with the Democratic side of the Committee on Education and Labor, as well as with the administration, to insure that this amendment is as fair as it can possibly be, and that it does not punish States which have had to reduce their arts funding as part of overall budget cuts.

I would point out to my colleagues that when Congress reauthorized the NEA in 1990 I was sponsor of efforts to increase the percentage of NEA funds going directly to the States. We increased the basic State grant from 20 to 27.5 percent of the NEA's budget, and made other changes which directed an additional 7.5 percent of NEA funds to rural and underserved State programs. I am a proponent, not an opponent, of Federal support for State arts programs.

It was not my intention in 1990 or today, however, nor was it the Committee on Education and Labor's intention, that these additional Federal funds should be used to supplant existing State funding. In fact, the 1990 Reauthorization Act specifically prohibited States from using these additional Federal dollars to offset reductions in their own funding for the arts.

Nonetheless, there is good reason to at least suspect that this is in fact occurring. Back in June, during a hearing on this reauthorization, I heard testimony which suggested that the increased NEA funding going directly to States and rural communities as a result of my efforts in 1990 was, among other things, compensating for reductions in arts funding at the State level. I asked my staff to look further into the trend in State funding for arts programs as compared to the trend in Federal support for those State programs. While the data is not conclusive, it certainly substantiated my initial concerns.

In the last 3 fiscal years, 24, 36, and 35 States and territories of the United States have reduced their own funding for State arts programs by an average of better than 12 percent. During the same period, Federal grants to States for the arts have increased from a 1990 base of \$21.5 to \$27.3 million—a 30 percent increase.

Let me present some statistics which give evidence of the problem.

In fiscal year 1991, 24 of the 50 States and territories reduced arts funding from the previous year's level. One State cut spending by more than 50 percent. Thirteen States cut spending by more than 25 percent. Overall, spending for the arts was reduced by 10.5 percent. Among the 24 States which cut arts funding, the average reduction was 16 percent.

At the same time, NEA basic grants to States increased by almost 25 percent, from \$21.5 million to \$26.2 million.

In fiscal year 1992, 36 of the 50 States and territories cut funding for the arts from the fiscal year 1991 level. Five States cut spending by more than 50 percent. Eleven States cut spending by more than 25 percent. Overall, spending for the arts was reduced by 21.6 percent. Among the 36 States which cut funding the average reduction was 18.5 percent.

NEA basic grants to States decreased by barely 1 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, 35 of the 50 States cut funding for the arts. Two States cut spending by more than 25 percent. Eight States cut spending by more than 15 percent. Overall, spending for the arts increased by about 1 percent. However, discounting the fact that one State—Michigan—increased its funding by \$13.5 million, the overall spending declined by more than 6 percent. Among the 35 States which cut spending, the average reduction was 8 percent.

NEA basic grants increased by 5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you just a few examples of what is happening.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA gave Florida \$575,000, a 20-percent increase over the State's fiscal year 1990 grant, and Florida cut its own funding for the arts by 29 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, Florida's basic grant increased again by 3.5 percent and State art funding declined again, by 16 percent.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA gave Alaska \$435,000, a 25-percent increase over the State's fiscal year 1990 grant, and Alaska cut its own State funding for the arts by 16.5 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, Alaska's basic grant increased again by 5.5 percent, and State art funding declined again by 10.5 percent.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA gave California \$766,000, a 13-percent increase over the State's fiscal year 1990 grant, and California cuts State spending for the arts by 5.5 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, California's basic grant increased again by 4 percent, and State art funding declined by 15.5 percent.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA increased Illinois' State grant by almost 20 percent, to \$558,000. Illinois cut State funding for the arts by almost 15 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, Illinois' basic grant again increased by 4.5 percent, and State art funding declined again by 21.2 percent.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA increased Maryland's State grant by almost 25 percent, to \$482,000. Maryland cut State funding for the arts by 14 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, Maryland's basic State grant again increased by 5.6 percent, and State art funding declined again by 31.1 percent.

In fiscal year 1992: NEA increased Pennsylvania's State grant by about 20 percent, to \$563,000 from fiscal year 1990 to fiscal year 1992. Pennsylvania cut arts funding in fiscal year 1992 by 16.5 percent.

In fiscal year 1993, Pennsylvania's basic State grant again increased by 4.5 percent, and State art funding declined again by 7.25 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a targeted list. It is, rather, representative of what is happening in a majority of States.

I understand that State budgets have been under extreme pressure over the last several years, and I am not intent on punishing States for having made difficult budget decisions. In order to make that perfectly clear to the committee, I have revised the amendment which I introduced initially so that a State's basic grant would only be capped in cases where cuts in a State's arts programs were disproportionate to cuts made in other nonmandatory programs.

Thus, a State which made an across the board cut in nonmandatory programs would not, I repeat not, be affected by this amendment. A State would only be affected if it were to cut nonmandatory spending over a 3-year period by an average of 5 percent, for example, while cutting arts funding over the same period by 15 percent that it would be penalized.

I would point out further Mr. Chairman that my amendment will not—barring an overall cut in the NEA budget—cut Federal arts grants to any State. It only says that we will not increase the Federal grant to any State which had disproportionately cut its own arts budget.

I do not think this is either inappropriate or punitive given the budget crunch we are trying to deal with. I am pleased to say that the administration agrees with me on this. I have been called personally by the Acting Chair of the NEA, Anna Steele, and she has told me that neither the NEA nor the administration objects to this amendment.

The Federal budget is under no less pressure than the States' budgets, Mr. Chairman, and we are being asked to make decisions about priorities that are no less painful than those being made in statehouses. We should not, under the circumstances, ask the Federal Government to make sacrifices in order to increase funding for State art programs when there is evidence that the States themselves are not willing to make the same sacrifice and demonstrate the same commitment to the arts.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be granted the 10 minutes on our side although we are not in opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], the cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the reauthorization of the Federal cultural agencies which have changed the cultural landscape of this Nation. The National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities and the Institute of Museum Services—and the organizations and programs which they aid—are clearly deserving of our continued support.

Arts groups in our communities battle formidable economic challenges yet manage to reach out to every segment of the population. Their work, day in

and day out, is in reaching children through arts education, fostering better understanding in our communities, and playing an important role in the vitality of our local economies.

That is why these arts groups should be seeing greater public support. To this end, I rise in support of this amendment to the Arts, Humanities, and Museums Amendments of 1993. Let me begin by commending subcommittee Chairman PAT WILLIAMS for his expert leadership on arts issues throughout the years and for this opportunity to remedy what I believe is an unintended situation.

Mr. Chairman, we must enhance support for local arts groups and programs and not have a situation where Federal funds are being used as a substitute for State spending. That principle is clearly articulated in the current statute for the Federal arts agencies and is something in which I strongly believe with regard to a variety of Federal Government programs.

What we have seen at the State level, however, are reductions in legislative appropriations to the arts. Most recently, in fiscal year 1993, 35 of the 50 States cut funding for the arts, with 8 of these States reducing funding by more than 15 percent. For fiscal year 1992, 36 of the States and territories reduced arts spending from the previous year's level. In that year, 11 of the States that reduced this funding did so by more than 25 percent.

Of course, a number of factors go into these decisions at the State level, and this amendment takes this reality into account. Under this amendment, no State will see a reduction in their current NEA State grant. Only those States which have singled out the arts for a disproportionately high reduction over the average of 3 years will have their current level frozen. The amendment also asks that the basic State grant be frozen only if the State reduces arts funding by a percentage significantly larger than those cuts made in other nonmandatory State programs.

Mr. Chairman, the people who ultimately suffer when Federal funds are used to supplant State funds are those nonprofit theaters and music groups, arts education programs aimed at children, and individual artists who should be seeing greater financial support. Instead, in many States, arts funding has been targeted for unfair cuts. This amendment directs the NEA to study State compliance with current law and to report to Congress before the next reauthorization. Hopefully, this will help us to truly provide increased assistance to the arts groups and programs which desperately need any bit of help we can give them.

Arts programs in our communities are simply too important to our Nation's economic success and our children's education to be treated as a low

priority. These arts groups and programs need what should be additional Federal funds to bring the richness of the arts to every part of the community. The arts not only teach our children—and, really, all our citizens—to appreciate beauty, or how to dance or to sing or to paint. The arts magically instruct us in better understanding ourselves and each other and in imagining worlds which are beyond our direct experience. For children who are increasingly exposed to violence, drugs, and other harsh realities, the arts can keep kids in school and give them a pride in themselves which can steer them away from self-destruction. That is a resource which we must commit ourselves to supporting. And, we have the means to that support in front of us today, in the continued authorization of the Federal cultural agencies.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the authors of this amendment.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] first raised it in committee, Mr. Chairman, we rather reserved judgment on it. However, he really did point up a potential problem here and unintended actions on the part of the States and I am just pleased that our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER], has joined him in this position, and I want to congratulate them.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an excellent resolution of a problem. Between now and the 2-year authorization that will be coming along we can examine the facts and determine if indeed a problem exists. For this we shall be looking to the NEA Chair for advice and counsel.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] for yielding this time to me and for his leadership on this very important issue. I rise in strong support for the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA supports artistic excellence and expanded opportunities for all Americans to experience and participate in the arts. I am so pleased that this body earlier today rejected the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN]. I rise to join my colleagues, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], in support of their amendment.

I just want to tell one little anecdote from my district, Mr. Chairman. I recently had my neighborhood meeting

in one of the poorer sections of my district where jobs and the lack of opportunities were the prevailing concerns, crises as well. Some of the women in the room, the mothers in the room, made certain that they rose to speak when they were recognized to say:

With all that we are talking about, about jobs, and crime, and health care and the litany of concerns that we have in our country, please remember, Congresswoman PELOSI, to make sure that in the Congress you provide for arts in the schools for our children.

Mr. Chairman, the arts are very important to our spiritual lives and to the enrichment of our young people in our country. In that spirit I rise to support this reauthorization for the National Endowment for the Arts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Endowment for the Arts. The NEA supports artistic excellence and expanded opportunities for all Americans to experience and participate in the arts.

Most Endowment grants must be matched by nonfederal funds—from 1:1 to 1:4—and therefore leverage significant other funds. For example, in 1992, the NEA awarded \$123 million to 3,500 organizations. This resulted in an estimated \$1.4 billion in matching funds or 10 times as much as the NEA awards. This is a good Federal program. Creativity is one of our Nation's most important resources. Investing in arts organizations creates jobs and improves the quality of American lives. Investing in arts education allows many children and adults access to learning that would not otherwise be possible. The NEA stimulates private and public sector giving which further creates jobs and opportunities for learning.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the Crane and Dornan amendments and support the NEA.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that my committee is in support of what the gentleman has crafted here, and we appreciate his leadership in trying to correct a situation. The gentleman from Wisconsin, I think primarily, believes that States may be supplementing their Federal funding for the arts by cutting State funding. I am in support of the amendment, but, as the gentleman knows, I really question whether there is that cause and effect relationship between increased Federal arts support to the States and State arts funding cutbacks. During the last 3 years State cutbacks in the arts have totaled \$77 million. During that same time States only received an increase of \$16 million with Federal money. So, I am not sure the States are really supplementing or making these cuts because they are getting increased Federal dollars, but, nonetheless, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] is trying to correct what he sees as a potential inequity, and he is trying to encourage appropriate funding for the arts at both the Federal and State level, and so we support him in that effort.

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Before yielding back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to my colleagues that the administration, I believe, supports this amendment, and I want to commend the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and his staff for working with us through subcommittee, through full committee, and here on the floor to reach out for details that we could all agree on.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1450

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2351) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, and the Museum Services Act, pursuant to House Resolution 264, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. CUNNINGHAM

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of California moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 2351) to the Committee on Education and Labor, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 2, after line 3, insert the following (and redesignate succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 2. LIMITATION ON DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE NOT LAWFULLY IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 3 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 952) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) With respect to fiscal years 1994 and 1995, the term ‘individual not lawfully in the United States’ means an individual who is not a United States citizen, a national of the United States, a permanent resident alien, an asylee, a refugee, a parolee, or a non-immigrant in status.”

(b) NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS.—Section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 954) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking “and” at the end,

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3), and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) none of the financial assistance available under this section for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 will be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States; and”

(2) in subsection (g)(2)(B)—

(A)(i) by inserting “(i)” after “(B)”, and

(ii) by inserting “and” at the end, and

(B) by inserting after clause (i), as so designated by subparagraph (A), the following:

“(ii) provides an assurance that none of the financial assistance received under this subsection for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 will be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States;”, and

(1) in subsection (i)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively, and

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

“(3) an assurance that none of the financial assistance received under this subsection for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 will be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States.”

(c) NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES.—Section 7 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 956) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by inserting “(1)” after “(e)”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) None of the financial assistance available under this section for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995 shall be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States.”

(2) in subsection (f)(5)(C)—

(A) by inserting “(i)” after “(C)”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(i) As a condition of receiving funds made available under this subsection for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995, each recipient of such funds shall provide to the Chairperson an assurance that none of such funds will be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States.”

(3) in subsection (h) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) As a condition of receiving funds made available under this subsection for fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995, each recipient of such funds shall provide to the Chairperson an assurance that none of such funds will be used to provide financial assistance to an individual who is not lawfully in the United States.”

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions because a simple extension of existing law fails to address the many serious problems with the NEA that continue to resurface.

Mr. Speaker, this motion contains instructions to limit distribution of NEA funds for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 that would provide financial assistance to illegal aliens. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] has stated that the rules prevent under the NEA and doctrine of issuing those dollars. And, to the credit of the NEA, they have withdrawn support for the problem that we had in San Diego.

The rules under which the NEA operates can be codified by this House by this motion to recommit, which prohibits those dollars from going to illegal aliens, directly or indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], that the reason I offer this motion is this was not the first case in San Diego. This is the fifth case of NEA dollars being directed toward illegal immigrants.

There are two agendas here. One is the illegal immigration agenda, which does not do the NEA benefit and does not do the taxpayers benefit. This summer in San Diego, some self-proclaimed artists received a \$5,000 grant from the Museum of Contemporary Art in San Diego that was partially funded by the NEA, and used it to hand out crisp \$10 bills to illegal aliens. And they call this art.

Mr. Speaker, giving our tax dollars to people who have broken the law by entering this country illegally is not acceptable. The NEA retroactively withdraw money so there was no Federal tax dollars used. But each year the same issue resurfaces.

Mr. Speaker, I would repeat to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] that it does not do the NEA any good to have to fight this particular issue, nor does it do the American taxpayers any good.

There are many worthwhile projects that are funded through the National Endowment for the Arts. That is not the question.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I came very close this time to supporting his opinion and not voting to cut the National Endowment for the Arts. There are many worthwhile programs funded by the NEA. As a matter of fact, I have per-

sonally given to local arts organizations in San Diego.

But as we must do with all government programs, we must make agencies accountable for the dollars they distribute. Part of that process is to make sure that precious taxpayer dollars do not go to funding those who did not contribute them in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, we are sending the wrong message, by constantly allowing these problems to interfere with nationally funded art. It does not do the NEA service, and I would hope that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] would support this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close and say that the National Endowment for the Arts does do some good work. In my own district, Escondido has a new performing arts center. We have the renowned San Diego Symphony. I have given money to both of these privately. But that is far different from handling out Federal dollars to illegal aliens and calling it art.

I am not a lost cause for the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] and I have hope for the future.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does a Member wish to be heard in opposition to the motion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. Speaker, I know this seems straightforward, but it really seems to me that it could create some unintended consequences. Let me give an example.

The gentleman's amendment does not allow any financial assistance to go to illegal immigrants. Of course, the NEA's guidelines, and I think I called them regulations a while back, but their guidelines prohibit that as well. So he simply wants to codify it.

The problem is that the way the gentleman's motion to recommit is written, it says that no financial assistance can go. Let us just take one example. Many touring companies, for example, some symphonies and other performing arts centers, use part of an NEA grant to provide reduced price tickets to the local citizenry. That is the financial benefit. That is financial assistance for those local citizens.

Do we have to screen out the illegal aliens among them in the crowd before we allow them in?

In other words, it seems to me while the gentleman is on the right track, there would be consequences here that most likely the gentleman would not intend.

Let me read to you what the NEA requires. They have various categories of

funding in the NEA. For example, in their design arts eligibility criteria, it says this: "Awards can only be made to U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the United States." In their literature program, "Applicants must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States." In their media arts program fellowships, "Individuals must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the United States." In all of their music fellowships, "Composers must be citizens or permanent residents of the United States." In their museum program, "Applicants must be U.S. citizens or permanent residents of the United States." In their opera and musical theater program, "The category is open only to individuals who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States."

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on. So the NEA does, through guidelines, carefully screen out people. But the gentleman's motion to recommit would be a broad-brushed attempt that would, as I have said, and do not want to repeat myself, but would probably create unintended consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Members on both your side and our side are tired of hearing this old saw, but it does seem to me that his issue needs to be heard. I think it is a good issue. I think we ought to hear it.

We are going to begin, by the way, our reauthorization hearings right away after the first of the year for the next 2-year cycle. This is an issue we really ought to hear.

Mr. Speaker, I do not say that to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] to put him off. But I want to do it in a fashion, for example, that would not disallow subsidizing tickets and making them reduced price.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1500

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems, and I think the gentleman will agree, is that this has been an ongoing problem, especially in San Diego, and I am not sure of other parts of the country.

The NEA went through a lot of hurt on this issue. This is going to resurface.

At a bare minimum, I would ask the gentleman, in those hearings, to at least, before a grant is offered, not everybody reads the rules on what they can or cannot do with these. They get a broad-based paper. But at least the individual receiving that grant should read and sign a statement saying that those dollars will not be used intentionally for illegal immigration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman is on the right track.

I am very aware, as is every taxpayer in this country, and we are all among

them, very aware of this problem that the border States have, particularly our southern border States. Montana is a border State, but has a northern international partner, a good neighbor, Canada.

We are all aware that some taxpayers' moneys are being used in large amounts to assist illegal aliens. There is no support for that in the United States. I do not support it. But I think that we have to get at it in a careful and structured way.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit includes a 2-year form of my amendment which prohibits giving tax dollars to illegal aliens.

Members should keep in mind these key points:

First, there is no current prohibition on NEA/NEH grantees from giving taxpayer money to illegal aliens. The regulation Mr. WILLIAMS has spoken of today applies only to direct grants from NEA, and says nothing about how grantees can spend the money.

Second, NEA's ruling in the San Diego case was only about whether \$10 bills could be considered materials. It said nothing about giving money to illegal aliens, because there are no such NEA regulations on the grantees.

The only way to prevent a repetition of NEA funds going to illegal aliens, and the only way to express the position of this House that taxpayer money in general should not be going to illegal aliens, is to adopt this motion to recommit.

Enough is enough. No more tax dollars for illegal aliens. Vote "yes".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes a vote on the question of passage, if that vote is ordered. This will be a 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit, possibly followed by a 5-minute vote on passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 214, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—210

Allard	Galleghy	Myers
Andrews (TX)	Gallo	Nussle
Applegate	Gekas	Oxley
Archer	Geren	Packard
Army	Gilchrest	Parker
Bachus (AL)	Gillmor	Paxon
Baker (CA)	Gilman	Penny
Baker (LA)	Gingrich	Petri
Ballenger	Goodlatte	Pickle
Barcia	Goodling	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Porter
Bartlett	Grams	Portman
Barton	Greenwood	Poshard
Bateman	Gunderson	Pryce (OH)
Bentley	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Bereuter	Hancock	Quinn
Bevill	Hansen	Ramstad
Bilbray	Hastert	Ravenel
Bilirakis	Hefley	Regula
Billey	Hefner	Ridge
Blute	Hobson	Roberts
Boehert	Hoekstra	Rogers
Boehner	Hoke	Rohrabacher
Bonilla	Holden	Roth
Brooks	Huffington	Roukema
Browder	Hunter	Rowland
Brown (OH)	Hutchinson	Royce
Bryant	Hutto	Santorum
Bunning	Hyde	Sarpalius
Burton	Inglis	Schaefer
Buyer	Inhofe	Schiff
Callahan	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Calvert	Jacobs	Sharp
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Shaw
Canady	Johnson, Sam	Shuster
Castle	Kasich	Sisisky
Chapman	Kim	Skeen
Clinger	King	Skelton
Coble	Kingston	Slattery
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Combust	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Condit	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Cooper	Lancaster	Snowe
Costello	Laughlin	Solomon
Cox	Lazio	Spence
Cramer	Leach	Stearns
Crane	Lehman	Stenholm
Crapo	Levy	Stump
Cunningham	Lewis (CA)	Stupak
Danner	Lewis (FL)	Sundquist
Darden	Lightfoot	Talent
de la Garza	Linder	Tanner
Deal	Lipinski	Tauzin
DeLay	Livingston	Taylor (MS)
Dickey	Machtley	Taylor (NC)
Doolittle	Manzulio	Thomas (CA)
Dorman	McCandless	Thomas (WY)
Dreier	McCollum	Torkildsen
Duncan	McCrery	Upton
Dunn	McHugh	Valentine
Durbin	McInnis	Volkmer
Emerson	McKeon	Vucanovich
Everett	McNulty	Walker
Ewing	Meyers	Walsh
Fawell	Mica	Weldon
Fields (TX)	Michel	Wolf
Fish	Miller (FL)	Young (AK)
Fowler	Molinari	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Montgomery	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Moorhead	Zimmer

NAYS—214

Abercrombie	Byrne	Dicks
Ackerman	Cantwell	Dingell
Andrews (ME)	Cardin	Dixon
Andrews (NJ)	Carr	Dooley
Bacchus (FL)	Clay	Edwards (CA)
Baessler	Clayton	Edwards (TX)
Barca	Clement	Engel
Barlow	Clyburn	English (AZ)
Barrett (WI)	Coleman	English (OK)
Becerra	Collins (IL)	Eshoo
Beilenson	Collins (MI)	Evans
Berman	Conyers	Farr
Bishop	Coppersmith	Fazio
Blackwell	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Bonior	DeFazio	Filner
Borski	DeLauro	Fingerhut
Boucher	Dellums	Flake
Brewster	Derrick	Foglietta
Brown (CA)	Deutsch	Ford (MI)
Brown (FL)	Diaz-Balart	Ford (TN)

Frank (MA)	Mann	Rose
Frost	Manton	Rostenkowski
Furse	Margolies-	Roybal-Allard
Gejdenson	Mezvinsky	Rush
Gephardt	Markey	Sabo
Gibbons	Matsui	Sanders
Glickman	Mazzoli	Sangmeister
Gonzalez	McCloskey	Sawyer
Gordon	McCurdy	Saxton
Grandy	McDermott	Schenk
Gutierrez	McHale	Schroeder
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Schumer
Hamburg	McMillan	Scott
Hamilton	Meehan	Serrano
Harman	Meek	Shays
Hastings	Menendez	Shepherd
Hayes	Mfume	Skaggs
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Slaughter
Hilliard	Mineta	Smith (IA)
Hincheey	Minge	Spratt
Hoagland	Mink	Stark
Hochbrueckner	Moakley	Stokes
Horn	Mollohan	Strickland
Houghton	Moran	Studds
Hoyer	Morella	Swett
Hughes	Nadler	Swift
Insole	Natcher	Synar
Jefferson	Neal (MA)	Tejeda
Johnson (GA)	Neal (NC)	Thompson
Johnson (SD)	Hutchinson	Thornton
Johnson, E.B.	Obey	Thurman
Johnson	Oliver	Torres
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Torricelli
Kaptur	Orton	Towns
Kennedy	Owens	Trafficant
Kennelly	Pallone	Tucker
Kildee	Pastor	Unsoeld
Kleczka	Payne (NJ)	Velazquez
Klein	Payne (VA)	Vento
Klink	Pelosi	Visclosky
Kolbe	Peterson (FL)	Watt
Kopetski	Peterson (MN)	Waxman
Kreidler	Pickett	Wheat
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Whitten
Lambert	Price (NC)	Williams
Lantos	Rahall	Wilson
LaRocco	Rangel	Wise
Levin	Reed	Woolsey
Lewis (GA)	Reynolds	Wyden
Long	Richardson	Wynn
Lowe	Roemer	Yates
Maloney	Ros-Lehtinen	

NOT VOTING—9

Green	McDade	Smith (MI)
Lloyd	Murphy	Washington
Martinez	Murtha	Waters

□ 1523

Mr. MILLER of California and Ms. SHEPHERD changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. DANNER and Messrs. PARKER, LANCASTER, SHARP, BROWN of Ohio, SISISKY, BRYANT, and GALLO changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that notwithstanding his prior announcement, this will be a 15-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 304, nays 119, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

YEAS—304

Ackerman	Furse	Miller (FL)
Andrews (ME)	Gallo	Mineta
Andrews (NJ)	Gejdenson	Minge
Andrews (TX)	Gephardt	Mink
Applegate	Geren	Moakley
Bacchus (FL)	Gibbons	Molinari
Baessler	Gilchrest	Mollohan
Ballenger	Gillmor	Montgomery
Barcia	Gilman	Moran
Barlow	Glickman	Morella
Barrett (NE)	Gonzalez	Murphy
Barrett (WI)	Gordon	Myers
Bateman	Goss	Nadler
Becerra	Grandy	Natcher
Beilenson	Gunderson	Neal (MA)
Bentley	Gutierrez	Neal (NC)
Bereuter	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Bevill	Hamburg	Obey
Bilbray	Hamilton	Oliver
Bishop	Hansen	Ortiz
Blackwell	Harman	Owens
Blute	Hastings	Pallone
Boehrlert	Hayes	Parker
Bonior	Hefner	Pastor
Borski	Hilliard	Payne (NJ)
Boucher	Hinchey	Payne (VA)
Brewster	Hoagland	Pelosi
Brooks	Hobson	Penny
Browder	Hochbrueckner	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hoekstra	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Hoke	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Horn	Pickle
Bryant	Houghton	Pomeroy
Byrne	Hoyer	Porter
Camp	Huffington	Poshard
Cantwell	Hughes	Price (NC)
Cardin	Inslee	Pryce (OH)
Carr	Jacobs	Rahall
Castle	Jefferson	Ramstad
Chapman	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Reed
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Regula
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Clinger	Johnston	Richardson
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Ridge
Coleman	Kaptur	Roemer
Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Rogers
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Ros-Lehtinen
Conyers	Kildee	Rose
Cooper	Klecza	Rostenkowski
Coppersmith	Klein	Roukema
Costello	Klink	Rowland
Coyne	Klug	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Kolbe	Rush
Danner	Kopetski	Sabo
Darden	Kreidler	Sanders
de la Garza	LaFalce	Sangmeister
Deal	Lambert	Santorum
DeFazio	Lancaster	Sawyer
DeLauro	Lantos	Saxton
Dellums	LaRocco	Schenk
Derrick	Lazio	Schiff
Deutsch	Leach	Schroeder
Diaz-Balart	Lehman	Schumer
Dicks	Levin	Scott
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Dixon	Lipinski	Sharp
Dooley	Lloyd	Shays
Dunn	Long	Shepherd
Durbin	Lowey	Sisisky
Edwards (CA)	Machtley	Skaggs
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Slattery
Engel	Mann	Slaughter
English (AZ)	Manton	Smith (IA)
English (OK)	Margolies-	Snowe
Eshoo	Mezvinsky	Spence
Evans	Markey	Spratt
Farr	Mazzoli	Stark
Fawell	McCloskey	Stokes
Fazio	McCollum	Strickland
Fields (LA)	McCurdy	Studds
Filner	McDermott	Stupak
Fingerhut	McHale	Sweet
Fish	McInnis	Swift
Flake	McMillan	Synar
Foglietta	McNulty	Tejeda
Ford (MI)	Meehan	Thompson
Ford (TN)	Meek	Thornton
Fowler	Menendez	Thurman
Frank (MA)	Mfume	Meyers
Franks (CT)	Michel	Torres
Franks (NJ)	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Frost		Towns

Traficant  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Upton  
Valentine  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer

Walsh  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise

Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NAYS—119

Allard  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus (AL)  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Barca  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bilirakis  
Billey  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bunning  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Canady  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combust  
Condit  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Emerson  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fields (TX)  
Gallegly  
Gekas  
Gingrich

Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Grams  
Greenwood  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Herger  
Holden  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Ingليس  
Inhofe  
Istook  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
Kyl  
Laughlin  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Manzullo  
McCandless  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McKeon  
Mica  
Moorhead  
Nussle  
Orton

Oxley  
Packard  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Portman  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ravenel  
Roberts  
Rohrabacher  
Roth  
Royce  
Sarpalius  
Schaefer  
Sensenbrenner  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Solomon  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—10

Abercrombie  
Berman  
Green  
Martinez

Matsui  
McDade  
McKinney  
Murtha

Washington  
Whitten

□ 1539

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 2351, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers

may have until midnight tonight, October 14, 1993, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2492, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, October 14, 1993, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight, October 14, 1993, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE PAT SCHROEDER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable PAT SCHROEDER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 13, 1993.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the County Court of the City and County of Denver, Colorado.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will notify you of my determinations as required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

PAT SCHROEDER,  
Congresswoman.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DIRECTOR OF NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Leonard P. Wishart III, Director of Non-Legislative and Financial Services, U.S. House of Representatives:

NON-LEGISLATIVE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, October 13, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with a subpoena issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

LEONARD P. WISHART III,

Director.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3167, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 273 and ask for its immediate consideration.

H. RES. 273

*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. 3167) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and the amendments made in order by this resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, the amendments printed in part 1 of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill as so amended shall be considered as read. All points of order against the bill, as so amended, are waived. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part 2 of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. 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.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 265 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], 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. Speaker, 12 days ago, on October 2, emergency unemployment benefits ran out for over 1 million Americans.

And unless we vote to extend those benefits today, those workers, and their families, and their children, will be left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, these are people who worked hard and played by the rules all their life.

They are the ones who have raised our families and fought our wars, the ones, who through no fault of their own, went to work one day, only to be told that the company was downsizing, and their name was at the top of the list.

These are the Ph.D.'s who are forced to deliver pizza.

They are the steelworkers, as someone once said, with fingers too big to use a computer who are waiting to be retrained for work.

They are the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, who sit down with the yellow pages and make hundreds of calls every day trying to get an interview.

They are the ones who, if they find jobs, usually take pay cuts of 50 percent or more.

These are the casualties of 12 years of destructive economic policies, and we have got to help them.

Mr. Speaker, after a 4-year national nightmare, we could not expect to get out of this overnight.

We could not expect to recover overnight from the worst recession since the Great Depression.

But our economy is finally starting to turn a corner.

Unemployment is at a 2-year low. Over 1 million jobs have been created.

Growth for the second part of this year is picking up, and interest rates are low.

But let us face it. Even if the economy comes back like the Philadelphia Phillies, there will still be people left on the bench.

Unemployment has turned the corner, but the number of long-term unemployed is still going up.

We have nearly as many long-term unemployed today as we did during the depths of the 1982 recession.

And we have 50 percent more long-term unemployed than we did at the depths of the Bush recession.

In parts of my district, 1 out of every 11 people is out of a job.

I want to get them back into the game.

As a first step, we must pass this bill today.

But we need more than that. We need to have a long-term program in place to retrain our workers, to retool our industries, and to create the high-skill, high-wage jobs we need for the future.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is turning the corner. But in the meantime, we cannot leave over 1 million hard-working Americans out in the cold.

We have to pass this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 273 provides for consideration of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and provides 1 hour of general debate.

The rule makes several modifications in the text of H.R. 3167.

These modifications consist of:

One, technical amendments reported by the Committee on Ways and Means;

Two, an amendment to strike section 7 of the bill, which would have extended the sponsorship period for legal aliens from 3 to 5 years for purposes of determining eligibility for the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Program; and

Three, amendments to change the effective dates of the benefits provided in the bill.

The rule also makes in order two amendments.

The first is an amendment to be offered by Representative JOHNSON of Connecticut. The Johnson amendment cuts off unemployment compensation to individuals in certain States.

The second amendment—to be offered by Representative SWIFT—would extend emergency unemployment benefits to railroad workers. This amendment is similar to one which has been approved on each of our previous unemployment extensions bills.

Finally, the rule allows one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mount Clements in Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, many in the Democrat leadership were decrying the potential decline of the committee system if discharge petition signatures were to be made public. I would point out that this rule is one of three consecutive rules reported by the Rules Committee that completely bypasses the committee system. Like the

rules for the Biological Survey and Goals 2000, this rule self-executes a changed version of the bill that was never considered in the committee of jurisdiction.

Where are the howls of indignation? Are we now being told that committee deliberation is no longer necessary?

For a moment in the Rules Committee Tuesday night, it seemed like common sense might prevail. As a result of bipartisan support, a motion to provide an open rule to permit the Members to work their will on the controversial issue of how to pay for extended unemployment benefits was adopted on a vote of 5 to 4.

But the Democrats on the committee could not allow a foreign concept known as deliberative democracy to stand. So they adjourned to their private quarters for a few minutes and then returned.

Now I will not characterize what was said or done, but certainly there was a great amount of coercion being exerted because the bipartisanship of the previous vote evaporated, retroactively. A motion was made to reconsider the vote, which was adopted, and the open rule was defeated on a 5 to 4 party lien vote.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, this makes one wonder. Is the leadership concerned about the committee system or is it concerned about a process that weakens its ability to subvert the will of the majority by controlling the outcome of legislation? We will have an opportunity to put that question to the test.

I urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question on this rule. In doing so, the strong role that committees play in legislative process will be maintained.

If the previous question is defeated, Mr. Speaker, I intend to offer an amendment to the rule that will re-

store the original bipartisan open rule motion that was adopted, but then rescinded on a partisan vote, in the Rules Committee. It will make in order H.R. 3167, as reported by the Ways and Means Committee, as the vehicle for consideration. In addition to making in order all germane amendments, it will also permit an en bloc amendment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SERRANO] to strike the SSI/alien provisions and shorten the extension period from 4 to 3 months.

More important, by defeating the previous question, we can put an end to the leadership's use of the unemployed as a political ping pong ball, to be paddled around because some aren't able to choose between benefits to unemployed Americans and benefits to immigrant aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to restore common sense to the rules and procedures governing the legislative process. Let us not support a rule that self-executes an amendment that obviously could not pass on its own. I urge my colleagues to vote down the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following information on rollcall votes in the Rules Committee:

**ROLLCALL VOTES IN THE RULES COMMITTEE ON MOTIONS TO RULE ON H.R. 3167, THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS**

1. Open Rule—Provides for one hour of general debate followed by an open amendment process. Adopted: 5-4. Yeas: Beilenson, Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Frost, Gordon, and Slaughter. Not Voting: Moakley, Bonior, Hall, and Wheat.

2. Beilenson Motion to Reconsider Vote for Open Rule Substitute—Adopted: 5-4. Yeas: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, and Gordon. Nays: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, and Slaughter.

3. Revote on Open Rule Substitute: Rejected 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost,

Bonior, and Gordon. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, and Slaughter.

4. Serrano Amendment—Striking self-executing provision relating to alien eligibility for SSI benefits and shortening benefit extension period of bill from four to three months, and making it in order instead as a separate amendment with one-hour of debate. Rejected: 4-4-1. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Frost, Bonior, and Gordon. Present: Beilenson. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, and Slaughter.

5. Gekas Amendment—An amendment to provide that the costs for the extension is to be financed by an across the board reduction in new spending in the reconciliation act of 1993. Rejected: 4-5. Yeas: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Nays: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, and Gordon. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, and Slaughter.

6. Adoption of Rule—Adopted: 5-4. Yeas: Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, and Gordon. Nays: Solomon, Quillen, Dreier, and Goss. Not Voting: Moakley, Hall, Wheat, and Slaughter.

**OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH-103D CONG.**

Congress (years)	Total rules granted <sup>1</sup>	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Number	Percent <sup>2</sup>	Number	Percent <sup>3</sup>
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	38	10	26	28	74

<sup>1</sup>Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

<sup>2</sup>Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

<sup>3</sup>Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Cong.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Oct. 14, 1993.

**OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d CONG.**

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 58, Feb. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 1: Family and medical leave	30 (D-5; R-25)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 246-176. A: 259-164. (Feb. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 59, Feb. 3, 1993	MC	H.R. 2: National Voter Registration Act	19 (D-1; R-18)	1 (D-0; R-1)	PQ: 248-171. A: 249-170. (Feb. 4, 1993).
H. Res. 103, Feb. 23, 1993	C	H.R. 920: Unemployment compensation	7 (D-2; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 243-172. A: 237-178. (Feb. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 106, Mar. 2, 1993	MC	H.R. 20: Hatch Act amendments	9 (D-1; R-8)	3 (D-0; R-3)	PQ: 248-165. A: 249-163. (Mar. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 119, Mar. 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 4: NIH Revitalization Act of 1993	13 (D-4; R-9)	8 (D-3; R-5)	PQ: 247-170. A: 248-170. (Mar. 10, 1993).
H. Res. 132, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H.R. 1335: Emergency supplemental Appropriations	37 (D-8; R-29)	1 (not submitted) (D-1; R-0)	A: 240-185. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 133, Mar. 17, 1993	MC	H. Con. Res. 64: Budget resolution	14 (D-2; R-12)	4 (D-1 not submitted) (D-2; R-2)	PQ: 250-172. A: 251-172. (Mar. 18, 1993).
H. Res. 138, Mar. 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 670: Family planning amendments	20 (D-8; R-12)	9 (D-4; R-5)	PQ: 252-164. A: 247-169. (Mar. 24, 1993).
H. Res. 147, Mar. 31, 1993	C	H.R. 1430: Increase Public debt limit	6 (D-1; R-5)	0 (D-0; R-0)	PQ: 244-168. A: 242-170. (Apr. 1, 1993).
H. Res. 149, Apr. 1, 1993	MC	H.R. 1578: Expedited Recession Act of 1993	8 (D-1; R-7)	3 (D-1; R-2)	A: 212-208. (Apr. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 164, May 4, 1993	O	H.R. 820: Nate Competitiveness Act	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 5, 1993).
H. Res. 171, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 873: Gallatin Range Act of 1993	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 172, May 18, 1993	O	H.R. 1159: Passenger Vessel Safety Act	NA	NA	A: 308-0. (May 24, 1993).
H. Res. 173, May 18, 1993	MC	S.J. Res. 45: United States forces in Somalia	6 (D-1; R-5)	5 (D-1; R-5)	A: Voice Vote. (May 20, 1993).
H. Res. 183, May 25, 1993	O	H.R. 2244: 2d supplemental appropriations	NA	NA	A: 251-174. (May 26, 1993).
H. Res. 186, May 27, 1993	MC	H.R. 2264: Omnibus budget reconciliation	51 (D-19; R-32)	8 (D-7; R-1)	PQ: 252-178. A: 236-194. (May 27, 1993).
H. Res. 192, June 9, 1993	MC	H.R. 2348: Legislative branch appropriations	50 (D-6; R-44)	6 (D-3; R-3)	PQ: 240-177. A: 226-185. (June 10, 1993).
H. Res. 193, June 10, 1993	O	H.R. 2200: NASA authorization	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 14, 1993).
H. Res. 195, June 14, 1993	MC	H.R. 5: Striker replacement	7 (D-4; R-3)	2 (D-1; R-1)	A: 244-176. (June 15, 1993).
H. Res. 197, June 15, 1993	MO	H.R. 2333: State Department. H.R. 2404: Foreign aid	53 (D-20; R-33)	27 (D-12; R-15)	A: 294-129. (June 16, 1993).
H. Res. 199, June 16, 1993	C	H.R. 1876: Ext. of "Fast Track"	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 22, 1993).
H. Res. 200, June 16, 1993	MC	H.R. 2295: Foreign operations appropriations	33 (D-11; R-22)	5 (D-1; R-4)	A: 263-160. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 201, June 17, 1993	O	H.R. 2403: Treasury-postal appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 17, 1993).
H. Res. 203, June 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2445: Energy and Water appropriations	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (June 23, 1993).
H. Res. 206, June 23, 1993	O	H.R. 2150: Coast Guard authorization	NA	NA	A: 401-0. (July 30, 1993).
H. Res. 217, July 14, 1993	MO	H.R. 2010: National Service Trust Act	NA	NA	A: 261-164. (July 21, 1993).
H. Res. 218, July 20, 1993	O	H.R. 2530: BLM authorization, fiscal year 1994-95	NA	NA	
H. Res. 220, July 21, 1993	MC	H.R. 2667: Disaster assistance supplemental	14 (D-8; R-6)	2 (D-2; R-0)	PQ: 245-178. F: 205-216. (July 22, 1993).
H. Res. 226, July 23, 1993	MC	H.R. 2567: Disaster assistance supplemental	15 (D-8; R-7)	2 (D-2; R-0)	A: 224-205. (July 27, 1993).
H. Res. 229, July 28, 1993	MO	H.R. 2330: Intelligence Authority Act, fiscal year 1994	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (Aug. 3, 1993).
H. Res. 230, July 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1964: Maritime Administration authority	NA	NA	A: Voice Vote. (July 29, 1993).
H. Res. 246, Aug. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authority	149 (D-109; R-40)		A: 246-172. (Sept. 8, 1993).
H. Res. 248, Sept. 9, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National defense authorization			PQ: 237-169. A: 234-169. (Sept. 13, 1993).

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES: 103d CONG.—Continued

Rule number date reported	Rule type	Bill number and subject	Amendments submitted	Amendments allowed	Disposition of rule and date
H. Res. 254, Sept. 22, 1993	MO	H.R. 2401: National Defense authorization	91 (D-67; R-24)	91 (D-67; R-24)	A. 241-182 (Sept. 28, 1993).
H. Res. 250, Sept. 13, 1993	MC	H.R. 1340: RTC Completion Act	12 (D-3; R-9)	1 (D-1; R-0)	A. 213-191-1 (Sept. 14, 1993).
H. Res. 262, Sept. 28, 1993	O	H.R. 1845: National Biological Survey Act	NA	NA	A. 238-188 (10/06/93).
H. Res. 264, Sept. 28, 1993	MC	H.R. 2351: Arts, humanities, museums	7 (D-0; R-7)	3 (D-0; R-3)	
H. Res. 265, Sept. 29, 1993	MC	H.R. 3167: Unemployment compensation amendments	3 (D-1; R-2)	2 (D-1; R-1)	
H. Res. 269, Oct. 6, 1993	MO	H.R. 2739: Aviation infrastructure investment	N/A	N/A	A. Voice Vote. (Oct. 7, 1993).
H. Res. 274, Oct. 12, 1993	MC	H.R. 1804: Goals 2000 Educate America Act	15 (D-7; R-7; I-1)	10 (D-7; R-3)	

Note.—Code: C-Closed; MC-Modified closed; MO-Modified open; O-Open; D-Democrat; R-Republican; PQ-Previous question; A-Adopted; F-Failed.

□ 1550

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the chief deputy whip, the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the rule and of H.R. 3167, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

I rise in support of the rule for a number of reasons. First and foremost, we owe it to the hundreds of thousands of jobless workers who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. In spite of the fact that over 1 million jobs have been created since the Clinton administration took office, many people who want to work have not been able to find jobs.

In my State of New Mexico, unemployment hovers at 7.4 percent. In actual numbers, 56,000 New Mexicans are out of work. In fact, 11,000 people in my State have been unemployed for more than 6 months and 1,000 new people exhaust their benefits every month.

Let us be straight about this. For these people who exhaust their benefits—there is no other assistance.

Second, I rise in support of this rule because it rights a wrong. This legislation originally funded part of the unemployment extension by extending the period of time that aged, blind, and disabled immigrants were ineligible to receive Social Security payments from 3 to 5 years. Again, I want to be clear, these immigrants are here legally. They have fulfilled every requirement of them and are obligated to fulfill all the obligations of citizenship short of voting.

It think it is wrong to pit this group of people against another, the unemployed. These immigrants, the aged, the blind, and the disabled, have done nothing wrong. And if we fail to pass this rule, they will have the rules changed on them retroactively, punishing tens of thousands of people for no fault of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule and to support this bill—it is the right thing to do.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to our hard-working friend and the ranking Republican on the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe what we are about to do with

this rule. Normally, rules are procedural in total content, and, whether I agree or disagree with them, I rarely speak on a rule. But this rule in its simplest terms would eliminate Federal unemployment compensation for American workers that number 350,000 strong who will not get those benefits in January so that aliens can get welfare benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the practical effect of current law is to require aliens to wait 3 years before they can qualify for many welfare benefits. H.R. 3167, as reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, would extend that waiting period to 5 years. This rule, if approved, would automatically remove that provision and return us to the current law of 3 years, all without a vote on this specific provision that was put in the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the vote on this rule is all about: A yes vote is a vote to choose welfare for aliens over unemployed American workers, and a no vote puts American workers and American taxpayers first.

The SSI welfare reform is a good one, and Members should not expect that they can hide behind the procedural aspect of adopting a rule for consideration of the bill. This rule is not purely procedural. It changes the substance of the legislation. It is a veiled attempt to conceal the issue of welfare for aliens from the American taxpayers.

The vote on the rule is an opportunity for Members to make a clear choice. It may well be our only chance to vote for the interests of taxpayers by reducing welfare benefits for aliens. I urge a no vote on the previous question and against the rule.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, Mr. ARCHER, we held SSI hearings this morning in the Subcommittee on Human Resources, and Mr. SANTORUM and I both, and in my opening statement, made it very clear, I think, and some of the administration's people who were testifying, that this is an area in which we have not had a comprehensive review as it relates to the aliens provision in raising and generating a revenue to offset this emergency unemployment compensation package.

It is the intent of the Subcommittee on Human Resources to conduct the

comprehensive study to see where we are, and I, too, would agree that this is an area that we must, as my colleague knows, address, and I think we will real soon before the Subcommittee on Human Resources.

Mr. ARCHER. Then we should have a chance to debate this as an amendment to this bill. This rule prohibits that. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to explain to my colleague why I will be voting to oppose this rule. While I have not worked to influence others to defeat the rule, I feel it is important to let you know why I prefer a separate floor amendment to accomplish the changes being self-executed by this rule.

The rule deletes the provision which would have increased from 3 to 5 years the sponsor-to-alien deeming period of the Supplemental Security Income or SSI Program, and it scales back the duration of the EUC Program by 5 weeks so that it will end on New Year's Day.

As a result, about 38,000 sponsors who pledged to maintain and support individuals legally immigrating to the United States will be held to that pledge for purposes of the SSI Program for only 3, instead of 5, years and 300,000 long-term unemployed workers will not be able to claim emergency unemployment compensation in the first 5 weeks of 1994.

I would like to clear up some misunderstandings which seem to exist about the sponsor-to-alien deeming provision in the Ways and Means Committee bill. Under current law, the income and resources of sponsors are deemed to be available to the alien in determining eligibility and payment amounts for the alien under the SSI Program. The sponsor must sign an affidavit that he is willing and able to receive, maintain, and support the alien, and that he is ready and willing to guarantee that the alien will not become a public charge during his or her stay in the United States.

Unfortunately, under the SSI Program the affidavit of support is binding for only 3 years, and a growing number of aliens are becoming public charges after the 3-year period expires, even

though their sponsors are not likely to be poor.

The provision that this rule deletes would have made the affidavit of support binding for 5 years for SSI purposes. This would have cut outlays by \$330 million over 3 years and financed the 5 additional weeks of unemployment benefits.

As you can tell, I believe that the policy of counting a sponsor's income in determining SSI eligibility is appropriate. It does not single out any group of immigrants. It applies to all—eastern European, Asian, Hispanic, every sponsored alien. And deletion of the provision means that about 300,000 more unemployed workers will not qualify for emergency benefits, since it is unclear whether any more extensions will be possible.

Mr. Speaker, I support allowing the House to work its will on these provisions by voting on a separate amendment to modify the bill. However, Mr. Speaker, since the committee of jurisdiction voted to provide a longer extension, I oppose shortening that extension through a self-executing rule.

□ 1600

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, while the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was not seeking to influence any Members on this rule vote, I have to say that his eloquence has led me to strengthen my resolve to oppose the rule.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the ranking Republican on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let us make no mistake about it: If Members vote "yes" on this rule, they are voting to take away jobless benefits from American workers in order to provide welfare benefits for aliens. That is exactly what this rule does.

Mr. Speaker, let's not mince words here. This rule is a dagger pointed at the heart of the House committee system.

Today it eviscerates the Committee on Ways and Means. Tomorrow it could be any committee.

I have lost count of the times we Republicans have been lectured in the Rules Committee about the need to preserve and protect our committees. We heard it when we were talking about discharge petitions. And we hear it daily when we are told why we Republicans can't offer certain amendments to bills because the committee of jurisdiction doesn't like or doesn't want to deal with them.

And yet here we are today with a rule that the Ways and Means Committee did not ask for on a bill they did not report, self-executing the elimination of a provision that they did report.

Where, oh where, have the great protectors of the House committee system

fled to today? Come over here to the floor. Why have they gone into hiding?

Mr. Speaker, we on this side may not agree with closed rules requested by the Ways and Means Committee—especially on nontax bills like this. But one thing we do agree on is the importance of making the committee-reported product the base bill for amendment purposes. That should go without saying. That is the rule of the House.

And yet this rule throws the reported bill out the window, as if the Ways and Means Committee had taken no action. Instead of the committee amendments in the reported bill, we are presented with Rules Committee amendments contained in the Rules Committee report. Those amendments are offered, according to the Rules Committee report, to the page and line numbers, of the introduced bill. Can you believe that?

Moreover, the Rules Committee's amendments are considered as adopted in the House and the Committee of the Whole upon the adoption of this rule. In other words, the rule self-executes the adoption of the amendments, and in so doing, it executes, with extreme prejudice, the work of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this body is as offended as I am, and as the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is, at the audacity of the Rules Committee in legislating for another committee.

Mr. Speaker, that is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat one more time: If Members vote for this rule, they are voting to take away jobless benefits for American workers, hundreds of them in my district, and thousands of them in yours, to give welfare benefits for aliens.

What has the Congress come to? This is an outrageous rule. Every Member ought to vote "no" on it. Please vote "no."

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, unemployed working men and women across this Nation are relying on us to act today and vote for the rule and pass a desperately needed extension of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program. These working Americans struggling to survive are asking us to do our jobs.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job to make sure that each of the almost 2 million Americans who find themselves unemployed and at the end of their regular unemployment insurance benefits are given the crucial assistance provided by this emergency program. For many of these men and women, the very ability to continue to house and feed themselves and their families often hinge on these benefits.

We must pass the rule and the extension and give working people the help

they need to keep on fighting day-in and day-out to find work in a job market that continues to offer them little, if any hope.

The bill before us today includes an innovative worker profiling provision critical to building the reemployment system. Worker profiling is good for workers because it helps them get new jobs faster. The system will also create real and significant cost savings for the Government. Savings that come not at the expense of any other person or group, but simply from getting workers off the unemployment lines and back to work more quickly.

Last week, 62,000 unemployed workers were turned away at unemployment offices because we failed to pass an extension. This week, 62,000 more will be turned away. Next week, the same. Mr. Speaker, it is long past time for us to pass this legislation, get the benefits flowing again and stop playing political football with the lives of unemployed working Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule, vote to extend the emergency unemployment insurance program, implement the new worker profiling system, and cast a vote for our country's working men and women.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], a hardworking colleague on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, even the most seasoned veterans, the most expert students of the twists and turns of the House Rules Committee, must be scratching their heads about this rule. First we had a rule—personally requested by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—to bring this unemployment compensation extension forward at the request of his committee. That rule never made it to the floor because of internal squabbling among the majority party over financing for this, the fifth emergency extension of unemployment benefits in recent memory. So yesterday in the Rules Committee an orphan rule was presented, devoid of sponsors and despite the express opposition of Mr. MATSUI, a distinguished senior member of the Ways and Means Committee. It was highly unusual that no one from the committee of jurisdiction came to testify in support of this rule which, through its passage, would self-execute a change in the financing under the bill and would thereby also shorten the extension of benefits to Americans from 4 to 3 months. When the minority made a motion to throw this controversial, complex, and closed rule out and replace it with an open rule, the incredible happened—a Bipartisan vote prevailed. But the victory of openness was short-lived, lasting only

as long as necessary for majority leadership to persuade a member of the majority to change his or her vote.

Mr. Speaker, there is a legitimate debate about whether an additional emergency extension of unemployment benefits is really necessary; about whether we can afford this extension; about whether the financing envisioned by the Ways and Means Committee is realistic and reliable; and about whether we won't just have to come back here, once again, on New Year's Eve, to deal with a sixth extension of this program. All of these issues affect each Member of this House—and all 435 Members should have the chance to impact this legislation. If you are planning to wish someone a happy New Year—especially someone without a job—you might want to vote "no." I urge defeat of this rule.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD].

□ 1610

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment, but I must say that I truly supported the bill reported from the House Committee on Ways and Means.

I certainly regret that I am in opposition or opposed to the chairman of the full committee at all. One of the problems I see with this is that, yes, we do, in fact, take away 5 weeks of emergency unemployment compensation benefits. That is a problem with me.

We also have an additional problem, and that is that we are 12 days behind the October 2 date. More than 100,000 long-term unemployed citizens of this country have exhausted their benefits.

If we continue this to another week, we will have 60,000 additional Americans who are out of work with no unemployment compensation benefits.

I certainly applaud the chairman of the full committee and certainly support him, but as one member of the Committee on Ways and Means and chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, I would urge my colleagues to let us adopt this rule and move this emergency unemployment compensation bill to the President for him to sign to give those long-term unemployed workers who are out of work their extended benefits.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] one of the Members who offered an amendment that tragically is not incorporated in this measure, the one that would help pay for it.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, we ought to reject this rule, not only for the excellent reasons already articulated by Members on both sides, that it is a travesty of the committee system that is employed in this particular rule, but there is an even better reason we should reject it.

We have been encouraged for term after term by the American people and for the American people to put into place, whenever we engage in a spending program of the magnitude of this one or any other program, some kind of sense of pay as you go.

The funding mechanism that has been provided in this bill, by any objective analysis, would constitute an enigma wrapped in a puzzle. It is one that is apparently workman like, but cannot work.

I have offered, in the Committee on Rules, a proposal that could fund this piece of legislation. And then it would persuade me to vote for the extension of unemployment benefits. Namely, we, this Congress, has passed a massive tax bill only this past summer.

Included in that extraction of tax moneys from the American public are provisions to provide for \$28 billion of new spending. My proposal is, if this new spending program, unemployment compensation, of slightly more than \$1 billion has to be paid for, why not pay it first in first out, out of the moneys generated in this past massive tax bill that was passed. How do we do that?

By taking the \$28 billion of new spending programs that the American people have been called on to pay with the new gas tax and the new retroactive taxes and all the other taxes that are in that bill and apportion the new spending bills downward to meet the cost of this bill.

That would make this appropriation revenue-neutral. We would be able to pay as you go on unemployment compensation out of new spending, because this is new spending. And the President and the Clinton administration, the majority want new spending in the tax bill that was passed. Simply fold this into that by reducing proportionately the funding, new spending programs that are in the new tax program.

That is why we should defeat this bill. This is a rule that does not permit my own proposition to come before the full House. I think it could gain support.

I will be met somewhere along the line with the proposition that, of course, my amendment could not be accepted because it requires waivers. Well, we waived the rules all over the place on all points of order on every conceivable bit of this particular rule. We should do the same for our amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have been here 9 years. I have watched the Congress try and deal with the loss of jobs, and this is pitiful. Unemployment compensation is becoming another way of life in America. Congress is trying to cure the cancer of job loss with a couple of aspirin and some warm milk.

Nobody is looking at the underlying problem in this country, and in 9 years we have not. It is disgusting.

We have a trade program that is a joke, a joke. We allow countries to send their products over to our flea market without even charging table space, and they deny us access. We even give most-favored-nation trade status to China that pays 17 cents an hour wages, when they do not pay slave labor.

Then we have a Tax Code that penalizes achievement, rewards dependency, rewards imports, kills exports, destroys investment.

Congress just does not get it. The American worker does not want unemployment compensation. The American worker wants employment compensation. They want a job. They want a paycheck. We are not making anything else available here.

For 9 years we have wasted our damn time, in my opinion. I have to lay that on the Democrats.

I think it is time to reward Americans who hire Americans, reward Americans who invest in America, reward Americans who buy American-made products made by American-made workers. We are either going to use a stick or we are going to use a carrot here, folks.

It is not working. It is time to change our Tax Code. We tax income. Why not also consider taxing expenses, spending? Maybe we will force some savings in this country to finance our debt. Maybe we will trap that illegal underground market on the streets and make some revenue from it instead of building more prisons. But no one wants to listen to that because we are not in the mainstream. I think some Members have to be removed around here.

I would just like to close by saying this: Ohio has less than a 7-percent unemployment rate, but nobody is dealing with a 15-percent unemployment rate in my damn town in Ohio. I want an opportunity at the Committee on Rules to deal with those types of problems for those cities.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, we always welcome him in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to a new member of the Committee on Ways and Means, my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I support extending unemployment benefits for workers and I support paying for them. That was done in the unemployment bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee.

And now as Paul Harvey says, "It's time for the rest of the story."

This story is about 300,000 Americans who will run out of unemployment benefits between January 2 and February 1 of 1994, because the Democrat leadership is playing inside-the-beltway politics that hurts the unemployed. Under

this rule 300,000 unemployed workers will not be eligible for an emergency extension of unemployment benefits.

Why is that?

The bill reported by the Ways and Means Committee covered these citizens who have worked hard, paid their taxes, and now face long-term unemployment because of the economy and downsizing by employers.

The \$1.1 billion extension was paid for by toughening job search requirements and yes, by reducing the billions of dollars in welfare benefits paid to aliens.

The majority pulled the unemployment bill on September 30 indefinitely, just before unemployment benefits were to expire, because some members of their caucus objected to reducing welfare benefits for aliens—some of whom have paid no employment or income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, now the majority in proposing this rule eliminated paying for it and pulled the plug on 300,000 Americans who will run out of benefits next year.

Support the unemployed—oppose the rule.

□ 1620

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule. I do that because I think the passage of this rule will make us make a choice that the Members of this House should not have to make. I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] that we want to extend emergency unemployment benefits. People are unemployed and they need the benefits through no fault of their own.

However, the rule only gives us a choice of passing unemployment benefit extension that will expire during the holiday season. It will expire at the end of this year, when Congress is out of session and American workers will still need help. To me, that is not the option that we should be voting on.

The bill that came out of the Committee on Ways and Means extended benefits until February, so we would have time to act on legislation to help our workers. The Committee on Rules has not given us that option. The Committee on Rules has taken extraordinary action in not allowing the full House to vote on an extension through February, which was approved and funded by the Committee on Ways and Means.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that this bill already cuts back on the emergency unemployment benefits to 7 weeks. There are many people who are going to be hurting, even with this bill passing. We need to take a look at the unemployment ex-

tended benefit program that involves the States, and if we are going to cut this bill back until the end of this year, we should at least deal with the trigger mechanism to allow States to move forward with their extended benefit programs. We have not done that. That would have been a very modest cost in this legislation.

For all these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues would defeat the rule so we could come forward with a bill that extends unemployment benefits to a time we can help the American workers and not leave them high and dry during this holiday season.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to a new Member, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to further extension of unemployment benefits.

My opposition is not because I lack compassion for those who have lost their job or been unfairly displaced by defense conversion. My opposition is because this Congress has failed our jobless citizens.

This Congress continues its policy of penalizing success and rewarding failure. This Congress refused to address the root problems of job creation.

This Congress lacks creative solutions to encourage employment. Look at what we have done since January:

We have increased taxes on job creators.

We have imposed more mandates on employers.

We have further mortgaged our future by spending more than we take in. Truly this Congress is schizophrenic.

We support enterprise zones with less taxation and regulations, then we tax and further regulate.

We talk about job creation and then put more people out of business.

When will we learn that tax incentives, policies that encourage capital formation and investment, create jobs?

There is no dignity in standing in an unemployment line. There is dignity in providing an opportunity and incentive to employ and be employed.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by first thanking the majority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for his efforts to try to get this rule through, and also to get passage of the bill, which is very important. I do not think there is any doubt we need unemployment benefits for the working men and women who have had a very difficult time over these last several years.

I want to hit the heart of what is going on in this rule. That is the provision that was struck from it which dealt with the SSI recipients who are aged, blind, and disabled. Let me add

one last thing to that. They are aged, blind, and disabled, but they are also immigrants. They are not just any type of immigrants, they are legal immigrants.

The problem is in this House, as we see in the public, there is a fire storm going on right now, and next year there are elections. Politically, immigrants are the hot topic, and everyone wants to be on the bandwagon when it comes to immigrants, legal or not. We are talking about folks who have every obligation that a U.S. citizen has, so a legal immigrant must go to war the way a citizen must, and a legal immigrant must pay taxes the way any citizen must. A legal immigrant must do everything, has every obligation that a citizen has, but they cannot vote, so they do not have a bloc that lobbies up here, so when it comes to them, it is a lot easier to go after them than it is someone else.

What do we find? That that is what we are trying to do here. We are giving one extra month of extension for folks who are unemployed by taking it away from the aged, blind or disabled. That was what was out there. We are trying to change that. We need this money for the unemployed, but we do not have to take it from Peter to pay Paul. Why are we robbing people who are entitled to something?

I hate this term that is constantly being used. They are not aliens, they are legal residents who have every right to be in this country, because we as a country admitted them here. I find it very distasteful that some people who are arguing against this rule are people who in previous times have voted against money for the unemployed. I think it is very disingenuous that people get up here and do that.

I would hope that the Members would have the common sense to see that what we are trying to do is come up with something that is temporary. We need to do more. Obviously, we have to come up with a permanent solution to the unemployed, and hopefully what we will do is, we will come up with a permanent solution so we do not have to come back here after 3 months or when we are out of session to come up with a solution.

I hope the administration is listening, because hopefully they will see it is up to them and will assist Congress to come up with the money people need to be able to get reemployed, to create those jobs. But please, do not do this because it is thought to be a hot button issue and people will vote for you next year. Do not go after people who are immigrants, and especially do not go after the folks who are legal immigrants, who went through every legal hoop that is required of them to get into this country. This country allowed them to come in. They are now fulfilling every obligation they have. Because of that, they have every right to

receive social security, supplemental social security, because they happen to be aged, blind or disabled.

Do not mask it as something else. Do not say they are aliens, because they are here as legal residents. Be truthful to the American public. What some are trying to do is create a scare tactic and scare Members on this side of the aisle. I hope my colleagues on this side of the aisle will stand up to that and give this chance to those who are unemployed for at least 3 months.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentlewoman from New Britain, CT [Mrs. JOHNSON], a hard-working member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule. I want to talk a little bit about this issue of aliens and their support under SSI.

Mr. Chairman, aliens when they come to America come with a sponsor. The sponsor is obliged to support their alien guest, to take care of them, until they got on their feet and could support themselves.

The evidence is very clear from studies that we have the backup system to support aliens if their sponsors become unable to support them is now being exploited. People are applying for SSI so that it will pick them up after their 3 years. It is planful and the result is that 20 percent of our SSI recipients are aliens. This is an exploitation of our welfare benefits program that is not in harmony with America's values, that was not intended, and that violates the principle of responsibility that underlies the sponsor program. For us to fund unemployment benefits by merely extending the obligation of the sponsor to support the alien that they invited to America, that they took responsibility for, to 5 years rather than 3 years.

This is not a hardship. There is a bond between sponsors and those they sponsor. There is an obligation, here, amongst people, not between the American people and the alien guest. Extending the period of sponsor-financial liability is an honorable way to fund the extended benefits for those in America who are faced with an extraordinarily difficult time in our economic history, who have been unemployed for long periods.

I regret that we have allowed benefits to expire. We have allowed a break in benefits, that if President Bush had done it, he would have been castigated by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

I do not hear those same cries of anguish for those people who now are losing benefits because we have not made this extension, but I personally am outraged at the break in services, at the break in benefits, and I regret that people's benefits will be cut off Janu-

ary 1, when we are not even in session, because we do not have the courage to fund them for the full 4 months.

□ 1630

It is not fair. It is not right. Return this rule back to the Rules Committee.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let it be clear there is a need here. We are talking about people who are exhausting their unemployment compensation.

The number who exhausted their unemployment compensation, 26 weeks in most cases, reached 39 percent last month. We have structural unemployment in this country, and it applies in every State, in every State.

The number of people who are exhausting their benefits reaches about 250,000 every month now. So let us not diminish this question. There is need here.

Most people want to work. There are some abuses. But the vast majority of unemployed people want to work. There is not a job available for them. There is structural unemployment in this Nation.

We tried to fund it in the Ways and Means Committee. We have a profiling provision. It is a real provision. It is true that it is spread over 5 years. But only 6 percent of the people who have exhausted their benefits in this country ever get any help on job search, only 6 percent. This bill is an honest effort to try to combine unemployment compensation with reemployment efforts. And we should have done this years ago. It was opposed by the Bush administration at every juncture, and it is those of us on the majority side who have been saying let us combine the unemployment system with reemployment.

We have tried to take steps to combine the welfare system with work. Here we are trying to combine unemployment compensation with getting back to work through reemployment efforts. So now what we are essentially hung up on is the SSI provision. There is enough money in this provision for one additional month. And it is a difficult problem, I acknowledge. Do not let anyone oversimplify it. Talk about outrage, when some of the people who cry outrage are those who would have opposed extension of unemployment compensation in any event, and did in previous years.

Look, this proposal was brought up in the Ways and Means Committee. Let the facts be clear. There were no hearings on it. There was no real discussion of it.

I think there are strong arguments in favor of reform of the SSI system. Those were not discussed in the Ways

and Means Committee. We were under the gun to fund the unemployment benefit extension in real terms. And so this proposition of reform or change in the SSI system was brought up by a member of the staff as one suggestion, and the committee did not delve in any depth at all into it.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD] held a hearing on SSI this morning. It is the first time we have had that kind of a comprehensive discussion, and it is not fair to pit resident immigrants against the unemployed. That is not a fair way to shape this issue, it really is not.

It is said the benefits would run out in February instead of January if we included the SSI provision. Look, we are going to have to face this extension issue probably next month in any event, because when we came back here in January, if it were going to expire in February, we would not be ready instantaneously to handle this issue.

There has been such a temptation to make this unemployment extension issue a plaything. Let us not do it. Reluctantly, but clearly it seems to me, I have to conclude that the best way to proceed here is to adopt this rule, and let us have an up-or-down vote on whether people here feel that we need to extend the unemployment benefits.

I think the facts are clear that we have to extend. Let us get on with it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my friend, the gentlewoman from New Britain, CT [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Certainly there is no intention to make this issue of unemployment compensation a plaything. I want the RECORD to note that I have always supported extending benefits, funded extended benefits. And our committee, every time we have considered it, has considered a variety of ways of funding it. And I personally, as a member of the committee, have often voted to increase the taxes in the system to honestly and legitimately and up front fund the new benefits.

We had choices. We did not take them. This provision is not a bad one, and we ought to stand by it, and provide the length of benefits our people out there need.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Pittsburgh, PA [Mr. SANTORUM] another diligent member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] just said that it is unfair to pit the unemployed versus aliens. We did not pit the unemployed against aliens. The Rules Committee, by its self-executing rule, put the play in play here on the floor of the House. The question is whether we are going to extend benefits for an additional 5 weeks to 350,000

Americans, or are we going to continue to give welfare payments to aliens.

Now, I might add, what are we talking about here; \$320 million over the next 3 years is what this alien provision costs. You may say that is a lot of money. Well, it is a lot of money. But over the next 5 years aliens in this country will qualify, and we will pay \$21.3 billion, \$21.3 billion of welfare benefits to people who came to this country, who signed a paper saying they could provide for themselves, who signed a paper who said they were going to be sponsored, and they were going to have income and benefits from the sponsor who brought them here. We are going to pay \$21.3 billion.

I will say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] I am a son of an immigrant. My father came to this country and his father came to this country together, not for welfare benefits. We came here for opportunity, for a chance to succeed. That is all we are saying.

We are giving people that greatest of gifts. It is not the welfare benefit. The greatest gift of America is to be in this country and have the opportunity for your son to be a Member of Congress.

I am very proud of that fact, that my father came to this country for opportunity, and he too served in a war. And he gave me the opportunity to be a successful American. And that is why I am here today.

The gentleman from Tennessee came here and said we had testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources today. We did. And now what did the testimony say? The testimony repeatedly said we are spending far too much money. We are spending far too much money on aliens in this country and welfare benefits. Now that is pretty clear from the testimony.

I would remind the gentleman that he voted for this provision in the House Committee on Ways and Means, and that in fact every member of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Republican and Democrat, voted for this provision in the bill to finance benefits.

I would just say that if Members on this side of the aisle want to support the President, they want to support a unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means, they want to support the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, they want to support welfare reform, they want to support American workers, then I would suggest that they defeat this rule and allow the extension of benefits to be 4 months, to February, and not 3 months to New Year's Eve.

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

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding and would agree with the gentleman

that all immigrants come here with the expectations of being able to do much better for themselves and their children, and in fact, we have laws that require that no one come into this country and become a public charge. That is not the issue here.

The issue here is that they are individuals that this country has said you have passed every legal hurdle and you are now here.

Mr. SANTORUM. If I can reclaim my time, all we are doing is changing the legal hurdle. We are saying instead of 3 years, 5 years. This is the law that we put in place and made the estimate at the time that 3 years of sponsorship, of having that amount of money deemed to be the money that the alien, in fact, has is 3 years. We are saying because of the ever-increasing charge that our Government is facing in providing for aliens in this country, legally, that we are now going to reassess that and extend the deeming provision for sponsorship to 5 years, all within the rules, not doing it retroactively. We are doing it prospectively. And I think it is a very fair way to go about reducing welfare benefits, No. 1; and No. 2, to solve the problem of the unemployed.

□ 1640

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

You know, I guess I intended to support this rule, but after the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] spoke, it makes me wonder whether I should.

I say to the gentleman I hope he will engage in this discussion because I think there was an implication here, he was directing to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] that his grandparents or parents came here to work and share in the American dream and there was an implication that perhaps the recent arrivals came here to collect welfare benefits. I think that is just the kind of rhetoric that is creating a lot of backlash against certain recent arrivals.

Let me just say this—it is a little difficult for me to say this on the floor of the House—but, you know, the gentleman himself blends in pretty well. No one would know whether he is 5th, 2d, or 15th generation American. But there are others of us who could be a 5th or 6th or 15th generation American but we sometimes suffer when that kind of rhetoric occurs on the floor of the House.

So I would just ask that my colleague temper himself somewhat. He has ambitions for higher office. I would just hope these higher office ambitions will remain at the level I think that the rhetoric deserves.

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

Mr. MATSUI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from California for wanting to engage in a colloquy. I would suggest that my father and my grandfather would not be on the floor arguing for welfare benefits for people who came over at that time. What they came here to do was to take advantage of the opportunity, and that was all I was trying to say.

Mr. MATSUI. I say to the gentleman I have the time. And I say, if in fact somebody comes in with a sponsor and let us say that person becomes disabled 2 years later or a year later, that person may be entitled, as any other resident of the United States, to benefits. I am sure the gentleman was not referring to that person wanting to come in here to receive benefits, is that right?

Mr. SANTORUM. All I am suggesting is that the gentleman voted that we extend the sponsorship provision, as the chairman said today on the floor, from 3 years to 5 years, that is all I am saying.

Mr. MATSUI. I just think that we ought to temper our rhetoric a little bit.

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

Mr. MATSUI. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct something else that was said by the gentleman which is incorrect. This is not prospective. If you have come to this country having followed every rule that this country required you to follow, you would be hit. It was as if you were telling someone who is retiring at 65, "No, we changed it, you cannot retire." If somebody who is below the poverty level does qualify to receive a particular benefit, we say, "No, you will not receive that benefit." That is what we are doing here.

What we are saying is do not change the rules all of a sudden for people who have followed every law and regulation in the book.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Huntington Beach, CA [Mr. ROHRABACHER].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the gentleman.

I would just suggest that this is the same gentleman who voted to retroactively raise taxes on people to the first part of this year.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The gentleman is not talking about me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note that I think there has been a terrible loss of faith in the American people in

their Government. We can see it all over the place. We can see people lost their faith in representatives who negotiate agreements with other countries, they have lost faith with their Representatives in Congress. Why is it?

They do not think that we care about them. They think we have other interests and other people that we care about more than our own people.

I think this hits to the heart of the matter. It is not unreasonable for us to say that if someone comes to this country, a foreigner who would like to come to this country and participate in the opportunities that we provide all people who get here and get here legally, that it is not unreasonable to say that they cannot participate in the Government benefits, especially the social welfare benefits that are eligible for our citizens for a period of 5 years. Is this unreasonable?

It is not unreasonable, because we care about those citizens, our own citizens, our own citizens who are in desperate situations because they have lost their jobs; the end of the cold war has happened, the aerospace industry is going down and they cannot find any work. We care more about them than we do about the person who has come here from a foreign country. It is not that we do not like those people from foreign countries. They come here and they want to take advantage of the opportunity, we applaud them, and we cherish our tradition of immigration in our country. We cherish it. We cherish our immigrants.

But we want them to come here and participate in the opportunity, and we cannot do it at the expense, when our own people are down and out.

We would have had an open rule that would have permitted us to go beyond this problem and have a vote on this. But instead, what happened? What happened? Their man in the Committee on Rules, a Democrat who was very concerned about the immigration crisis in California, voted for the Republicans, and he was beaten down by his own Democrats and forced to change his vote.

We care about the American people, yes, we love our heritage of immigration in this country.

We have got to put top priority on our own people.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished former mayor of Fort Lauderdale, FL [Mr. SHAW], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I cannot remember a time where we have seen some senior members from the Committee on Ways and Means together with the chairman come and talk down a rule, encourage its own members to vote "no."

The simple reason is that things are in total disarray. It is time that we

give some leadership here in the House. It is time that we have a situation where various caucuses do not make the majority party cave on rules, cave on bills, cave on its plan. This House desperately needs some leadership.

I would encourage the Members to vote "no," send that message in, and let us get some leadership on the majority side of the aisle.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple process that we have come to right now. Many who have criticized those who are opposing the rule, say we are trying to delay ensuring that those benefits get to the unemployed. The fact of the matter is those of us who oppose this rule stand ready to bring forth an open rule which will allow the committee process to work its will and every member a chance to do the many things that have been discussed during this past hour of debate.

I urge a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can make an open rule and let this House work its will.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield my remaining time to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule. I believe as strongly as everyone in this Chamber that the extension of unemployment benefits is absolutely necessary.

The proposed extension is the best alternative available to us. It does not delay compensation to unemployed Americans, and it gives Congress until January 1, 1994 to come up with a new funding mechanism if we need to extend benefits further. The prior proposal was unfair to aged, blind, and disabled immigrants who depend on SSI benefits. We should not—and need not—rob Pedro to pay Paul. Legal immigrants should not be asked to solely bear the burden of financing this extension for the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, I urge quick passage of this rule so that Americans no longer have to go without the unemployment benefits they so heavily rely on.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would just close by suggesting to my colleagues to vote "aye" on the previous question—I assume the minority will ask for a vote on that—"aye" on the rule and "aye" on the bill. It is time we got on with providing these people who have played by the rules with the unemployment compensation extension that they deserve and in fact they have paid for in their taxes and through their employers over the years.

Let us not pit the disabled, the blind, and the aged against unemployed people. Let us move in this direction and come back with a program that makes sense for the future on this issue.

□ 1650

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 235, nays 187, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—235

Abercrombie	Farr	Matsui
Ackerman	Fazio	Mazzoli
Andrews (ME)	Fields (LA)	McCloskey
Andrews (NJ)	Filner	McHale
Andrews (TX)	Fingerhut	McKinney
Bacchus (FL)	Flake	McNulty
Baessler	Foglietta	Meehan
Barca	Ford (MI)	Meek
Barcia	Ford (TN)	Menendez
Barlow	Frank (MA)	Mfume
Barrett (WI)	Frost	Miller (CA)
Becerra	Furse	Mineta
Bellenson	Gejdenson	Minge
Berman	Gephardt	Mink
Bevill	Geren	Moakley
Bilbray	Glickman	Mollohan
Bishop	Gonzalez	Montgomery
Blackwell	Gordon	Moran
Bonior	Gutierrez	Nadler
Borski	Hall (OH)	Natcher
Boucher	Hall (TX)	Neal (MA)
Brooks	Hamburg	Neal (NC)
Browder	Hamilton	Oberstar
Brown (CA)	Harman	Obey
Brown (FL)	Hastings	Oliver
Brown (OH)	Hayes	Ortiz
Bryant	Hefner	Orton
Cantwell	Hilliard	Owens
Cardin	Hinchee	Pallone
Carr	Hoagland	Parker
Chapman	Hochbrueckner	Pastor
Clay	Hoyer	Payne (NJ)
Clayton	Hughes	Payne (VA)
Clement	Inslee	Pelosi
Clyburn	Jefferson	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Johnson (SD)	Pickett
Collins (MI)	Johnson, E.B.	Pickle
Condit	Johnston	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kanjorski	Poshard
Cooper	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Coppersmith	Kennedy	Rahall
Costello	Kennelly	Rangel
Coyne	Kildee	Reed
Cramer	Klecza	Reynolds
Danner	Klein	Richardson
Darden	Klink	Roemer
de la Garza	Kopetski	Ros-Lehtinen
Deal	Kreidler	Rostenkowski
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rowland
DeLauro	Lambert	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Lantos	Rush
Derrick	LaRocco	Sabo
Deutsch	Laughlin	Sanders
Diaz-Balart	Lehman	Sangmeister
Dicks	Levin	Sarpalius
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Dixon	Lipinski	Schenk
Dooley	Lloyd	Schroeder
Durbin	Long	Schumer
Edwards (CA)	Lowey	Scott
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Serrano
English (AZ)	Mann	Sharp
Eshoo	Manton	Shepherd
Evans	Markey	Sisisky

Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Spratt  
Strickland  
Studds  
Stupak  
Swift  
Synar  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Tejeda

Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traficant  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Valentine  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer

Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

## NAYS—187

Allard  
Applegate  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus (AL)  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Billirakis  
Bliley  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Brewster  
Burton  
Buyer  
Byrne  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Castle  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combest  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emerson  
English (OK)  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Fish  
Fowler  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Goodlatte

Goodling  
Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Callahan  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kobbe  
Kyl  
Lancaster  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
Machtley  
Manzullo  
Margolies-  
Mezvinsky  
McCandless  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
McMillan  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (FL)  
Mollinari  
Moorhead  
Morella

Murphy  
Myers  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Paxon  
Penny  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Ramstad  
Ravenel  
Regula  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Roth  
Roukema  
Royce  
Santorum  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Talent  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Walker  
Walsh  
Weldon  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—11

Bunning  
Engel  
Green  
Martinez

McCurdy  
McDade  
McDermott  
Murtha

Rose  
Stokes  
Washington

## □ 1710

Mr. PETERSON of Florida changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 149, nays 274, not voting 10, as follows:

## [Roll No. 505]

## YEAS—149

Abercrombie  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Barca  
Barrett (WI)  
Becerra  
Berman  
Bishop  
Blackwell  
Bonior  
Boucher  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Cantwell  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Conyers  
Coppersmith  
de la Garza  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
English (AZ)  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gedjenson  
Gephardt

Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamburg  
Harman  
Hastings  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klein  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klein  
Kopetski  
Kreidler  
Laughlin  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewy  
Maloney  
Mann  
Manton  
Markey  
Matsui  
Mazzoli  
McDermott  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Mfume  
Mineta  
Mingos  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Nadler  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz

Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Pelosi  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schenk  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Smith (IA)  
Studds  
Stupak  
Swift  
Synar  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Tucker  
Unsoeld  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates

## NAYS—274

Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews (TX)  
Applegate  
Archer  
Army  
Bacchus (FL)  
Bachus (AL)  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barlow  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bellenson  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Bevill  
Billbray  
Billirakis  
Bliley

Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Borski  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Browder  
Bryant  
Burton  
Buyer  
Byrne  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cardin  
Carr  
Castle  
Chapman  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Combest

Condit  
Cooper  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Darden  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Emerson  
English (OK)  
Everett

Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Fingerhut  
Fish  
Fowler  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Gallegly  
Gallo  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Grams  
Grandy  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hayes  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Herger  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Houghton  
Huffington  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Inhofe  
Istook  
Jacobs  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Kasich  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kyl  
LaFalce

Lambert  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lehman  
Levy  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Machtley  
Manzullo  
Margolies-  
Mezvinsky  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McKeon  
McMillan  
McNulty  
Meyers  
Mica  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mollinari  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murphy  
Myers  
Neal (NC)  
Nussle  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (VA)  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad

Ravenel  
Regula  
Ridge  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Royce  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Sarpalius  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shepherd  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slattery  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Strickland  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Swett  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thurman  
Torkildsen  
Traficant  
Upton  
Valentine  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Williams  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—10

Bunning  
Engel  
Green  
Martinez

McCurdy  
McDade  
Murtha  
Rose

Stokes  
Washington

## □ 1815

Mr. VOLKMER and Mr. ACKERMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from "nay" to "yea." So the resolution was not agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to try to explain what our intentions are for the rest of the evening and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, it is our intention to take up the rule tonight on unemployment compensation. This would be the original rule. The vote would be held until tomorrow morning.

Tomorrow morning the House will meet at 10 a.m., and we will proceed to a vote on that rule, and then to consideration, if the rule passes, of the unemployment compensation legislation, leading to a vote.

It would be my assumption, Mr. Speaker, that that would be the only business that we would be able to complete tomorrow to be able to leave at a reasonable point.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], my friend, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that in the event, for some reason, this rule were to be pulled, I would like to announce to the House pursuant to clause 4(c) of rule XI that tomorrow I may call up House Resolution 265, the original rule that the majority leader has said we are going to consider this evening.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I have no further announcement to the House if there are no further questions.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression that it was very likely that the reason we would be staying for business tomorrow was because we would move forward to consideration of the rule dealing with HUD and independent agencies, as well as the bill itself. My chairman has not been on the floor in the last couple of hours. I have heard nothing else from anybody in connection with that.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, our concern is that the unemployment program, as my colleague knows, has run out. We need to bring this legislation forward and finish it. I am told that the unemployment legislation will take 4 or 5 hours for the entire transaction, even with the debate of the rule this evening, so we really will not have time to bring up other matters.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, Members can probably expect then that we would rise about 3 o'clock based on the schedule the gentleman has outlined.

Mr. GEPHARDT. That is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the gentleman.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3167, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM EXTENSION

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 265 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 265

*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. 3167) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, to establish a system of worker profiling, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. 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 Ways and Means. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the bill, modified by the amendments recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill. The amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

□ 1820

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman

from California [Mr. DREIER], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has read the rule. The House has spoken. This rule is the same as the rule we just considered, with the exception of the self-executing amendment that was the point of controversy on the last rule.

Mr. Speaker, we know this issue. It is time for us to act so we can deal with the immediate needs of people who are on unemployment and have been on unemployment for an extended period of time.

I would also point out to my colleagues that the rule makes in order two amendments. The first amendment is by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], which cuts off emergency unemployment compensations to individuals in certain States. The second amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT], would extend emergency unemployment to railroad workers. This amendment is similar to one which has been approved on each of our previous unemployment extension bills.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this restrictive rule. Yes, in many parts of the country, the economy remains sluggish. Unemployment remains near 9 percent in California, and 10 percent in Los Angeles—more than three points above the national average. Therefore, I believe that our top legislative priority should be private sector job creation, even above health care and welfare reform. However, this bill does not create jobs. We should have an open rule so that all of these issues can be fully debated.

Let us put this benefit extension into perspective. If we pass H.R. 3167, it will be the fifth extended benefit bill passed since November 1991. Now is the time to ask, "When does this all end?" Unemployment is going down. Yes, slowly. Yes, in States like California, it is much higher than we can stand. But, nationwide, things are getting better. Today, unemployment is at 6.7 percent. It peaked two Junes ago.

Although unemployment has been falling more slowly than we would hope, maybe it is time to consider that these extended benefits may be contributing to the problem. In some States, extended benefits are providing a very damaging incentive not to work.

In addition, the Clinton tax increase is likely to kick the economy in the shins and cause things to get worse. If for no other reason, we should stop extended benefits now, just so that when things do get worse, we can reinstate

them again to handle the higher unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, this is another in a long line of unfair restrictive rules. Instead, we should have an open rule. This is not a tax bill. There is no reason for the Ways and Means Committee to be protected from open debate. Once again, the vast majority of Americans are having their representative in Congress gagged by the closed Rules Committee.

This rule does permit one amendment by Mrs. JOHNSON. It will save the taxpayers as much as \$100 million. It is about time. Her amendment says that States with unemployment rates below 5 percent do not qualify for emergency extended benefits any more. They should not. The eight States with unemployment below 5 percent are at full employment. Businesses are finding it hard to find enough people to work. They are cutting back hours and losing sales.

Back in February, when we last extended these benefits, Mrs. JOHNSON asked the Rules Committee to make a similar amendment in order. The Rules Committee gagged her, costing the taxpayers \$1.2 billion dollars this year. That's the real cost of a closed rule.

As we all know, finding a way to pay for these extended benefits has become a small fiasco. The Ways and Means Committee bill includes \$1 billion in benefits, and claims to pay for them with \$700 million in smoke and mirrors, and a \$300 million change in the Supplemental Security Income Program making it harder for aliens to qualify for Federal disability payments.

The vast majority of this financing is basically the hope that we are going to spend \$700 million less on regular unemployment benefits over the next 5 years because all the States are going to do a better job of finding jobs for the unemployed. Sure they will.

That is it. That is where we get the money. Not real spending cuts. No new revenue is raised. In fact, CBO believes that it will cost just as much to implement the worker-profile reforms as will be saved by them. The House should insist on concrete spending cuts to pay for more benefits.

As we know, Mr. GEKAS has an amendment which would reduce new spending included in the President's budget reconciliation package to offset the \$1 billion cost for this bill. We should grant him the waiver he needs. We cannot keep adding to the deficit—short term or long.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and let's come back with a rule we can support.

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, this issue of how we deal with legal aliens

and SSI is a very important issue, and it is one that has to be, in my view, done carefully.

We have a number of Members in the House who are deeply concerned about the rapidity with which this change is being made. I want to refresh Members' memories about how this law came into being and what is at stake here.

Back in the early 1970's, the SSI Program came into being. It is obviously a program to help elderly citizens who are very poor. It has been a very successful program.

From 1972 or 1973 when it first started, until about 1982, there was no requirement of a period of years in which a family member's income would be imputed to an elderly legal alien's income. It was in 1982 that the 3-year requirement which we are talking about tonight came into being. That 3-year requirement has been in place since 1982.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion that has come forward from the committee to help pay for the extension of these unemployment benefits was to raise the level from 3 years to 5 years during which a family member's income would be imputed to the elderly legal alien's income. This is a recommendation that came from the committee. It is controversial with many of our Members.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what we are really presented with here tonight, and have been over the last weeks, is a much larger and much more complicated and tougher question, and that is the question of how we are going to pay for the extension of unemployment benefits.

I believe we have a chronic unemployment problem in our country. We have had that problem for some time.

□ 1830

There are millions of Americans that tonight are not even counted as unemployed, who have gone off unemployment compensation. I think the actual unemployment rate in America is much higher than 6½ or 7 percent. It is probably more like 10 or 12 percent.

The truth is, our unemployment compensation system, I think, is broken. And it needs to be fixed. We need a reemployment compensation system. We need to review the way the whole system works, at the State level and at the Federal level.

In my view, we need the kind of retraining and replacement system that many have called for and talked about for a long time.

Obviously, before we approach this question again, if this rule passes and this bill passes, we are going to have to reapproach this whole question. I hope that we will do that in a spirit of fixing a system that is broken. I hope we will look at the way we pay for this and the way the benefits work. I hope we will look at the way the entire system is constructed so that we can do better at

getting people retrained and back to work in the period while they are unemployed.

And I hope that by doing that, we can cut down dramatically over time on the amount of people that continue to be unemployed in our society.

I would like to engage the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, the honorable gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FORD], and ask him if in the last weeks there has not been an effort in his subcommittee to look at this question as to the advisability of this particular way of funding this unemployment extension and if there would not be a willingness on the part of his subcommittee and the committee to look at this again anew before we approach this question again in the early part of next year.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me answer in two parts. One is yea on the SSI legal immigrant. That is an issue that we announced this morning that we will have public witnesses and public hearings sessions probably within the next 2 or 3 weeks. And hopefully, we will get the instructions from the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], as to how we should proceed in this particular area.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that we need to go back and revamp this whole emergency unemployment compensation, unemployment compensation in general, that we need to get it before the committee and move with the bill with the leadership and, hopefully, with bipartisan support in this Congress to really address this problem, rather than coming back to this House floor every 3 or 4 months in these emergency unemployment crises that we are faced with as it relates to the compensation package.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. It just appears to me that we are talking here about unemployment compensation.

As the gentleman knows better than anyone in the body, this is a system that has traditionally been funded by taxes paid by workers so that in the event they become unemployed they will be able to draw these benefits, try to be retrained, try to be reemployed.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we want to stay on track, with the funding mechanism in place, that that would certainly be the areas in which this subcommittee would be finding the necessary funds to fund the emergency unemployment compensation.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

I feel deeply that this program is a very important part of our country. I also believe that it is broken and it needs to be fixed.

I believe what we are doing tonight is a temporary move to make sure those unemployment benefits, extended benefits can still be extended in the next 3 or 4 months. But I agree with the gentleman that it is vital and important that before these 4 months are up that we look at a real fix for the entire program, that we review the entire intent of the program, the way the program has worked, and try to come back with modifications, long-term changes that will bring it back to its original intent and make it, again, the kind of successful reemployment program that it once was and should be.

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I will assure him that is the intent of the Subcommittee on Human Resources of the Committee on Ways and Means, to really address and to reform this area of unemployment compensation benefits.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to our chief deputy whip, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

This is an issue that over the last several years has been heavily politicized. This is an issue that was used by the Democrats to literally beat up on George Bush on almost a monthly or every few months basis, suggesting that he did not care about domestic affairs and did not care about the unemployed, because he was unwilling to sign unemployment bills that were not paid for under the Budget Act.

Now we find out that the problem in unemployment is something quite different than what they told us it was just a few months ago, when they were using it as a wedge against President Bush. We have just heard a dialog here that suggests that the unemployment system is broken and should be fixed.

That was one of the things that President Bush was trying to say about the unemployment system, too. But at that time the Democrats were telling us, "Oh, no, we can't proceed with that, because President Bush doesn't care about the unemployed. And we can't fix the system. There is nothing broken about this system."

We have just heard now totally different, when it is in their interest to do so.

I would also suggest that we have heard a lot of talk, political talk over the last few weeks and months about gridlock in this town. We have just watched gridlock in action. It had absolutely nothing to do with the Republican Party.

It had to do with the fact that on the Democratic side of the aisle, literally

we have to appease every caucus in sight in order to move legislation. If there is a group of 10 that gathers together, evidently, they have to be appeased no matter what the emergency.

People are actually being turned away at unemployment centers right now while the Democrats play their own internal politics and hold up legislation from coming to the floor.

I will say that I find it extremely disturbing, and the next time we hear about gridlock, I think most of America should focus on what we saw on the floor this evening when the leadership could not get their act together in large part because there were too many competing interests within the Democrat Party to deal with.

That was not a Republican problem. That is purely an internal Democrat problem, where they should have plenty of votes necessary to move legislation if they so desire.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to underscore, first, that this rule was reported out 15 days ago, No. 1.

Second, as we had that 45-minute or 1 hour and 15 minute recorded vote, a couple of new Members came to me and asked a very simple question.

They said, "Now, it seems that there is a real problem going on here in this negotiating process. I can't imagine what it must have been like when Ronald Reagan and George Bush were in the White House."

And I said, "I don't remember a situation like this taking place on the House floor."

We have ended gridlock. We have both Houses of Congress and the executive branch in the control of one political party. And yet, the situation that we just witnessed a few minutes ago, which is, quite frankly, jeopardizing the opportunity for people to not only get their benefits but for us to get a job-creating program put forward, took place.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the House for finally doing the right thing and bringing the rule to the floor that was originally reported out and should have been brought to the floor earlier, rather than going through this long-term negotiated process that resulted in literally thousands of Americans being denied their unemployment benefits. That had absolutely nothing to do with the Republicans, and I am glad we have finally seen sense.

We have finally decided to do the right thing and bring the right rule to the House floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his congratulations and I look forward to working with him as we tackle this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

□ 1840

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, first let me say a word to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and to everybody else about reemployment and reform of the system. A number of us have been talking about this for a number of years. A number of us have been talking about the need to completely redo it. A number of us have been talking, and it was led by Mr. Pease in those days, many years ago, about the need to change the trigger mechanism.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is the time for a lot of partisan bickering, when there are hundreds of thousands of people who are unemployed through no fault of their own. The truth of the matter is that every effort to change the trigger was resisted by the President, the then-President, Mr. Bush, and also by most in the minority. We had no support for reform of the system. We have been talking about combining unemployment with reemployment for a number of years, so it is not anything that we just thought of today for the first time. We have been in the vanguard on the majority side trying to change the unemployment comp system from simply an income maintenance system to one that helps get unemployed people back to work. That is point No. 1.

I know it is a temptation to the minority to try to raise the specter of gridlock. All I want them to know is that there was an honest effort here these last weeks and months to put together a funding mechanism that was real, that was real. We did not suggest waiving the law and having an emergency provision here. We were trying to come up with real moneys. The provision here in this bill for profiling is an honest effort in that regard.

There has been a clear evaluation by CBO, working with OMB, as to what it will save over 5 years. Members say it will cost more than will be saved, but in any welfare reform proposal where there are health provisions and day care provisions, it may at first cost more than it will save, but by the way, the savings that are calculated in terms of our expenditures are not the only savings. People are going to go back to work, because of the job search provisions here. They are paying taxes, and those taxes eventually will go into the U.S. Treasury.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I just want to clarify that point. I agree with the gentleman. I support this rule. The money that is going to be spent for the worker profiling program will be spent

by discretionary funds that are under a cap, so we are not going to spend any more money.

We have heard testimony in the subcommittee, as the gentleman knows, that they believe, the Labor Department believes, that there is sufficient money in the job training program right now, job search program right now, to take care of this increased case load. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. LEVIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct. The Labor Department has already requested adequate moneys in 1994 to handle this job search. Let it be clear, we are not going to have to appropriate a dime more, so it is not fair for the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] or anybody else to say it is going to cost more than we will save. To get people back into employment will cost some moneys in training, in job search, whatever it is, but they are more productive and it is what they want, and we save more, when we add everything together, including the tax revenues.

It is easy on the gentleman's side to try to caricature the efforts that have been made here to pay for this, but I want everybody to know there was a genuine effort to do so. I will be interested in the votes tomorrow on the final bill. I am not sure that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has ever voted for an extension. I would ask the gentleman, has he? He voted against the last one. Has he ever voted for any extension of unemployment benefits?

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the gentleman go back and look back through 1991. On the last five, I may have voted no, and quite frankly, I do not believe this is the best way to deal with this issue. I have argued time and time again that when our Committee on Rules will put forth a rule that will allow economic growth packages, that will create private sector jobs, that is the kind of thing that I believe needs to be incorporated in this kind of package.

If my friend is questioning my credibility at all in voting against a rule, opposing a rule, and at the same time voting against the extension of unemployment benefits, I do not know why he would be doing anything like that.

Mr. LEVIN. Because essentially, Mr. Speaker, people come on the floor and talk about the need to provide some assistance to the people who are laid off through no fault of their own, but when the chips are down, when there is a chance to extend benefits, they vote no.

I will go back and check the gentleman's previous vote. I have the last vote. The gentleman voted "no."

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not know when I have said that, but I have regularly said, let us create some private sector jobs and get the Government out of providing this kind of constant extension which we basically should establish as an entitlement program that will go on ad infinitum.

Mr. LEVIN. I do not want it to go on ad infinitum. On the other hand, I do not want us to be inconsistent, to say one thing and to do another.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman has not told me when I have said one thing and have done another. My friend has accused me of saying one thing and doing something else. I would like to have an example of that.

Mr. LEVIN. The example is that time after time on the extension of benefits, most in the minority people came—

Mr. DREIER. Is the gentleman referring to this gentleman?

Mr. LEVIN. Most in the minority party, let me finish, came forward and said, "Let us do something else." They said, "Let us have an economic growth package." Many of the times it was not paid for and it did not meet the immediate needs of people who were laid off through no fault of their own.

I do not want an entitlement program. This is not a welfare program. I have been a leader in the effort to try to connect unemployment with reemployment. Here we have a bill that does exactly that.

It is a disgrace in this country that only 6 percent of the unemployed have any help with job search, even as they are exhausting their benefits. We do not provide the link between unemployment and reemployment. Here is a bill that does exactly that. It has become, instead of a place where we join hands because it is a good idea, it becomes, again, like the previous unemployment comp extension efforts, a political football.

The people who are in the unemployment lines, who want to go back to work, and there are some abusers, as is true in any other program, and it is up to the States to get rid of the abusers. We should help.

Here we have a program that does link the two. It is time for us to not talk about what was done 6 or 7 or 8 months ago, or to talk about gridlock, but to get behind this bill. I will be very interested to see how many votes we will get on the minority side tomorrow when the chips are down, when the wheels really hit the road.

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

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to formally hear on the floor, in response to the remarks of my very dear friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN]. I would like to extend to him an invitation to join our

bipartisan, bicameral, arm-in-arm, zero capital gains tax caucus, which is designed to create private sector job opportunities, and I hope he will join Members on his side of the aisle in both the House and the Senate who are part of that, so we can step forward and create meaningful private sector jobs and expand this economy.

I hope very much that my friend will seize the opportunity to join us in the attempt to create meaningful private sector jobs, so we will not have to stand here and argue whether or not we are going to extend unemployment benefits to States that today have full employment.

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

I know the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], who has been very active about the issue, feels passionately about the amendment she will offer. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has just indicated his position on it by his last statement.

I would say to my friend from California, a State may have full employment, but there are people within that State who are out of work and deserve those benefits, just as much as people in Michigan, in California, and other places. They do not care whether their State, in terms of numbers, has full employment or not. They are out of work. They are out of work for a long time. They have obligations to meet. They are just as deserving as the people who come from a State that has high unemployment.

I am sure we are going to get into this debate tomorrow. If the gentleman likes, we can do it this evening as well. I think the intention of the amendment is probably well-intentioned.

□ 1850

But the fact of the matter is there are real people behind those numbers, those are real people in those States. They have families, they have mortgages, they have education payments to make. All they want to do is have a decent life and a commitment to work, and you cannot treat them differently than people in high unemployment States. And that is all we are saying.

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

Mr. BONIOR, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. We will be debating this in the morning.

By the way, look, we should be debating, discussing capital gains provisions. I sponsored one that was tied in to inflation.

But for the 250,000 people who will exhaust their benefits this month, they want action. They do not want further debate. And I am in favor of every assistance we can give to the creation of the jobs in the private sector. But do not use that as an excuse for inaction.

I just want to say to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], this is going to come out tomorrow, when she looks at the exhaustion rates in some of the States that would be caught by her amendment, they are higher than the exhaustion rates in some of the States where the workers would receive these benefits. And you have to bear that burden, you have to bear that burden.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to yield 8 minutes to my very good friend, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of things that I think very much need to be said at this time, and we will get into this more tomorrow.

But my colleague from Michigan has talked about how people who are unemployed in States with low unemployment rates are still in tough straits. They are in tough straits personally, but in very different circumstances.

In Connecticut when our unemployment rate was 4 percent, I had companies turning down orders because they could not find enough people to beef up their production rates. I had grocery stores closing down hours because they lost people to bag. We on this floor had to come back and specifically increase the salaries the VA system was offering to receptionists and all kinds of people because we could no longer compete at the salaries that we had been offering once unemployment got below 5 percent in Connecticut.

Now the unemployment rate of 4 percent or 3 percent represents the normal turnover, people who are moving from job to job, and so on and so forth. And anyone who lives in a State that has that kind of unemployment sees signs out that say help wanted. Now they may not be at the same wages that one was accustomed to work, but the circumstances of an unemployed person in a State with 4-percent unemployment is absolutely different than the circumstances of the people in Connecticut or in California, both of which are suffering from the dual impact of the collapse of the S&L system and the absolutely irresponsible pace at which we have been cutting defense contracts. And so those people genuinely not only are unemployed, but are in States where there is no employment option. And our responsibility here on the floor is to look at the particular nature of the extended benefit program.

I want to add a couple of things, because there have been some statements made in this debate and I think mislead the public as to both the quality and quantity of the work this body has done in recent years. We did reform our unemployment compensation benefits program and particularly the extended benefits portion of it only a year ago. And when our friend, Tom Downey of

New York, chaired the committee, we adopted the lowest and the most generous trigger for extended benefits that the Nation has ever adopted. We adopted not only a 6.5 percent at that time, when economists were testifying that 6 percent was full employment, but we used to develop that 6.5 percent the most generous definition of unemployment the Nation has ever used, because it included those exhaustees. It was the first time, and Tom Downey deserves a lot of credit for having worked with the Department of Labor, President Bush's Department of Labor, to develop a way to estimating exhaustees. And the Ways and Means Committee reformed that program, made it far more generous, far easier to trigger extended benefits.

The difference was that the States had to share in the cost. Now almost all of the States right now had a surplus in their unemployment compensation funds, and they could share in the cost. And yet, we are going to tomorrow consider providing extended benefits 100 percent federally funded extended benefits at a time when this body raised taxes a very significant amount to fund the needs that we felt the Nation had only a few short months ago. In other words, we said to America that it is tough, you are going to have to pay more taxes, but this is what we need, these are the needs of our people, and here is the plan to address those needs, the spending needs, and we will have to raise taxes to do it. We knew about this need then. We knew we were going to have to extend benefits then. We should have included it in that budget, paid for it with those tax increases, and by gum, that was the right way to do it. And for us to be coming back a few months later to fund a need we knew about is part of the reason the people do not trust us any longer.

But I did want to get on the record that the Ways and Means Committee did a very powerful, very responsible reform of our extended benefits program. I agree with the Majority Leader that we need to reform the retraining programs in America so that we do a far better job of helping people get reemployed rather than sustaining them on unemployment. And I am proud, I am pleased to say that this President is proposing that kind of reform.

I am even prouder to say that President Bush introduced the most comprehensive reform of our unemployment system and of our job training system that anyone had ever introduced, and he did it because he wanted us to understand that the free trade agreement with Mexico would be backed with a new and better system. And our committee would not hear that bill. Now remember that. We refused to even consider a retraining program that for the first time offered stipends to people who were in danger of

losing their jobs because of changes in trade or environmental law. I mean, it was the most progressive retraining bill we have ever had, and the bill that is going to come to us from the Labor Department will build on it.

So this Congress has, for political reasons in the past, deferred. So when my colleague from Michigan says we should not do politics, enormous politics have been done with the unemployed. And I am proud of the fact that the Republicans tonight did not put obstacles in the way. We want a bill that is funded, and many of us are going to vote for it. But in the past my colleague from Michigan also said we never supported unemployment. We supported unemployment overwhelmingly, the extension of benefits overwhelmingly.

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I am happy to yield for a moment to my colleague from Pennsylvania to get this issue of fact on the record.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I will just quote the dates on which unemployment bills were passed.

On November 14, 135 Republicans voted for the extension, 26 against. That is the first extension. The second extension, February 4, 1992, 151 Republicans voted for it, 8 against. On July 2, 1992, the third extension, 142 Republicans voted for, 21 against.

So in all three cases of funded extended benefits they were supported overwhelmingly by the Republican Party.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. The important thing is that the Republicans have stood firmly and strongly behind extending benefits when they were paid for. We voted against them when they were not paid for.

In contrast, the majority party in today's Congress passed completely unfunded extended benefits a few months ago, totally borrowed money, 100 percent federally funded, federally borrowed money, and this time they are making an absolutely honest effort to fund it. And I commend them on that, and I will support it.

But the record of Republicans in supporting extended benefits is an honorable one. It has been a tough one because we have had to vote no when they were not funded. We have voted yes when they were funded.

Furthermore, the committee's record in reforming our extended benefit program is an honorable, progressive, and reformist record of those Republicans and Democrats, with Democrat leadership of our colleague Tom Downey. And our record as a party on reforming job training proposals is an outstanding one. As a Congress it is a silent one.

□ 1900

I hope we will move together to do that. But make no mistake about it,

we do not accept the implication that we are in any way blocking unemployment comp. In fact we are absolutely strongly opposed to the delay you have imposed on our constituents getting the benefits they need. And it is that responsibility that you and you alone must take.

Just one last comment. Let me clear up this issue of a supplementary security benefits problem. Nobody on that program now is going to be taken off that program by the way we are funding these benefits. Everyone on it is secure. The only difference is going to be those that are coming up to the 3-year limit will now have to be supported by their sponsors for 2 more years. If the sponsoring family has experienced an economic catastrophe and cannot afford to support the alien they sponsored, they will be free of that responsibility. So there is no hardship here. It is only families that can afford to carry their sponsored person for 2 more years that would be affected. Those are the facts, and I think it is important to have our debate and our decisions based on the facts.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to respond, if I might.

I want to make a couple of comments with respect to my colleague from the State of Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. First of all, let me say that we in the Rules Committee have made the gentlewoman's amendment in order. I am sure the gentlewoman is aware of that. I expect she will be supporting the rule as we move forward on this bill.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do intend to support the rule.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for that.

For those of you who are listening to the debate here this evening, I think it is instructive to maybe give a little bit of the other side of the Johnson amendment because I think it is an important amendment in this bill. The amendment would exclude from the emergency unemployment extended comp program those States that average a rate of total unemployment for the most recent 3 months of less than 5 percent. Those States include Delaware, Hawaii, Iowa, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Indiana, North Carolina and Wisconsin.

Now, the argument that the gentlewoman from Connecticut makes is that chances of getting a job in a low-unemployment State are much better than they are in a high-unemployment States. If you have got full employment, as the gentlewoman said, in your State, there are going to be advertisements our there, people are going to be

looking for people to employ in these jobs. They say that it follows from this that workers in low-unemployment States should get a job instead of filing for unemployment benefits.

This might be true in some States. The gentlewoman's State is a relatively small geographical State, as is Rhode Island, Delaware. But even in some of these States it is difficult for families to pick up and do the thing that she suggests, to go from one end of the State to the other.

For instance, in Iowa, the latest unemployment rate available in Iowa City, IA, where I happened to live for 4 years, is 1.9 percent. They clearly have what is termed full employment.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. But they are going to give benefits under your amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. But it is 5.3 percent in the Waterloo-Cedar Falls area. The question is: Should we deny these benefits to unemployed workers in Waterloo-Sioux Falls because the unemployment rate in the rest of the State is low? I do not think we should. They are just as unemployed as they are in Virginia, where, by the way, the unemployment rate is the same, 5.3 percent.

So it seems to me we have got to refocus this debate on this important amendment down to individuals. We are not talking statistics. Statistics do not bleed, Mr. Speaker; people do, families do.

These families have the same obligations, the same needs for opportunity, the same bills to pay as people in California, as people in New York, Michigan, or Ohio. And we ought not to just summarily dismiss them because they happen to live in a State where the unemployment rate may be below the average, even though they may be hundreds of miles away from where those opportunities lie.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind the body that if anybody has the credit of bringing this issue to our country's attention, that is, the plight of the unemployed, it was Mr. BONIOR in the last session of the Congress who stood on this floor for hours upon hours pointing out that unemployed people in this Nation were hurting and we need to extend the unemployment benefits for them. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] forgot to point out that President Bush vetoed one of those bills. It would be interesting to see the vote count on that as well and how his caucus voted on the bill that President Bush vetoed.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPETSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman for yielding. It

was vetoed because it was unfunded. The bill which President Bush vetoed was unfunded.

Mr. KOPETSKI. The fact is, if you are unemployed out there in America, you do not care if the funding is there or not. You need the check because the grocer still charges you money for groceries, your mortgage is still due, the car payment is still due, and the kids have got to go to school. That is what we are talking about, what Mr. BONIOR is talking about, these individuals in our society.

I know the gentlewoman has a care and concern for people in this country, but we are talking today about unemployed people. It seems the debate is straying away. We start talking about capital gains tax reductions, which I of course support, but we are not dealing with that issue here. We are not trying to change the world. There is a great bumper sticker that says, "Some people want to change the world, we just want to change your oil."

All we are trying to do here is extend unemployment benefits to unemployed workers. These are people who are ready to work, able to work, they are out there looking for work, and there are no jobs for them.

The problem we are facing in this country today, which this administration is recognizing and is going to have programs in place to address, is the fact that whether you are displaced—if you are a displaced aerospace worker or a defense worker in Connecticut, you may not be qualified to take a job that is in existence there in Connecticut. Or if you are a displaced timber worker in Oregon, you may not be able to take an existing job in the high-technology industry that is available in Oregon today. That is the structural setup. That is what we are calling the structural problem in this unemployment system.

The committee examined all kinds of ways to fund it. We knew we could not put it on the deficit, so we looked for something. We knew we could not bring an increase to the FUTA tax to this floor because there would not be the political support for it. This is what we came up with. This is the best we know. Is it the best means? No. Is it perfect? No, but it shows that we are scraping the barrel to finance even this kind of program for people in this country, that we do have to reform the system, that we do have to get this economy going.

I hope all of you support that rule tomorrow.

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

I say to my friend from Mount Clemens that I hope he joins with the gentleman from Oregon and me in supporting the greatest job-creating item we have coming before us on November 17, that being the North American Free-Trade Agreement.

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

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We can come back later tonight and spend an hour or so on it.

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to.

Mr. BONIOR. I recall reading yesterday that Secretary Reich sent up the retraining money in the Senate. He is asking for \$100 million for the whole country to retrain 10,000 workers who will be displaced by the North American Free-Trade Agreement—10,000 workers is a drop in the bucket, but I would be happy to talk about that at some future time.

Mr. DREIER. We look forward to taking part in that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my friend from Mount Lebanon, PA [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank my friend for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friend from Oregon that his comment that the people who are unemployed do not care whether it is unfunded or not is fundamentally wrong. I happen to have one of the highest rates of unemployment of any area in the country, and they do care. But I went to lots of town meetings, and I talked with those people, and they said they are not willing to sacrifice their children's future by piling more money onto the deficit just so they can get their unemployment benefits. They wanted a responsible package.

□ 1910

What this House continually does is underestimate how responsible families are in this country, how much they realize that they do want their government to live within their means. It is that kind of attitude that we should listen to more in this House, instead of just willy-nilly passing more benefits to people who would like to see them paid for.

What I would like to do first is to just commend my chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] and the committee for putting forward in this rule a bill that everyone on this floor should be able to support. It is a bill that is paid for. It is a bill that extends benefits for 4 months and does it in a way that I am very, very proud to be here and support, because it has two reforms to pay for this proposal which I think are both good reforms, one having to do with the sponsorship of provisions that we discussed earlier, and the other having to do with worker profiling which I think is a very important thing that I think we should be doing.

So I want to commend the chairman for his fine work in bailing out the administration and coming up with a funding mechanism and to be able to

stand up here and support the work of the committee that was done unanimously in committee, to see it here on the floor.

The only thing I would like to express a little concern about is the fact that this should have been done 15 days ago. Fifteen days ago we had this very same rule that we have today. I can guarantee you that 15 days ago the chairman and every member of this committee would have been up here supporting this bill and having it pass overwhelmingly and we would not have had 2 weeks of people in this country having fallen off unemployment benefits, 2 weeks of people being denied benefits in this country because we refused to act.

The gentleman from Michigan claims himself to be the great patriot of the unemployed, and yet held up consideration of this bill for 2 weeks while people went without extended benefits.

I think the compassion that he would express for those in States like Nebraska that have a 2.9 percent unemployment rate should have been evidenced on the floor for the past 2 weeks, where no one from his side of the aisle took the well and complained why there was not a vote on this bill, took the well and complained why we were not addressing this problem because there were internal special interest politics being played on his side of the aisle.

Where is the compassion, when the effort to solve this situation is bound up in special interest politics? Where is it? Where have you been for 2 weeks? Why have you not been here on the floor defending the unemployed for 2 weeks as they fell off?

I will say that Members from your side of the aisle have done a great job in past extensions telling us how urgent the need for extended benefits are, and how we could not delay, not a moment to wait to extend benefits because, well, we had to pay for these.

In fact, I will read you quotes, Mr. PICKLE on November 20, 1991, says:

There are millions of people, Americans who need this legislation, I hope that this is the final version of it and it can be approved immediately.

February 4, 1992, second extension, Mr. PETE GEREN from Texas:

The clock is ticking for the 43,000 unemployed workers in my home town. An additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits should not only be the beginning of our efforts to get them back on their feet, these benefits will keep food on their tables and the wolf from the door.

Again on February 4, 1992, the second extension:

These folks are not looking for a hand-out—

Said the gentlewoman from Tennessee [Mrs. LLOYD].

They are taxpayers who have supported this Nation. Many have fought to defend our personal freedoms on foreign shores. They have

sent their sons and daughters off to do the same without hesitation. Action must be taken now to stave off the proverbial wolf at the door which has forced many families to choose between essentials which they cannot afford to do without.

The third extension of benefits, July 2, 1992, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]:

With so many people out of work, we have a responsibility to act quickly and decisively if we are to give them the assistance they need and deserve.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA]:

For some on July 4th when unemployment runs out for millions, it will not be a day for fireworks. It will be a sad day for family meetings to discuss how to pay for mortgages and how to buy groceries.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD]:

Today, all across our Nation, millions of Americans are preparing to celebrate the 4th of July weekend with their families. For many Americans, however, this holiday, like so many before, will hold no reason for celebration, only the continued fear and economic insecurity, of an impending expiration of their unemployment benefits.

The fourth extension of unemployment benefits earlier this year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE]:

Some may argue that the House should delay action on this issue, but any delay puts at risk the ability of unemployed Americans to provide for their families. The House must act expeditiously to ensure that unemployment benefits are available after the expiration date.

It goes on and on. Where were these people the past 2 weeks? Where are they are on the floor today? Where is the compassion that was held up for the people who are for the unemployed, when you were playing special interest politics for 2 weeks while people could not feed their families.

Let us talk about real politics. Let us not talk about phonies. Let us talk about the cost to States who now having dropped the program are going to have to reconstitute the program and try to find these people who have dropped out of the system and get them back in the system to pay them their extended benefits. You have not even addressed the issue of where we are going to come up with that money.

This place is full of hypocrisy in many, many instances, but never will I hear in my time here the hypocrisy that has gone on in the last 2 weeks on this floor that we have seen on this bill.

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

I just have one question for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Where is the gentleman on the North American Free-Trade Agreement? Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] support that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am still receiving testimony in the Ways and Means Committee. I have not made up in my mind.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I guess I started the NAFTA debate here.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my very dear friend and colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Greater San Dimas, CA, and environs for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to look at this from a somewhat different perspective. This is a debate on the rule. I realize we sort of have gotten away from that, and certainly after the very useful discussion we just had with the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I think outlined the problems very well from the perspective of the customer whom we all serve and the problems that have taken place in the past 2 weeks.

I will say for the record that the Minority side did participate in the lengthy meeting with the Rules Committee which caused some inconvenience because it was called at the last minute because of the deadline when we realized the October 2 expiration was coming up, and we did our work and we reported out a rule, I believe, September 29, in time for action to be taken to meet the deadline, so no American who was unemployed and eligible for this program needed to have gone without.

I think it is perfectly clear, the record is clear that the problem has been on the other side of the aisle, the management on the majority side. I do not know what the problems are. I am not going to talk more about gridlock. I think we have seen a new definition of gridlock today, but that is not my point in getting up.

We have redefined tranching. This is the sixth bite. The sixth bite would have come on New Year's, but we have not accepted that approach. Now we are going to do the fifth tranche at some point soon because the pressure is on to deal with this program, and the sixth tranche will come sometime later, presumably after 4 months; but we will have yet another tranche, so we have given yet another word a new meaning.

We have also given the word emergency a new meaning I think in this process, but the bottom line is how are we going to pay for this?

What we are being told now is that it is going to be a miracle of the States that is going to pay for this. We are going to go through this worker profiling, and what has never been possible before by these States that are strapped for funds is suddenly miraculously going to be possible and we are going to raise millions of dollars to pay for this program.

The SSI problem we have heard caused a problem on the other side with the rule we passed out on the 29th, the rule we are talking about now, has not gone away. So we still have the problem there.

The shortening of the benefits package from 4 months to 3 months apparently is not meeting with approval.

The Gekas proposal, which is the one we really wanted to make in order, which is a sensible way to begin talking about funding this, we are not going to be allowed to debate.

So the question remains, how do we pay for this?

I submit that the majority is asking us to pay for this by adding it to the national debt. That is really what we are being asked to do, avoid the issue of pay, we will get to it later. The emergency is too great. We will have another chance to come to the sixth tranche, and that is responsible to all Americans who are being asked to pick up the tab for the national debt, including those who have not yet been born.

That is why I am opposing this rule and suggest others oppose it as well.

□ 1920

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

Mr. Speaker, I just recommend to my colleague who sits with me on the Committee on Rules that he share a discussion with the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] who is a supporter of this rule, and maybe between now and tomorrow morning when we do it she can convince him, as a Member of his party, that this is the best we can do at this point, that we should go forward and provide these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA] is recognized for 1 minute and advises the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] that he has the right to close.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin can close for me.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I hope we do not delay any further. There are thousands of Americans that are waiting for our action tomorrow, and I hope we will find a way to work together on a bipartisan basis to pass a rule and finally pass a much deserved and much needed bill.

But secondarily, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will also have the compassion to not only not delay, but also not to deny benefits to thousands of workers that have worked hard to qualify for benefits, that need those benefits, that happen to live in States that are below 5 percent, and I can tell my colleagues that there are parts of my district

where the unemployment rate far exceeds a statewide average of 5 percent.

That is why I hope tomorrow that the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] will fail. I hope we will have some equity, and I hope that we will be able to ensure that workers and their families that need this help will get the help that they richly deserve so that they can get retrained so they can get back into the workforce where they want to be, and so I will just ask, Mr. Speaker, that we work together.

I say to my colleagues, Let's pass a bill tomorrow.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my very good friend and hard-working Member, the gentleman from Del Mar, CA [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the comments from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON]. I think they said it very eloquently for our position. I would like to go from another direction.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard that people bleed, but why are they bleeding? I have heard that we do not care that we are paid or not paid, or people do not care who or what event is paid for. But if we increase the national debt, which is already \$4.3 trillion, that is going to cost more jobs in the long run. The Clinton tax bill increased the debt by \$1 trillion. That will also cost jobs. I have heard about the displaced timber workers from Oregon, and I say to my colleagues, You won't find the Republicans voting on an unreasonable Endangered Species Act which is putting those timber workers out of work and then cry they don't have the dollars.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are bleeding. Look at the fishing industry, especially in the State of California. The other side has destroyed it with the Endangered Species Act.

They want to get the economy going? We are not talking about line-item veto and balanced budget amendment, but all of these things will create jobs, and that is what we are talking about here. I heard that the North American Free-Trade Agreement will displace 10,000 jobs. The Clinton tax plan of a \$127 billion tax cut in defense, above the \$50 billion we already went through, will cost 2 million jobs in the United States. Two million jobs, Mr. Speaker. How about those folks?

These are the same people that are going to bleed and that they are going to want to give unemployment dollars to. We need to take a look at that.

In the State of California my colleagues say they have got problems. We have got in some areas 10 percent unemployment.

Now let us take a look at why we are bleeding, and I say to my colleagues, If you take a look at the highest tax rate in the history of this country, we are

going to bleed. Eighty percent of all your spending cuts come after 1996, and I say quite frankly, I do not want President Jack Kemp to have to deal with that.

What about construction and real estate? They put a clamp on the banks so tight with revenue cutters that banks cannot be banks to make loans that create the jobs in the construction industry, in the real estate industry.

Let us look at the EPA. Look on how many States, Republicans and Democrats, how the EPA has put rules and regulations on them. It is costing us jobs.

Look at the family leave program on small business. The Democrats are attacking small business on purpose. Why? Because small business votes with the Chamber; they support Republicans.

The Federal employees, on which they passed the Hatch Act, votes Democrat mostly. They are trying to socialize this country, trying to unionize it at the expense of business, and that business is jobs, and now they are trying to pay for it when they cannot pay for it and extend it.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, in this country unemployment benefits, health care benefits, education reform are tools to socialize this country by the leadership of the Democrat Party. They are trying to put everything under a single umbrella so that they can buy the votes. That is why they wanted to increase taxes. They want to socialize the country, make it beholden to the Federal Government and cry that people are out of work.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, You can't do that and create jobs. If you did, you wouldn't vote for those kinds of things. Look at the volunteer education program. You just created 100,000 new Federal workers, gave them \$17,000. But in each city you are going to have to establish those bureaucracies, and a new Federal Government and a new mandate. With the health care bill, my colleagues, sure. You want to increase the size of government, but again you want to put it on the backs of small business. That is going to cost you jobs along with the tax increases, with the family leave program, with the Hatch Act, with all the other things that you're destroying jobs, and then you are trying to fight for those unemployment benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is wrong.  
Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule I, further proceedings are postponed until tomorrow.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

**INTRODUCTION OF MILITARY FAIRWAY FAIRNESS ACT OF 1993**

(Mr. KLECZKA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Military Fairway Fairness Act of 1993, which would open military golf courses to the general public, an idea which would raise \$100 million for deficit reduction. I had previously sought to introduce this as an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1994, but was unable to include it in the rule.

The idea to open military golf courses came to me from one of my constituents, Mr. Jack Nedobek. This constituent, like many, is concerned about Government spending and saw this solely as a benefit for the military. I agree with him and am pleased to bring this issue to the national forum. It just goes to show that some of our best ideas don't come from inside the beltway, they come from the folks back home.

Currently, military golf courses cost American taxpayers \$6 million a year. The American people pay part of the cost of operating the courses, yet they do not receive any benefit from their investment. Those in uniform often pay half as much at a military course as civilians pay at a public golf course.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the military is concerned with the morale and quality of life of its personnel. I share this concern, but I believe that exclusive golf courses are unnecessary. As in a similar bill introduced by Senator DECONCINI, this bill would not restrict the use of these golf courses by military personnel; it would simply permit the use of the facilities by civilians. I believe that it is unfair to ask American people to continue to support such exclusiveness. It's time to tee off on this unnecessary benefit.

Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the Military Fairway Fairness Act of 1993:

H.R. 3283

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Military Fairway Fairness Act of 1993".

**SEC. 2. USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE GOLF COURSES BY THE GENERAL PUBLIC.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"§ 2246. Department of Defense golf courses: use by the general public**

"(a) LIMITATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), each golf course equipped,

owned, operated, or maintained at a facility or installation of the Department of Defense shall be open to use by the general public.

"(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to a golf course at a facility or installation outside the United States or at a facility or installation inside the United States at a location designated by the Secretary of Defense as a remote and isolated location.

"(c) USE OF GENERATED REVENUES.—(1) Not more than 10 percent of any gross revenues generated during a fiscal year from the operation of a golf course to which subsection (a) applies may be retained by the operator of the golf course. Any such gross revenues that are retained under this paragraph may be used only to maintain such course or to support morale, welfare, or recreation activities of the military personnel at the facility or installation. Any such gross revenues generated during a fiscal year that are not retained under this paragraph shall be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury and used only for Federal budget deficit reduction.

"(2) The Secretary of Defense shall annually submit to the Congress a report that identifies in detail how the revenues retained under paragraph (1) have been expended.

"(d) FEES.—The Secretary of Defense may subsidize for active and retired military personnel any fees imposed by the Secretary for the use of the golf course and give priority access to the golf course for such personnel. Fees imposed for nonmilitary persons for the use of the golf course shall be based on rates that are competitive with golf fee rates in effect in the relevant local community.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe regulations to carry out this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of such subchapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"2246. Department of Defense golf courses: use by the general public."

**THE CLINTON HEALTH PLAN: PROMOTING PRIMARY CARE**

(Mr. KREIDLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton health reform plan will improve the quality of medical care in America by encouraging more doctors to work in the fields of general and family medicine.

I would like to share with my colleagues a recent article in the Tacoma News Tribune that discusses our efforts in Washington State to address the critical shortage of these primary care physicians.

In America, we pay too much to treat illness after it becomes serious, and too little to prevent it in the first place.

That's because we have too many high-priced, high-technology specialists and not enough down-home family doctors.

Most countries have a ratio of one specialist for every two general practitioners.

America has just the opposite. My district has a shortage of primary care physicians.

That means too many people go to the local emergency room for their care—and that's the most expensive care around.

That's not only bad economics, it's bad medicine too.

The Clinton plan will change that and offer better care at an affordable cost.

That's the prescription we need.

[From the Tacoma News Tribune, Sept. 27, 1993]

#### BACK TO BASICS OF MEDICINE

(By Patti Eplar)

Every Friday afternoon, Dr. Cynthia Dumler trades the medical woes of downtown Tacoma for the growing suburban ailments of Puyallup's South Hill.

Dumler, a first-year resident, is one of two new doctors who are learning the specialty of family medicine in an area of the county that really needs their help.

Despite three pages of listings in the Puyallup yellow pages, doctors in Eastern Pierce County are in short supply. Now, state officials and health care administrators are hoping to entice young physicians to set up practice in underserved areas of the state through tuition assistance and offsetting residency training costs.

"It's not out of the question," says Dumler about settling in Puyallup after her three years as a family practice resident are up. A Nebraska native, Dumler says she likes the opportunities small towns have to offer family doctors, including a better sense of community and a broader range of privileges at local hospitals.

Dumler is the kind of doctor envisioned in President Clinton's just-released health care proposal as well as the reform measure the Washington Legislature passed earlier this year.

In fact, experts say, the trend in medicine is away from specialties like orthopedic surgery or thoracic surgery and toward specialties that people really need—family care, pediatrics, internal medicine, the so-called primary care fields.

No more running to the doctor only when you're sick. That drives up costs for everyone.

Instead, people would regularly get checkups from doctors who could focus on what a particular patient might need to maintain a healthy lifestyle and avoid ailments like heart disease.

A 30-year-old woman, for example, doesn't need blood tests or heart exams, says Dr. Marilyn Darr, a family practitioner and faculty member at Puyallup Valley Family Practice Clinic in the South Hill area.

"She needs good breast exams and to be taught how to do that herself. She needs good Pap smears and good pelvises," Darr said.

"It's not the glorious fix-your-heart thing, but it's the basic stuff that needs to be done."

The trouble is there are not enough primary care physicians. University of Washington medical school administrators estimate there's a need for nearly 300 more primary care doctors along the Interstate 5 corridor in Snohomish, King and Pierce counties.

Eastern Pierce County, one of the fastest-growing areas of the state, is feeling a particular crunch because of its rapid growth and rural characteristics.

The Puyallup and Orting valleys are short about 30 primary care doctors, and Dr. John

Coombs, associate dean for regional affairs and rural health at the UW School of Medicine.

Coombs said a lot of people in the fast-growing east country area may not be able to get to a doctor on a regular basis or have to drive a long way from home for a checkup.

Darr said dozens of patients come from Mount Rainier, Orting, Graham and even Tacoma to the South Hill center for medical care.

Moreover, Coombs said, the emergency room at Good Samaritan Hospital in Puyallup is one of the busiest in the state because many people use it for ailments they should be seeing a private physician for.

The Puyallup clinic is a satellite of Tacoma Family Medicine, which also trains residents in family practice. Dumler and Dr. Alan Shulman are the only two of Tacoma Family Medicine's 20 residents who receive training in Puyallup, although officials hope to expand the program to six residents eventually.

The residency program is sponsored by Good Samaritan Hospital and Multicare Medical Center, which looked at the number of doctors in the area and found a void that needed to be filled.

Earlier this year, the Legislature boosted funding for a UW program that helps hospitals and clinics pay residency training costs for doctors who agree to go into primary care fields.

The \$2.8 million brings the state's commitment to training doctors to about \$4 million and was a key element of the state's ambitious health care reform effort.

"There's a very, very strong commitment on the part of the Legislature to deal with underserved areas and to follow up with the money to make it work," said state Sen. Phil Talmadge, a West Seattle Democrat and one of the principal lawmakers behind health care reform.

Talmadge notes that enticing young doctors away from the glamorous, high-paying specialties and into the family care fields is a central principle of health care reform. The state hopes to corral runaway medical costs in part by taking better care of people up front, before they develop problems that need expensive procedures and treatments.

Health care reform "will not work absent a shift in the nature of the professionals providing the services," Talmadge said. "We have to produce people who will be the gatekeepers" of good health.

To that end, the Legislature also required the UW medical school to make sure that at least half its graduates go into primary care fields, in order to keep the extra funding for residency training, Talmadge said.

Still, wrenching the medical profession from its traditional way of doing business isn't cheap.

State funds contribute only about 8 percent of the actual cost of training residents, Coombs said, with the rest of the money coming from grants, patient fees and hospitals like Good Samaritan.

Residents are encouraged to stay in the geographic area where they take their training but aren't required to do so. Coombs said the residency programs have about an 80 percent retention rate—doctors who end up staying in the state.

"There are lots of enticements," he said, including support from the residency program for a new doctor beginning practice.

"Most of them will practice within 50 miles of the residency program," Coombs said. "That means having a residency program in Puyallup will help bring doctors to that area."

#### WORKING FOR EQUITABLE ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY HEALTH CARE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, all Americans, especially the poor and minorities, need health security for their families which provides for primary and preventive health care services and eliminates a multitier health system.

More than 38 million Americans are without health coverage today, and millions more are underinsured. Minorities and persons with limited income represent the largest percentage of the uninsured and underinsured. However, most Americans are without the security of knowing if their insurance coverage will protect them fully in case of a medical crisis. We need to change the health care system in our country to insure that all Americans, rich or poor, have the health care coverage they and their families so rightly deserve.

I know first hand the problems the citizens of the First District of North Carolina face in their efforts to receive adequate health care. Because the First Congressional District of North Carolina is very rural and economically distressed, many of my constituents do not have access to regular primary health care or preventive services. In fact, the recent census has shown that the number of poor people in America has increased—that will mean more families will be denied adequate health care.

One of the biggest challenges in reforming health care will be to insure equitable access to high quality health care. That will mean the current system based on structural inequities in rural areas and inequalities based on race must be eliminated.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the health care reform proposal to insure that all Americans receive high quality health care.

Mr. Speaker, for the RECORD I include a statement on the Clinton health care reform, and what it means to African-Americans:

#### THE CLINTON HEALTH CARE REFORM: WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO AFRICAN AMERICANS?

(By Linda A. Clayton, MD, MPH and W. Michael Byrd, MD, MPH)

#### CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS HEALTH BRAINTRUST TESTIMONY

In this ERA of health reform, the unique and crisis laden needs of African American, disadvantaged minority, and poor populations have hardly been mentioned. Instead of a reform based on principles of public health, rational and objective health planning, and meeting quantitative health needs assessments, emphasis instead has been placed upon developing a system overwhelmingly shaped by purely economic and ideological considerations. In this artificial debate, the poor health outcome, health status, and health service delivery performance of the United States (U.S.) Health System; the

wide, deep, health outcome and services disparities based on race and class, and; the multiple causes of the economic displacements and runaway health care costs inflation are scarcely mentioned, much less analyzed and addressed.

Though seldom mentioned in the media, African Americans suffer the worst health status, receive the worst health services, and experience the worst health outcomes of any racial or ethnic group in the United States. The general "Mainstream" health crisis characterized by rampant health care cost inflation consuming 14 percent of the GDP; leaving 37 million Americans uninsured and another 50 million underinsured, and; usurping the United States' competitiveness in the world economy cannot be allowed to obscure this severe, ominous and dangerous, structural, race and class-based health crisis. Moreover, the lower tier of this "Dual health crisis" is built upon decades of health care segregation and discrimination and has roots more than three centuries old. Problems this deeply ingrained in the fabric of a social system don't solve themselves.

For example, the glowing reports released yesterday of improvements in white America's longevity and infant mortality rate don't mention the fact African Americans have been losing life-span since 1984 and infant mortality rates two to three times worse than white rates have stagnated. Blacks, both urban and rural, are far less likely to receive preventative or therapeutic services; less likely to have access to primary or specialty care providers, and; are less likely to receive or benefit from the recent high technology medical progress.

Over the past 30 years we have lost over 200 black, inner-city and rural, hospitals; we have lost more than 600 community health centers and numerous migrant health centers. For the past quarter century funding has been continuously stripped from city and public hospitals, yet blacks, other minorities and the poor are forced to utilize these underfunded, poorly equipped and understaffed facilities or emergency rooms for their health care.

Collapse of urban and rural health care infrastructures, has been the result of market forces, cut throat market competition in the health system, monetarization and commercialization or health care, and over-reliance on the private sector for the delivery of health care in America. While market forces have been working, inner-city and large blocks of rural areas have been categorized as "medically underserved" areas for the past 30 years and this situation continues to deteriorate to the present time. Yet no specific plans, measures, or corrective actions have been revealed to alleviate these problems or adequately serve these populations.

Additionally, race and class discrimination is pervasive throughout the United States health system at all levels from patients to professional and institutional providers. This has been reflected in health outcome studies; recent health service utilization studies both recently reported in the *N Engl J Med*, *JNMA*, *JAMA*, and the *J Health Care for the Poor and Underserved*, and; health practice patterns studies recently conducted by the National Medical Association.

As reflected in the recently released world health organization report and Andrew Hacker's book "Two Nations, Life Across the Racial Divide in America," is very separate and very unequal; and that includes the health delivery system.

We challenge the Clinton administration to join in the philosophy of the other 23 Or-

ganization for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD] nations and develop a universal health system that will correct structural inequities and inequalities based on race and class; will objectively, practically, and structurally incorporate all Americans into a truly unitary health system driven by the Nation's public health needs, and; will provide equitable access to high quality, comprehensive, health services based on international, not "Fortune 500", standards regardless of race, class, work status, ethnicity, geographic location, or the ability to pay.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the 60-minute special orders granted today for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] be switched. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1930

#### OVERREGULATION OF BUSINESSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as we talk about reinventing Government, we need to talk about overregulation.

Mr. Speaker, every day, Congress endangers jobs in this country through the overregulation of business. According to a 1993 study cited by the Vice President's report on reinventing Government, the private sector has to spend at least \$430 billion annually to comply with Federal requirements—that's 9 percent of GDP. As we search for ways to help Americans, let's make sure we don't help them right out of their jobs.

A survey of small and mid-sized businesses this summer found that 38 percent have been unable to get enough investment capital. One cause of this capital crunch is the money siphoned off by Federal Government overspending and overregulations.

The list of burdensome requirements placed on businesses is long: payroll tax deposit requirements; OSHA regulations; environmental rules; wage reporting requirements; Disability Act requirements; minimum wage rules; product safety standards; pension regulations; and Equal Opportunity Act reporting requirements.

Mr. Speaker, alone, none of these regulations are fatal to business, but together, they hit businesses like a wrecking ball, demolishing the hopes of American workers and entrepreneurs. Small businesses are the engine of growth in America. Let's not regulate them out of business.

We just have not talked enough about the negative consequences of big

Government that is out of control. We all know horror stories resulting from Government redtape, but seldom do we think of the costs involved.

Our Government has 125,000 regulators working at any given time on 5,000 regulations.

This is occurring at 59 Government agencies and these regulators produce 66,000 pages printed in the Federal Register annually. Every year, 66,000 new pages of regulations.

Most important, Mr. Speaker, is that these regulations cost our economy an estimated \$430 billion annually, or about \$4,000 for each family in America.

Government regulations are crippling our country.

Big government, with our overzealous regulations, is costly not only for taxpayers, but certainly for jobs and ultimately our standard of living.

Mr. Speaker, as we reinvent Government, let us invent one with fewer job killing regulations.

#### TRAGEDY IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been doing a series of special orders the last 2 weeks, trying to make sense out of our policy in Somalia. And I am learning something as we go along day to day. So some of the things that I surmised or tried to figure out a few days ago, I am learning today may have been slightly wrong. But I am getting to the hard facts. It is not easy, because, as I said last week, for the first time in my 17 years on the Hill, 15 in office, I have never had such difficulty getting straightforward, I don't want to say truthful, because that would indicate untruthfulness, but straightforward, clear, right from the shoulder, factual briefings.

I have got to kind of go around like I am back on as a journalist, as an investigative reporter, and piece this together.

I held up this morning the three principal news magazines, *U.S. News & World Report*, *Time*, and *Newsweek*. They all had Durant on the cover. One of his family members just called me a while ago, and I missed the call, they left a number, and told my staffer to thank me for everything I have done the last week to keep his name alive. His wife, Laurie, is on her way to Landstuhl, Germany. He is on his way up there from Somalia.

We now have no hostages. Of the 18 men killed on Sunday, October 3, and the 3 that died in the hospital later on on the 4th, and the 1 that died in the hospital up in Germany, those 18 men, we miraculously have all the remains home. There is a set of remains of one of our heroic men who was dragged

through the streets, beaten after he was dead, spit on, mutilated, and finally burned so badly that they are trying desperately to identify him. They are going to have to go to DNA. He is back on the soil of the country that he died serving. His uniform is as a door gunner. He is up at Dover in a mortuary as we speak. I am not allowed to release his name, but there is only one person missing.

As I said this morning, his mother knows who he is, because she identified him, live, on Monday night, October 4, on television. "That is my David," she said. She did not even know he was over there. Then the Army said, "We don't think so." Then the next day they told her he is missing, and for 7 more days she has gone through this most unbelievable of all agonies that could ever be presented to a mother.

Her statement to USA Today was, "I am torn up inside. I don't know what to say." Of course, his wife was holding out hope that it was not him.

Now, here are two of the magazines. I misplaced U.S. News & World Report. But here is Time. "What in the world are we doing? Anatomy of a disaster in Somalia."

They went to press when CWO Michael Durant was still trapped. He is now out. Here it says "The inside stories."

Here is Newsweek. "Firefight from hell." Here is the opening of their story, a picture of Les Aspin, "The making of a fiasco. An inside look at how Washington blundered into a misguided two-track policy. Our track, the humanitarian track; the U.N. track, putting out a contract on the very warlord who has four sons in the United States."

Try and sell that case to the mothers and fathers and wives and children of these 18 men that died.

Here is the inside of Time. Newsweek, by the way, censored themselves. They had none of the gruesome pictures. But Time magazine, "Anatomy of a disaster," with a handsome soldier on one side, goes to a full page photo, bled off on all edges, that means nothing but photo copy, of this big tall blonde American hero, dead at this point, thrust on two of his arms and a foot, one of the fellow crewmen on the helicopter of Durant's who had white handcuffs cut, as I said last week. No one puts white handcuffs, stolen from us, on a dead body.

Now, here is something that I am developing, and I will have more to tell you next week. There was a crash of the first Black Hawk that went down on September 25, 8 days before the firefight from hell when we lost 18 Americans dead.

□ 1940

On September 25, a utility Black Hawk, a UH-60 was hit by a rocket-propelled grenade, the same as the three

that were hit Sunday. The third one made it back and crash-landed. The plane is destroyed, the helicopter is destroyed at Newport on the port. So they got 3 helicopters. I do not know how many are in the air. Part of that no straight briefing stuff.

But the first Black Hawk went down on the 25th, went down in an open street area, not as bad as the two that went down 8 days later.

We rescued the 2 warrant officer helicopter pilots.

#### FURTHER REVELATIONS ABOUT SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me say one thing before I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

We just left the Armed Services room. We have a reception there for our staff members who have been working hard to put a budget together.

As I walked out, I saw the placard that has a provision of the Constitution that we always show our witnesses, when the administration comes up to testify.

It says, among other things, that the Congress shall be responsible for raising and supporting armies. That means seeing to it that our men and women in uniform, no matter where they are around the world, are as secure as we can possibly make them and to see to it that they have, in the words of Colin Powell, superb training and superb equipment.

I want to compliment my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] because, of all the members of the Armed Services Committee, and all of us have this responsibility of looking after our young men and women in uniform, he has done more than all the rest of us in terms of trying to knit together what happened to our young men and women in uniform, long before we have hearings on this and long before we have definitive statements from the administration.

He has contacted families. He has worked hard, even while the warrant officer who has been recently released was in captivity.

I know that the family was very grateful for that. I have seen some indications of that.

I just want to thank my friend for following up on his responsibility as a Member of Congress and the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the sense of confession is good for the soul, let me tell the Speaker and the 1,200,000 people watching a piece of advice the gentleman from California

[Mr. HUNTER] gave me about these special orders over the last few days.

He said, "My friend, be passionate but don't look so angry."

It is good advice. I want all these people watching me to know that one of my staffers said to me the other day, "In 17 years you have never raised your voice to a staffer." Maybe I am just a pussy cat, like Ronald Reagan, not tough on staff.

I am not an angry person around here. I think all colleagues will acknowledge that I try to be an upbeat, optimistic, happy person.

But in this well, I let some passion show. I do not mean it to be anger.

Track the rest of my investigation. September 25, UH-60 goes down. We rescue the two warrant-officer pilots, the two door gunners, and we do not know the condition because I cannot get the after-action report.

A passenger from the 10th Mountain Division, that is where BOB DOLE was crippled and won his Purple Heart and Bronze Star in World War II in Italy, 10th Mountain Division, Fort Drum, NY. He was riding as a passenger in this 101st Regiment chopper.

It goes down. Rescue the two pilots. So it was not a hard landing.

The three in the back are overwhelmed by the crowd. Now, we have only gotten back the remains of one, one, terribly mutilated. The family has put their hero to rest either in Arlington or their hometown. I will find out where.

The other two, I am going to slow down so you hear every word, everybody following the proceedings here and you, Mr. Speaker. We do not have a fingernail back of one of those two heroes.

I learned this looking at a paper, when I see this beautiful African-American, black American family, the Williams, mother, father. I think a widow. I cannot remember a child. Eugene Williams, 26, and the last line says, "No remains."

Now, I am fighting to get all the remains back of the five men that were beaten to death and murdered by the crowd on the 3d and the 4th.

I am saying, wait a minute, we did not get remains back from the September 25 crash.

One remains and two no remains. And here is where I get this feeling the Army is not straight with the American people, some people in the Army.

They said, the fire of the crash consumed all the remains. That is not true.

When a jet fighter goes straight in, you can get 5 or 10 pounds of remains. A B-2 hits a mesa in Texas, and they got 10 pounds of remains out of 4 big, healthy Air Force officers. You get something.

No. What they were covering up was the cover up that happened a couple of weeks ago when they said, the crowd

does not have those bodies. We have those remains.

The first shots we ever saw of the remains of Americans being held up in the street was not October 4. It was September 25 and 26 on our news. Those were the remains.

When Agency France Press and when Reuters said they were waving limbs around, our Government said, impossible. We got the remains.

No, they did not. They were waving the limbs of our heroes.

My point is, we had 8 days to analyze not just in Mr. Aspin's shop but to analyze in Mogadishu that unfortunately we were flying over angry mean streets where the people were acting like sharks and tearing our men apart.

Somebody should have said, was that a lucky shot with a rocket-propelled grenade that took out our 101st Regiment chopper? What if they get another one?

The next two that they got were Special Forces guys. We have lost Delta Forces guys. We have lost Rangers. We have lost sergeants in their middle thirties.

Durant's pilot was 45 years old. I bet you the next time I am on the floor, I will be talking about his combat record in Vietnam as a 19-, 20-, or 21-year-old Huey or Cobra gunship pilot.

This is truly a disaster, not only here, but I want questions answered to me, if I have to go to Mogadishu itself, to tell me why in 8 days they did not have a hard-core, well-thought-out rescue plan through these dangerous, mine-laden, angry streets, to get to a chopper crew, if it went down before, for a second time, they were overrun, beaten to death. And their bodies desecrated in that way.

#### A DISCUSSION OF AN IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, as the only Independent in this House, my views on many issues are different than my colleagues of the Democratic and Republican Parties. And that is fine, because that is what democracy is about.

But my major concern in terms of what happens here in the House is that there is an enormous amount of obfuscation, that we run away from the most important issues facing the American people.

On any given day, there are thousands of issues out there. And we often talk about many of them. But it is amazing to me, and I think to the American people, how somehow we forget to discuss the most important issues facing the ordinary people of this country.

In the few minutes that I have, I just want to touch upon some issues with

the hope that maybe, just maybe, we can begin some serious discussion about these issues here in the U.S. Congress.

The first point that I want to talk about that concerns me very much is my fear that this country, this great country, this democracy is evolving into an oligarchy. An oligarchy is a country in which a few people have tremendous wealth and tremendous power and exercise that wealth and that power over all of the people.

In the United States today, and this fact is not terribly well-known, the wealthiest 1 percent of our population own 37 percent of the wealth. The wealthiest 1 percent of our population own more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. And what is going on in this country today is that the wealthiest people are becoming wealthier and have more power.

The middle class is shrinking, and the poor are suffering more than they have ever suffered before.

When we talk about oligarchy, we are talking about the power of the few over the political process. That means both major political parties.

When we are talking about oligarchy, we are talking about an increased concentration in the media where a few corporations control more and more of our television, of our radio, of our magazines, and of our newspapers.

That raises the issue of whether or not the American people are getting the truth about what is going on in this country or whether what we are hearing about reflects the interests of the wealthy and the powerful.

□ 1950

That issue, the evolution of a democracy into an oligarchy, is not talked about too much in this institution, in the Congress. I hope we can begin that discussion.

The second issue that I want to touch upon briefly is very often people get up here and they say, "The United States is the wealthiest Nation on Earth." They are wrong. It is not. The interesting question is, and the interesting issue is, 20 years ago in terms of the wages and the benefits that ordinary Americans received, we were No. 1. We led the world. Our workers received the highest wages. Our health care system was the best. Our educational system was the best.

Today, according to a variety of studies, we are 12th in the world. Do the Members want to know why German automobile manufacturers are coming to the United States today? They are coming to the United States for the same reason that American companies are going to Mexico. They are coming for cheap labor.

Today in terms of wages and many other indicators, we rank 12th in the world behind Western Europe and Scandinavia. Many of these countries

have health care systems guaranteeing health care to all of their people. Many of these countries guarantee free educational opportunities to their people, so the question arises how did the United States, under both Republican and Democratic leadership, go from 1st in the world to 12th in the world, and why are we not talking about that reality.

Another point that I think should be raised, when we talk about rich and poor and working people in this country, is not simply to mention that the standard of living of working people is in rapid decline. That is important to point out. But we should point out that the gap between the rich and the poor is growing wider, and we should begin to ask some questions as to why the chief executive officers in the United States of America earn 157 times more than the workers in those corporations, 157 times. That is the largest gap in the industrialized world.

In 1960 in this country the gap was 40 to 1. In Japan today my understanding is that the gap is 32 to 1. What has been going on in this country is that as our standard of living, as we have become a poorer nation, the big-money interests have taken more and more out for the few and left the working people and the poor out to dry.

The last point that I want to touch upon, we can talk about the past and we can moan and be concerned about what has happened over the last 20 or 30 years, a real tragedy. However, we should also be thinking about what is going on in the future, and what we must do to change the trends.

What concerns me very much is that when we talk about employment, and we hear the employment statistics, 6.7, 7 percent, it does not sound too bad. Mr. Speaker, I will be back.

#### ON BALANCE NAFTA IS A VERY GOOD DEAL FOR NEBRASKA, AMERICA—AND THE HEMISPHERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed North American Free-Trade Agreement has resulted in more exaggerated claims and hyperbole, and more distorted arguments by both sides, than any issue Americans have faced for a long time. Given the breadth of coverage of this trade agreement and the huge economic and development disparities between Mexico and its two North American neighbors—Canada and the United States—it is understandably a very complicated agreement. Canada and the United States have already faced most of our tough trade issues in our bilateral free-trade agreement of 1989; therefore, the focus

is now on the trade relations with Mexico, especially Mexico-United States trade relationships.

Our neighbor to the south has a large population of 90 million, one that is very young and growing rapidly. As recently as 1986 we had a trade deficit with Mexico, but in 1992 we have a \$5.6 billion trade surplus. Mexico is our second largest export market for manufactured goods and third largest agricultural export market. Even allowing for the maquiladora—Mexico-United States border twin plants—trade, Mexico imports far more per capita from us than we import from them.

Yet it is important to remember that the Mexican wage rate is, on average, one-seventh that of a United States citizen. It is also obvious that Mexico's economy, democratic institutions, infrastructure, et cetera are far less developed than its northern neighbors. Also, their gross domestic product is still only 5 percent as large as the American GDP, causing some exaggerated claims by both proponents and opponents.

In every international trade agreement there are, in varying degrees, winning and losing sectors. Some people and some business enterprises will gain and others will lose—at least relatively. Some sectors, industries, or geographic areas are seen as demanding politically, culturally, and economically sensitive treatment through negotiated protective tariffs, quotas, et cetera. But carefully negotiated international trade treaties are not zero-sum games; one country need not lose so the other can gain. Experience has shown that overall reductions in impediments to the freer flow of goods, services, and ideas benefit all countries in such trade agreements.

The NAFTA negotiation process was begun by President Bush with specific concurrence by the Congress. The negotiated results, including several side agreements to cover subjects particularly sensitive or controversial in the United States, have been endorsed by both President Bush and President Clinton, and all living former Presidents. These side agreements cover important subjects such as labor standards and the environment. Other agreement provisions address such problematic areas as damage to a domestic industry by import surges, and the transshipment of America-bound goods through Mexico in order to escape the normal American tariff rates.

#### THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF NAFTA FOR THE UNITED STATES

The crucial question to be asked by a Member of Congress in considering this proposed trade agreement is whether its approval is in the best interest of the United States or contrary to it. As best as we can determine we must consider the overall cost and benefits—direct and indirect. Such a determination should consider not only the

short-term impacts but, also, certainly, the overall cost-benefit balance for America in the longer term. Of course, within this national context, as an elected national representative of Nebraskans, I also must attempt to measure what is overall in the best interest of our State and its citizens.

Also, within national and Nebraska overall cost-benefit determinations, one cannot ignore the impact of these proposed changes on the jobs, lives, and overall well-being of individual Americans and Nebraskans. If it is your job which may be lost because of changes in trade patterns, quite probably you have a much different attitude about what is said to be abstractly in the best interest of our country. Indeed, many of the most vocal and well-financed opponents of NAFTA are a hodgepodge of special interest groups, and political figures hoping to seize on a political issue, that play upon an individual's most basic fear of losing his or her job.

Because I know how important the NAFTA decision is to America and its citizens, I have delayed my decision on the proposed NAFTA, very intentionally, until I could carefully examine the provisions of the basic agreement and the side agreements. I also wanted to allow sufficient time to consider the opinions and arguments of both all the affected interests and of those organizations and individuals who think they have valuable opinions or conclusions to offer for consideration.

My conclusion, for both the short run and the long run, for both the United States and Nebraska, is that the approval of the North American Free-Trade Agreement is in our overall best interest; consequently it should be approved by Congress. The lessons of history tell us that, time and time again, the reduction of trade barriers stimulate economic growth for those countries and their citizens who are willing to compete. Conversely, the increase of tariffs and trade protectionism has proven disastrous for countries which have chosen to turn inward and ignore international economic realities. That is surely even more true in the global economy in which we live today. The passage of the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariff legislation in the 1930's was no small factor in the severe American depression of that decade. It is in part because of these underlying, linked, historically sustained principles, in addition to objective analysis of the numbers involved, that has resulted in more than 300 of the world's most distinguished economists writing to President Clinton to support NAFTA and destroy its opponents' arguments. Indeed, nearly every major economic study of NAFTA concluded that reducing trade barriers will increase growth, jobs, and wages in all three countries. To satisfy NAFTA opponents and my own curios-

ity, I have also read the book, "Save Your Job, Save Our Country," written by H. Ross Perot and Pat Choate, and the line-by-line critique of it by the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. The USTR paper devastates the arguments of the book.

A great many Americans are concerned about the loss of American jobs to locations in other countries. We all should be, and I certainly am. Many people say no to NAFTA simply because they are upset by current international labor and plant location trends. They are upset by the status quo, in effect saying, "Stop the world, I want to get off." These underlying concerns about lost jobs are certainly understandable and not to be ignored. However, it is important to remember that there is currently nothing to prohibit United States companies from moving jobs to Mexico, Southeast Asia, South America, and the other low-wage economies where, in total, four-fifths of the world's people live. These low-wage countries will continue to aggressively pursue U.S. jobs and investments even if NAFTA is rejected. And businesses in developed countries with high labor and other production costs will continue to look for less expensive or more productive business locations.

One also needs to remember in this regard that we already have something approaching a free-trade arrangement for most Mexican goods, services, and commodities. The problem is that it currently works only one way—nearly tariff-free access for Mexican exports into the United States, but not the reverse. At this time the average Mexican tariff on United States agricultural and manufactured exports is 10 percent while the average United States tariff on Mexican exports to the United States is only 4 percent. If NAFTA is approved there will be a sharp reduction in Mexico's tariffs, phased down over time for some very sensitive agricultural commodities and other products. These sharply reduced tariffs would allow a United States manufacturer to remain in the United States while for the first time exporting its products to Mexico with little or no tariff. In other words, the low-wage incentive to move jobs out of the United States already exists; therefore, approval for NAFTA would actually reduce this job-relocation incentive rather than increase it—by eliminating Mexico's substantial barriers to United States manufactured products.

Likewise Mexican domestic content laws would be either eliminated or the required domestic content would be sharply reduced. Thus, it would no longer be necessary for United States auto makers and auto parts manufacturers to locate facilities in Mexico to tap Mexican markets; these products could be made in the United States by American workers and exported to Mexico.

Frequently people ask about the competitive impact of low Mexican wage rates. Again it must be said, of course, that the wage differential exists now—without NAFTA. Despite this huge differential in wage rates the bottom line is that many companies still find it more expensive to manufacture in Mexico. Why? American labor is more productive. Labor costs currently represent on the average only 15 percent of the costs of production for American manufacturing companies. Mexican industries have higher transportation, packaging, marketing, utilities, infrastructure, and capital investment costs. Larger future United States export markets in Mexico, Canada, and the rest of the Western Hemisphere, with fewer trade barriers, should make it possible, and provide an incentive for American businesses, to make the capital investment and productivity expenditures to maintain our industries' competitive edge.

Will the passage of NAFTA eliminate the environmental degradation in Mexico, especially along our border? Will it eliminate unsafe working conditions and other labor abuses of Mexicans working in their country? Will it curb government corruption and encourage greater democracy in Mexico? The answer is "No"; NAFTA will not solve all these existing problems. But, the provisions will eliminate the maquiladora arrangements that have accentuated such environmental and unsatisfactory labor conditions along the United States-Mexican border. Actually NAFTA is the first trade agreement to also address the environmental and labor disputes arising among the nations involved.

What about enforcement of the provisions of NAFTA? Chapter 20 of NAFTA and the recently concluded side agreements establish procedures to solve disputes among the three nations. This was a very difficult and complex problem, but the proposed dispute mechanisms give individuals in the three nations the right to petition against foreign companies which are allegedly violating the laws of their domicile country. For constitutional and sovereignty reasons the enforcement of a country's laws is left to that country, but fines or punitive tariffs are authorized for the other countries if a nation does not comply with the treat provisions by implementing or enforcing them.

It is also important to note that NAFTA does not restrict the United States ability to adopt more stringent environmental, safety, or other standards than Canada or Mexico. The agreement merely requires that such standards be based on scientific principles and that they are applied in a non-discriminatory fashion.

What about immigration—legal or illegal? Greater trade and economic growth should enable Mexico to allo-

cate more resources to the protection of its own environment. It should also help alleviate some pressures for Mexicans to emigrate to the United States in search of employment, although I believe that substantial relief from the incredible and expensive tide of illegal aliens to the United States from and through Mexico will be possible only in the longer term. This is a very big and growing problem for the United States, and, realistically, NAFTA will not offer much short-term relief.

Mexican economic growth and prosperity through greater trade with the United States and Canada is, perhaps, the best method for ensuring continued reform and a stable progression towards democracy in Mexico. Conversely, failure by the United States to approve NAFTA could erode support for democracy, reduced trade barriers, and economic reform in Mexico.

Beyond that, rejection of NAFTA would by example send a very bad message to other nations, of Latin America and the Caribbean which are now committed to take, or could be encouraged to take, steps forward for economic liberalization and political reform. In addition to other advantages they see in a NAFTA-like trade agreement with the United States, our neighbor countries to the south now understand these reforms are also the key to greater trade and access to U.S. markets and U.S. exports. We must remember that a NAFTA agreement with Mexico is only the first step. Chile is the next country impatiently waiting in line. Its circumstances make such an agreement far easier to reach, with substantial benefits accruing to the United States and Chile.

Finally, in analyzing the impact of NAFTA on our Nation as a whole, I must tell you that one of my primary concerns was whether our United States Government would have the will to enforce the authorized punitive tariffs and fines if the Governments of Mexico or Canada, or any variety of business interests in those countries, are found to be in violation of the provisions of NAFTA. During the cold war era there was the perception, in part reflecting reality, that the U.S. Government all too often failed to insist on general fair trade treatment or even the enforcement of trade agreements. National security or foreign policy considerations were cited by the State Department or Defense spokesmen as the reason for such inaction or decisions.

Now the cold war is over and the economic interests of our Nation and its citizens certainly deserve much stronger consideration when it comes to enforcing trade agreements. Accordingly, when I met separately with Trade Ambassador Mickey Kantor, Secretary Warren Christopher, and President Bill Clinton, I raised this issue. I received reasonable assurances they understood this concern and recognized the need

for a change in national perspective. They pledged they would be more aggressive in demanding compliance with current and NAFTA provisions by our trade partners.

I also asked, and do still hope, that President Clinton will forcefully express himself and pledge his commitment on this issue in a public statement to the American people. It would reassure many American employers, business families, and farmers that the protection of their interests will be the highest priority when our Government has evidence of trade or other treaty violations. I pledge to be aggressive in the oversight of NAFTA compliance and in demanding appropriate action by the Clinton administration and its successors as long as I am in office.

#### THE IMPACT ON NEBRASKA

Since agriculture, food processing, and other types of agribusiness still largely dominate the Nebraska economy, the approval of NAFTA is even more clearly in Nebraska's best interest than for the Nation as a whole. In saying that I do not mean to give the impression that I am ignoring the interests of Nebraskans employed or with financial interests unrelated to agriculture, for I have not. On balance, as in the rest of the Nation, some Nebraskans in the manufacturing and service sectors will benefit and others will not. Yet, overall NAFTA will be a net plus for Nebraskans, who will fare better than most Americans. Generally our manufacturing facilities are newer and better, with less job obsolescence. Our labor force is better educated and has a stronger work ethic. And, frankly, in the transportation sector—truck or rail—it is hard to imagine anything but a brighter future for all Americans involved.

In agriculture, though, Mexico is the third largest and most rapidly growing export market for United States farm commodities. Despite Mexico's more restrictive tariffs and quotas on agricultural imports, the United States currently enjoys a growing \$1.5 billion trade surplus with Mexico. As mentioned, those Mexican agricultural quotas and tariffs, on a specified timetable, will be gradually phased out or cut to a minimum.

Therefore, most of Nebraska's agricultural commodity groups, the Nebraska Farm Bureau, and the Nebraska Grange strongly support the approval of NAFTA. NAFTA would be especially beneficial overall to Nebraska agriculture. With the possible exception of sugar and dry bean producers, NAFTA's quota and tariff reduction provisions, plus the elimination of many obvious nontariff barriers, will certainly make Mexico's fast-growing markets more accessible to Nebraska's agricultural and processed food exports. For example, a recent study commissioned by the Nebraska Corn Board to examine a variety of economic studies on Mexican-American

trade found that the estimates for American corn exports varied from "44 to 244 percent greater with NAFTA than without it." They concluded that these greater exports could increase the price a farmer currently receives for a bushel of corn by 9 cents.

Other Nebraska commodities and exports predicted to benefit significantly under NAFTA are: Sorghum, wheat, cattle, beef, hogs, pork, soybeans, soybean meal, soybean oil, dairy products, and processed foods in general. Together, corn and these commodities represent over 95 percent of Nebraska's agricultural production. Consequently, over 101 American agriculture producer and processing organizations support passage of NAFTA.

Nebraska's other industries and businesses should also benefit greatly under passage of NAFTA. Those sectors expected to benefit from passage of NAFTA include: Mining, crude petroleum and natural gas, printing and publishing, chemicals and related products, petroleum and coal, rubber, leather and leather products, fabricated metal products, industrial machinery and computers, transportation equipment, and miscellaneous manufacturing equipment. Also, the following industries are expected to export more goods and services to Mexico and Canada: Food processing machinery manufacturers, farm equipment manufacturers, agricultural chemical and fertilizer producers, automobile and aircraft parts manufacturers, steel producers, and pollution control manufacturers.

The Nebraska service-related industries, including banks and financial services, insurance companies, telecommunications equipment and service firms, construction and engineering companies, trucking, and railroads are expected to benefit. Finally, provisions of NAFTA that protect intellectual property rights should benefit Nebraska's pharmaceutical manufacturers and software producers in our domestic market and through increased exports.

#### CONCLUSION

As I mentioned previously, many NAFTA opponents have strong views, sometimes have used distorted information and arguments, and a few have demagogically exploited the job concerns of more vulnerable American workers. On the other hand, some proponents have also engaged in hyperbole, exaggerating the projected benefits, slanting their arguments, and glossing over less inviting or problematic details of NAFTA. Together, both sides have engaged in a very expensive grassroots lobbying effort aimed at Congress. Some labor unions and business groups have asked their workers or members to set aside their intellect and common sense, and instead blindly follow their position in lobbying Senators or Representatives.

However, I am confident that most Nebraskans will see through these tac-

tics, sort through the various arguments and facts, and independently reach their own conclusions. We certainly don't need outsiders telling us what is best for Nebraska. And, Nebraskans, living in a State settled by adventurous, industrious pioneers, are not afraid of change or the future.

When it comes to deciding if NAFTA is in the best interest of the United States—and Nebraska—I must and have set aside any partisan interests and particular sectoral or other special interests. My responsibility is to carefully examine the provisions of the NAFTA, and the arguments pro and con, and then reach the best judgment regarding its merits. I have done this and concluded that the approval of NAFTA is in the overall best interest of the United States—both in the short-term and long-term; for Nebraska the case is even more overwhelmingly positive. I hope this summary of the consideration that resulted in my judgment will also be helpful to Nebraskans in examining this complex and controversial issue.

#### REPORT ON THE SIEGE OF SARAJEVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indian [Mr. MCCLOSKEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, it was a beautiful, bright, moderately crisp fall day Monday in Sarajevo as I arrived with Representative CHARLES WILSON and eight other international parliamentarians.

With numerous people walking on the streets, one could almost forget that a sniper or heavy artillery shell could destroy anyone at any time. And indeed, some people did meet such a fate in the hours we were there. These included a young man wounded in a bread line.

Occasionally, automatic weapons were fired and heavy artillery hits could be heard at various distances.

The New York Times reported that Sarajevo suffered about 150 artillery hits that day.

The brave and noble people of Sarajevo are trapped by both Serb gunners and cruel UNPROFOR policy as they continue to get minimal food and water.

There is little electricity and no heat for the coming winter. And UNPROFOR restricts communications. Access for mail and other outside communications is nearly nonexistent.

Even Sarajevans who have the right to reside in other countries cannot travel out.

We will not allow these people the arms to defend themselves. And we won't militarily intervene. In short, the West is abetting the genocide and is even restricting the spiritual solace of communication.

Somehow, most of these people go on, with some but dwindling hope.

As residents of the world's largest concentration camp, they know that Assistant Secretary of State Steve Oxman is not credible in recently calling Sarajevo a "precarious situation" rather than a full-blown brutal siege.

The Clinton administration has pledged to launch air strikes against Serb positions if the siege of Sarajevo is resumed. It has resumed. Humanitarian assistance is being blocked, water and electricity lines are cut, and no one can go in or out of the city.

Serb forces are preventing sick and wounded civilians from leaving the city for proper medical treatment. The United Nations' so-called protective forces will not deliver mail or restore telephone links to the outside world.

We heard that, recently, U.N. forces have actually prevented journalists from carrying more than six letters to and from Sarajevo.

We also heard that 25 signatures are needed on U.N. documents to obtain U.N. approval to fly wounded citizens out of Sarajevo. Even then, 3 days notice has to be given to Serb forces, who have the final say over who goes in our out.

In recent days, Serb forces have refused to allow any citizens to leave. They are demanding that injured Serb terrorists be allowed out before any innocent civilians can be taken out. The United States and the United Nations do not challenge this outrageous demand, so no one gets out. People continue to suffer and die.

Several people are killed outright every day in sniper and artillery attacks, and many others are wounded.

While we were in Sarajevo, we visited the Kosevo Hospital. On the day we were there, the bodies of seven victims of Serb attacks were in the morgue. We visited with a young man who was fortunate enough to survive an attack that day. He was hit while trying to collect some water for himself and his family.

If this is not a siege, I do not know what is. It is part of the Serbs' ongoing genocide against the people of Bosnia. The only appropriate moral and political response to this genocide happens to be the only effective one: To launch air strikes against Serb positions and lift the arms embargo so that the Bosnian people can defend themselves.

We should honor the legitimately elected Bosnian Government's request that we come to their aid so that Bosnia's territorial integrity, sovereignty, and independence can be restored.

We should also honor their request to open Tuzla Airport so that adequate aid can reach the country's remaining Bosnian enclaves. If suffering increases this winter, the responsibility will lie with us, rather than with the Bosnians who are rejecting Owen and Milosevic's entreaties to surrender in Geneva.

We must save Bosnia and the cause of conscience. History will not vindicate us merely because we were unified in our inaction in Bosnia. Rather, we will be judged by the concrete steps we took to end the genocide in Bosnia.

□ 2000

#### ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH CARE PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the health care legislation that the administration has been working on and that the President gave a speech about a few days ago in this room. There have been a number of comments made by various members of the public and Members of the Congress that the administration has been slow in bringing the actual legislative language for this proposal.

I think it is strange that this criticism is being lodged. In most legislative proposals that are made in this town, and in the Federal Government, they are made by what we call writing specifications, putting down on a piece of paper the general ideas that will later be embodied in specific legislation. And in fact, in all of the competing proposals from Republican Members of the Senate and Republican Members of the House, Democratic Members of both bodies, there is no specific legislation. There are only specifications, again, general language about what the proposal would be.

It is also worth noting that this health care proposal being made by the administration is the most far-reaching health care proposal that we have seen in our country perhaps ever. In the 1930's we passed Social Security. In the 1950's we passed the Medicaid legislation. In the mid-1960's we passed Medicare legislation. But there has not been, in my memory, or perhaps anyone's memory, a piece of legislation on health care that is as comprehensive and far-reaching as the proposal that is now being made by President Clinton.

I think the criticism that has been lodged is ill-founded and inappropriate. I think the administration should take the time, as they are, to make sure that the legislation is correctly drawn, that all of the cost estimates are accurate, that all of the features of the legislation correctly and appropriately work.

It would be far better to take another week, or another 2 weeks, or another 3 weeks now than to present legislation hastily with all of its myriad of specifications, and to have mistakes, or to have things in it that do not work properly, or to have cost estimates that are not accurate.

I give the administration high marks for taking the time over 9 months to bring this proposal to us. I think it is a good proposal. I think it is an exciting proposal. I think the American people are focused on the need for this kind of legislation. I think it would be entirely inappropriate to make this proposal in specificity until it had been clearly thought through.

So I think rather than criticizing the administration we should be praising them for having the courage to bring this kind of a bill to the Congress. Rather than criticizing them for being too slow, we should be praising them for having the gumption to try to bring this proposal together, and rather we should be asking for them to take the appropriate amount of time so that they see that this proposal is correctly put together.

When it comes here we will have extensive hearings in all of the committees. Every Member of Congress will have a chance to read every word in the legislation. People in our districts will have the opportunity to read and to understand what is being presented. And then, after all of the hearings, we will begin discussions in the committees, and we will bring a health care proposal to the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House.

So I think rather than being impatient right now we should be satisfied with waiting and seeing the specifics of this legislation. And I hope and pray that in the early part of next year, certainly by the middle of next year we are able to pass in both bodies the most far-reaching and revolutionary health care reform proposal that our country has ever seen.

#### CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter a week or so ago from Patrick Truman. Mr. Truman, in the Bush administration, had been the head of the Office of the Department of Justice that prosecutes child pornography. It is called the Child Exploitation and Obscenity Section. He wrote to me and to other Members of Congress the following:

I am writing to call your attention to the fact that the Department of Justice has reinterpreted the Federal child pornography law in a way that will open the floodgates of child pornography in America and lead to increased sexual exploitation of children. It did so in a brief filed last week in the United States Supreme Court case in which a twice-convicted child pornographer seeks review of his most recent conviction.

Mr. Speaker, this letter concerned me, and I looked into it. And we have sent the letter to the Attorney General, who recently addressed the Republican Members of Congress, and I

am sure she would say the same to the Members of her own party, she expressed her concern in the meeting with us about the need to do something for children. And the letter we sent her, which is cosigned, I believe by 66 Members of Congress who signed this letter, the letter we sent to her asked here please, in the name of doing something to protect children, please take a look at the brief that your Justice Department, acting on behalf of the people of the United States, has filed in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, it strikes me as extremely ironic. This is the first time in 12 years that the Justice Department has gone in seeking to weaken rather than strengthen the child pornography laws. And I think many of us are aware, and I am sure the people across the country are aware of what happened here just recently in the Nation's Capital where a lady discovered a small child being forced to perform a sex act upon an adult, and this brave woman had the courage to pick up a stick and beat the man until she broke his arm. She should get a medal.

But the fact of the matter is that there are thousands of children being exploited, and we know that people who commit sex crimes on children use child pornography. And here we have a case where actually the district court, the Federal district and the circuit court of appeals actually upheld the child pornography law that has been in effect. And now after that law has been upheld by the two lower courts, the new Justice Department under President Clinton is coming in and seeking a reinterpretation of the law which mirrors very closely exactly what the defense in this case is asking for.

□ 2010

And it is going to make prosecution of child pornography much more difficult. Whose interests are we serving here? The ACLU? Is that who the Government is designed to support in this? How in the world do we benefit by aiding child pornography, and in effect that is what the position of the Justice Department is doing. I hope that Ms. Reno will take a close look at the letter, will look at these departments, which are very large, with lots of briefs going on. I can only hope she was not personally aware of the details of this brief. The idea that we are now going to weaken for the first time in 12 years, under the Clinton administration's stewardship, the child pornography laws is totally unacceptable, especially since this is an administration which is very public about its expressing its concern for children.

Mrs. Clinton at one point was head of the Children's Defense League and has expressed on various occasions her concern for children.

So I would like to just draw that to people's attention.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] for his comments.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to talk about the family in a little different way. Today we talked about the unemployment compensation bill. First, before I get into that, I would like to take a look at—Mr. GEPHARDT from Missouri talked about the health care plan, and I would like to address that. BOB MICHEL, our leader, and NEWT GINGRICH, our whip, 2 years ago set forth a health care task force to take a look at the real needs of health care. Every item in there except for two the President talked about in his address.

The Republican plan is called Action '93. The 100 percent deductible for self-employed, the grouping of insurance, the cutting of paperwork, all of those things are good and supported, and there is a lot of common ground between the President and the Republican plan.

But what I would do is ask Mr. GEPHARDT if he will fight equally as hard to keep the burden off—off the American taxpayer and small business, and that is the part I want to talk about, in the American family.

In this unemployment compensation bill, every time it comes up the other side speaks and says, "Well, the Republicans do not care about the unemployed." But if you take a look at the votes, the Republicans do vote for the unemployment bill when it is paid for. This country is in a \$4.3 trillion debt, and I am amazed that the American people do not know there is a difference between a deficit and the debt. Comments were made in the unemployment plan that people do not care whether it is funded or not. But your grandchildren will and their grandchildren will because they are going to be unemployed because of it if we fund it.

What I would like to speak to tonight is a little bit about, in this Member's opinion, as just a sophomore, but the other side of the aisle is trying to federalize and socialize this country. How are they doing it? They are doing it by intentionally attacking small business. You say, "Well, DUKE, that is Machiavellian." Well, it is Machiavellian. The health care bill, the education volunteer program are tools in order to bring a bigger bureaucracy under the Federal Government.

And why would they do that? Because it is the economy, stupid; people vote their pocketbook.

And if you are a Federal employee and a Republican is trying to reduce the size of the Federal Government, who are they going to vote for? And they have broken that code. So we are trying to reduce the size of the Federal Government, and they are trying to build it into a bigger bureaucracy.

Take a look at the education volunteer program, where students get \$17,000 a year. Only \$4,700 goes back to pay for tuition. The rest is in health care and child care.

But that person is now 100,000 new Federal employees, and every city is going to have a bureaucracy. We have to pay for that bureaucracy.

What does that do? It cuts private sector jobs. Then we are going to cry for unemployment.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Reclaiming my time, what the gentleman is saying is right in tune with what the economic statistics are revealing.

Fortune magazine, July 12 this year, had a very interesting article entitled "When Will You Get a Raise?" Well, there is a graph there, and the graph is—I will hold it up here—that pay hits the skids. It says, "From Wall Street to Main Street, since 1970, real compensation per employee, including benefits, has actually dropped 1.2 percent." Imagine that, adjusting for inflation, we have dropped in real compensation. By the way, to save people reading the article—it is an excellent one—but if you do not read it, the answer to the question, "When will I get my next raise?" "No time soon" is the answer because companies cannot pay the raises if the economy is not growing, productivity is not increasing.

The gentleman from San Diego has been pointing out all of these marvelous new entitlements that we are busily creating for people like the one the gentleman just mentioned in the educational area, you know, I liken this to asphyxiation where we are slowly losing our oxygen, slowing down. Enough people have not figured that out yet. But every time we concoct some new program ostensibly to help someone, we are just taking away a little more oxygen from all of us.

I yield to the gentleman, but before that I observe the gentleman is very correct, this is a socialization of America going on right under our noses and it is not improving the quality of life; it is getting worse directly as a result of those kinds of efforts.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. I would like to make it, as one President said, perfectly clear that I am not a Perot supporter, but Mr. Perot in his campaign was right on the money when he held up the chart that half of the United States was painted red. That represented all of the State and Federal tax dollars that go to pay the interest on the debt, just the interest. And if you take a look at the year 2000, Mr. Perot pointed out all of the United States would be colored in.

How does that affect the American family? It affects their individuality and their ability to work.

People say, "How come? When I was growing up, both parents did not have to work, but now today both parents are having to work just to make ends

meet. Why?" Because of the national debt.

And what does the family need? It needs security and long-range planning.

I hesitate to mention this next thing because my good friend from California, Mr. HUNTER, I told him he could not talk about free trade tonight, but Mr. BONIOR stated that we would lose 10,000 jobs if free trade goes through. I tell my friend from California I have still not made up my mind on the free trade issue.

There are a lot of issues on both sides. But under the Clinton tax plan, we are going to lose 2 million jobs with \$127 billion cut in defense. And a cut in defense—and I am on the Committee on Armed Services, and we just went through the bottom-up review—and AL GORE, the Vice President, in his paper in reinventing Government, made the statement that those cuts on the bottom-up review were based on the President's \$127 billion cut, not on the readiness that we need, but on a bare-bones readiness. And that would put us into a hollow force.

This comes at the time of Haiti, Somalia, maybe even Bosnia. That is also a family issue.

But the main point is 2 million jobs are going to be lost. California overall has a 9 percent—you are talking about 3 percent unemployment, 4 percent unemployment, California has a 9 percent unemployment rate. The Clinton tax plan, under the Federal income Tax Code, California paid only 12 percent of the Federal income tax as a State. But under this tax plan we will pay 16 percent.

What does that mean? It takes \$40 billion out of the State of California that Governor Wilson could have used for education, for health care, for the criminal justice system, for the programs that we want to support. But, no, the Federal Government can do it better.

This is all in the plan to federalize and bring everybody under the control of the Federal Government.

□ 2020

My colleague, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is listed as an Independent. He is a devout Socialist. He believes in socialism.

Now, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] personally is a very nice man, I want to assure you, but his politics stink, because that is what this Government, this administration, is trying to do to this country is socialize it, to attack small business and take that individuality away and create it under a Federal bureaucracy.

How? Look at the banks. Can banks be banks today? Under the rules and regulations, can they make a small business loan?

You know, I used to be able to sign on the dotted line for a loan. I cannot

do that anymore, because of what I call the revenuers or the regulators.

Talk to the banks. Can they make small business loans? No. To create new jobs? No.

The biotech industry wants to have people invest in it because they want to create new medicines for us. Can they do that? No, because the Clinton tax plan wants to tax them on the benefits that they are going to give to their new scientists and call it real income, so they cannot create the jobs.

The environmental controls, the unreasonable environmental controls. When they talk about unemployment, look at our industries. Look at the forestry industry. You will not find Republicans trying to destroy it.

Who cost those jobs in the first place? Look at the forestry industry. Look at the real estate industry. Look at the construction industry. Look at the fishing industry, even in San Diego, and the shipbuilding industry.

They are saying they want unemployment dollars, but yet they put a knife in the backs of the independent small businessmen and cost the jobs.

Our position is let us save the jobs and the private industry for the people. That is what the family is about.

I could go on, but I would like to yield, because I see my friend, the gentleman from California, would like to speak also.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I invite the gentleman to interrupt and have a colloquy.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to make one other comment that I had forgotten?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In the \$127 billion defense cut, you will notice on the other side of the aisle all the Socialists, all the liberals come up and cry for the conversion plan. This is their way to create jobs when defense goes down the tubes, 2 million jobs. That will only keep up with about 1 one-thousandth of the jobs that are lost. It is excuse to say, "Hey, we can demilitarize and yet we cannot support the men and women that we are asking to go in harm's way."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to say that the great distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and my good friend, my seatmate from San Diego, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] are two gentlemen who I most admire in this Congress, because they have a real sense of what America needs.

I think the debate we had today, I notice the gentleman from New York

[Mr. SOLOMON] is here as our leader on the Rules Committee, and fought this rule with respect to the National Endowment for the Arts, but I saw another attack on America's families today, and that was the idea not only that we are going to continue to allow an organization to exist that has done horrible things, I am talking not just about the obscene pictures that have been paid for by American taxpayers, but also as the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has pointed out, the giving away of crisp new ten dollar bills, thousands of them, to illegal aliens by so-called artists who are giving away American taxpayer moneys, and I object to the NEA's waste of taxpayer money because of those things; but I also object for another reason that is family related.

We try to teach our kids to be charitable, to give to good causes and to support good causes. Sometimes those good causes are feeding the poor. Many of us are involved in those causes through our churches. I can remember going down with my mother and father to Ensenada, Mexico, and supporting a particular orphanage down there because they had such a feeling for that particular orphanage, or working with them in our church or with my wife, Lynn.

We all tried to imbue that ethic, the ethic of charity and helping others in our children, and yet at the same time with these giant Government organizations that we are supposed to fund with taxpayer moneys, we are teaching our children, America's children, that the real party that is responsible for charity is Government, and that we do not necessarily have to take care of the poor ourselves, because Government is going to take care of the poor, and we do not have to worry about supporting people who are young and struggling artists and helping the arts and helping people develop in those fields because now Government is going to support artists. As the hand of Government creeps in and takes over a bigger and bigger part of the responsibilities that are spread out across America in this great, wonderful free country that we live in, families and children are left with less and less of an ethic that is theirs to carry out.

I can see this going to what we have done with America's farmers and ranchers with respect to the Endangered Species Act. Our people who live in the country, and I know the gentleman from northern California has many farmers, many ranchers, many timber owners in his area of California, and the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, who came from Shelby, MO, population 1,250.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It is 2,113.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, 2,113, and as my seatmate from San Diego knows many ranchers and farmers, and you know, America's ranchers, farmers and tim-

ber owners, have always been interested in conservation. Whether it was that farmer who kept that extra hedge row for Bobwhite Quail or maybe developed a marsh for the ducks and the egrets and all that wildlife that we care about in America, they did it because they developed over the years in this country a conservation ethic, that idea advanced by Aldo Leopold, the great naturalist, that this is our wild America and it is our duty as custodians, as private individuals, to care for nature and for wildlife, and yet now when you have a Government bureaucrat who walks on to a farm and tells the farmers who have bought and paid for with his hard-earned dollars a piece of land and that bureaucrat says, "You're going to have to stop plowing the south 40 because I now deem that the south 40 is wetlands, and therefore you have to stop plowing it because I went down and felt it and it's damp."

He is turning that farmer now into somebody who hates wildlife and who now abandons the ethic of conservation because big government is coming in and telling him he is not doing it in the right way.

I hate to see this Government intrusion in every area of our lives that is leaving less and less of an ethic for our young people to be conservationists, to be charitable, to care for others and to do all the things that we used to do as families and individuals that now we are told shall be done by government, big faceless government with somebody else's dollars.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am going to recognize our colleague, the gentleman from New York, in just a minute.

I would just like to observe that conservation ethic that the gentleman from California referred to really is based on the ethic of stewardship contained in the Bible. God has given us these things to use wisely for the benefit, the Bible says, of man, meaning mankind. That is the view that we have and we are losing sight of that.

In fact, as one of our former colleagues used to say, we are switching from worshiping the Creator to the creation. I think he has a very valid point there. We are getting our priorities mixed up.

I think we have got to be mindful of the fact—you know, typically we hear discussed in modern politics the idea that economic issues are over here and the social issues are over here.

Well, I think, frankly, one of the leading social issues of our time is going to be the economic health of the United States of America, and that economic health directly impacts on just about every other social issue that we could name, and I am not going to go into it now, we have talked about it before, Bill Bennett's outstanding publication, the Index of Leading Cultural

Indicators, illustrates very clearly what has been happening in this country in terms of the decline in this civilization.

I thank the gentleman for his comments. I hope he will stay and jump in.

We have one of our outstanding leaders here, the ranking member on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON]. I am pleased to have the gentleman here, and I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be here with all these Californians. Of course, they all seem to think like I do anyway.

I am from the Adirondack Mountains up in New York State. We also have some people from Oklahoma sitting over here, too. I guess we are going to hear from them in a few minutes.

I just want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] for focusing on this deplorable, deplorable issue, the most deplorable that I know of, which is child pornography.

I am just looking at an article here that was given to me the other day from the Boston Herald, a credible newspaper in Boston, MA.

□ 2030

The title of it is "Kiddie Porn Gets Justice Support," and they are talking about our Justice Department. Here we have another example of just how some of the Clinton appointees are imposing social policy far to the left of the American mainstream, and that bothers me to no end. In this case we see how the lawyers over at Janet Reno's Justice Department have reversed previous administration policies with respect to child pornography. I do not know how they can do that.

Enforcement of child pornography laws under the Justice Department's new policy effectively can be described as a charade: it does nothing less than increase the protection afforded to the producers of this trash. Up until now, the relevant standard was focused on whether the material was intended to elicit a sexual response from the viewer, rather than on the actions of the child.

For the past 12 years, the Department used that standard to successfully prosecute child pornography involving sexually explicit photographs of children.

Now, the Clinton appointees over at Justice argue that there is no child pornography where the child has clothing on, no matter how suggestive the pose or context.

Mr. Speaker, as a father of five and a grandfather of two fine young children I just cannot believe what I am reading in this article. The Justice Department's new standard treats the child like an adult, 5- and 6-year-olds, and that is probably no accident. After all, First Lady Hillary Clinton has always advocated minimizing the differences between adults and children.

She says that children should be able to divorce their parents. That I cannot believe, Mr. Speaker. She also made a statement that my wife took some terrible offense to. She said that marriage, the vows of marriage, are a kind of slavery. My wife almost went through the ceiling when she read that.

However, Mr. Speaker, at what point do adult rights for children actually deprive the children of their rights to privacy, and the pursuit of happiness?

Now any child should be presumed to be mature enough to know that he or she is being taken advantage of and strong enough to resist a sick photographer or film maker.

The adult photographer or filmmaker is almost always in a better position to manipulate the child into posing in certain positions which the child might not otherwise do if he or she were more mature. Any parent, Mr. Speaker, knows that.

Like so many of the other Clinton social policies, this one is not based on reality.

In fact, it scares me to see how the same administration which claims to be so concerned about the future of our children is actually doing so much to leave them unprotected.

What happens when that child sees the results of that photo session?

Maybe not right away, but maybe as the child grows older, the child will see the photos and be ashamed.

How can that young person maintain a high self-esteem?

We have educators in schools today worrying that low self-esteem in children holds them back from reaching their potential.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues agree with the argument, how can we permit exploitation of children who are too young to make judgments on participating in this degrading trash, what some adoringly call art?

In all good conscience, how can we permit some perverted filmmaker to ruin the child's self-esteem and quite possibly reduce the child's future contribution to society?

Well, the Clinton officials at the Justice Department want to relax the protection of the child.

Unlike most Americans, they think that a child has to be totally naked and performing lustful acts on screen to constitute child pornography.

Ask the parents of kidnapped children who are forced into posing for pictures which are sexually suggestive but do not satisfy the stringent standards set down by the Justice Department.

Ask them what they think about this new policy. I don't know how we can look them in the eye and defend how we can place more of a value on some so-called artist's freedom of expression than a poor, innocent child's personal dignity.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise, then, that Dade County, FL, where Janet

Reno enforced child pornography laws as a State attorney, currently has more child pornography businesses than any other county in the Nation.

Is this what we can expect on a nation-wide scale under this new policy?

For the sake of our children, I hope this does not happen. We must not let the Justice Department curry favor with the child pornographers on this one, and that is exactly what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, Again sorry to take up so much of the gentleman's time, but, when I read that article about what is happening over there, the country has to focus on this issue, and the gentleman's special order here this evening is doing just that.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my children and my grandchildren, and all of the other children in this Nation, I say, God bless what you're doing, and thank you for doing it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Does the gentleman from California wish to ask a question? We have got the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] who wants to enter in.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I am sorry. I did not see the gentleman, but I would like to tell the gentleman from Oklahoma that my dad grew up in Shawnee, OK, so we got red clay in our blood.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. So, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], our new Member courageously pushing for a full ethics committee investigation in the matter surrounding the post office, an issue that is very much at the forefront of events here in the Capitol.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] was making some remarks about what the government does or does not do when it comes to charity. It reminds me of the evolution that we have gone through in this country. The old saying was: Charity begins at home. Now it seems that charity begins in some sort of government office; at least that is the perception. I think that we have gone from what used to be charity, to welfare, to entitlements, and the progression, as I see it, works like this:

Under charity, if you desire to assist someone, you do it out of the goodness of your heart, out of your desire to help your fellow man. You can impose whatever conditions you desire to impose, or no conditions whatsoever, on what you do for them. If you think that they need to have some corrections in their own behavior as a condition to receiving some assistance, you can say, "I'll help you if you will do something."

Mr. Speaker, that is charity.

But then we got to a situation where we have welfare replacing charity, and welfare, of course, is coming from the government, and welfare has the same purpose of assisting people, but it does not have the conditions that are attached to it. A person gets welfare because the government enables anyone to receive that, and there is no correcting mechanism where receipt of something depends upon behavior or abstaining from some sort of other behavior, and people began to have what I can an I-gave-at-the-office syndrome. Why should they dip into their own pockets or take their own time to assist so much in charity if the government is going to do it through welfare? But it goes a step further and says, "It's not only the government giving you something through a welfare mechanism, but it's an entitlement. If the government fails to give it to you, you can sue, you can demand, you can insist, you can go to court, you can win and compel the government to give these things to you, and again, of course, there is no link to your behavior. There is no correcting mechanism whereby you are encouraged to become independent or you are encouraged to avoid the type of behavior that perhaps helped you get in the situation that you are in or that you learn the types of behavior that will make you self-sufficient."

Now of course we have discussion of changing government programs, workfare rather than welfare, trying to link it to some behavior, but every time that we have to go through a government bureaucracy we have tremendous inefficiency. We do not have someone who is there acting out of a motivation of kindness and concern. They are doing it because it is their job to do so.

□ 2040

And you will never have the same effectiveness upon someone's behavior as when they know that you are acting purely out of the goodness of your own heart, you are doing it because you desire to assist people.

It is always remarkable to me that so many people continue to engage in the many good works that they do, that we do still have so many volunteer groups in this country that do so many good deeds and that reach out to help their fellow men and their fellow women as well. But a lot of people are having that killed. We are being told that charity is no longer what you do with your own money, it is your willingness to dip into somebody else's pocket and compel them to pay, through the government, through the tax system.

We have lost track of the 3-foot rule. The 3-foot rule is what you do when you reach out with your arm and you get into your own wallet. Instead, we have got the long arm of government going out. And I do not consider it

charity if I cast a vote to compel other people in this country to contribute to a welfare state. I consider it charity when I take of my own time and my own money and my own commitment to reach out and help someone else.

I do not want to kill charity in this country, and I do not want my children to live in an environment where they think the world owes them a living, that America owes them a living, that they are entitled to things that are not linked to their behavior, not linked to self-reliance, to independence, to honesty, to forthright dealings with their fellow man. I want them to see that linkage.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have the security that comes not from a government handout, but from a solid, strong, stable family. We need government policies that encourage that.

I know the President has been speaking recently upon the theme of security. He will call it personal security, economic security, health security. How about family security?

The laws in America have been skewed against the family. Look at the divorce laws. It started in the 1970's in your home State of California with passing no fault divorce laws. Currently every State in America, except South Dakota, says that if you want to get divorced, you only have to meet one requirement: you must be married. You do not have any linkage to behavior, you do not have any concern over what will this do to the children as far as whether the divorce is going to be granted.

We need to have a linkage with the best interest of the child, and realize that a marriage is not just an arrangement between a man and a woman; it is also something that involves the children. We need government policies, whether it is changes in divorce laws, whether it is changes in the Tax Code, where we do not encourage, we do not give the same tax incentives for families to stay together as we used to with the personal exemptions. We have a child care tax credit that only goes to parents that work outside of the home. The tax rates themselves, the marriage penalty, we need to change these policies. That is part of the linkage that you were talking about between economic policy and social policy.

If we want America to be strong, we need to give people more freedom to stay at home more frequently and do things with their kids, instead of feeling a financial pinch to go out.

I realize there are other people who want to speak, but I think that it is important that we teach and live so that security comes through the family unit, rather than saying we are dependent upon a government system of handouts to seek our security.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman. Certainly history bears out his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], who has been a stalwart for reform in the House bank, the House post office, and on behalf of the wise use of governmental moneys, which are really the people's money, and a member of our sophomore class.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I appreciate that. I thank the two gentlemen from California for the fine work in putting together this special order.

A lot of people ask why we have special orders. I think it is a time for us to speak to the Nation and to remind them in a reflective moment of what is going on here in Washington and what is not going on in Washington.

The gentleman has pointed this special order toward the family. I agree with the previous speakers that the family is the core and the heart toward civilization. It is the oldest block of our civilization, and it is the only way we can change what is happening in America in the areas of crime and poverty. We depend very much on the family.

I would like to focus just a moment on the duplicity and hypocrisy that we see in the debate we are having about budget cutting. I know the administration has come forward and said that they have recently put through a package that was to cut the budget. And when we examine that package, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations I have an opportunity to examine that package, we find that we are not cutting the deficit. We are not cutting spending.

To the contrary, the package of taxes of over \$300 billion will go to create more government. Taxes were increased and there will be more government spending. The national debt at the end of the first 4 years, according to the administration's own estimates, will be somewhere between \$1 and \$1.5 trillion extra. That means that our children and grandchildren will be facing a national debt not of \$4.5 trillion that we have now, but somewhere close to \$6 trillion, while we are being told that they must sacrifice and pay additional taxes in order to pay for more government, not to reduce the deficit.

On the Committee on Appropriations we have 13 subcommittees. That is where the cutting is done for appropriations spending. Not in the Rose Garden, not in the press conferences, not talking around the country, but in those subcommittees during the hearings and markups that we have of the bill.

Let me tell you that while the President is speaking about cutting deficits and how important it is, his Office of Management and Budget sent to our Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and State a request to have each of the categories, whenever the Senate would cut or the House would cut, he wanted the higher level. He instructed his representatives to tell the Members of

Congress that he wanted the higher level. So we will come out of that with a 12-percent increase in many of the categories, tens of billions more dollars than the House and Senate actually were willing to settle for.

Now, I think it is time that we level with the American people. If we are going to cut spending and try to get control of the deficit, then we should keep our word and do it. We should not promise one thing and do the other.

This has an impact on the family, both from the spending, the legacy we are leaving our children, but the problems we are creating as far as jobs and employment opportunities in this country. These are going to be badly affected by the use of our capital by creating more and more government.

Certainly we leave a bad impression and undermine public confidence when we try to mix signals by saying we are cutting and reducing the deficit when we are merely increasing taxes and providing more government.

I appreciate the opportunity the gentleman has presented by holding this special order and for giving all of us a chance to point out the strengths of this country and what direction we really need to be going in in this country in promoting the family.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I thank the gentleman very much. It is wonderful to have someone with the gentleman's views sitting there on the Committee on Appropriations, which actually controls how we are going to spend the money on behalf of the people of this country. We just do not have enough people with your philosophy there yet, but we are working on it.

I yield to my friend from San Diego, the great DUKE CUNNINGHAM, Vietnam ace.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank my friend JOHN DOOLITTLE from California.

We are talking about family values, family issues. In the State of California there is one issue that cuts across education, it cuts across health care, it cuts across law enforcement, and it cuts across the ability of the American taxpayer, the California taxpayer, to pay for those programs. I am speaking about the illegal immigration problem that we have in California.

The State of California has got over a \$12 billion deficit. Why? Just like this body, we have got a Democratically controlled assembly and senate, and the Governor cannot stop the spending. We want to provide education for our children, in which our schools are being overrun by illegals; in law enforcement, where you have got 22 percent of your illegal felons in our prison system and we are having to rotate felons out of our jails because there is not enough room; and in health care, where you have two-thirds of all the children born in Los Angeles hospitals are to illegal aliens, and then the mothers go down and qualify for welfare.

□ 2050

In the State of California, we pay \$24 million a month on welfare for illegal aliens, \$24 million a month. That would pay for a lot of unemployment. And to the folks that want to bring up the unemployment bill tomorrow, we can pay for \$27 billion that it is costing this country for illegal immigration, \$27 billion, just by stopping illegal immigration. But yet, the Senator from the other body from the State of California stands up on the border and beats on her chest and says, "I want to stop illegal immigration."

Her cohort, the other female Senator from California, while she was a Member of this body, we could not get her to support one item that would stop illegal immigration. But now that it is popular, both of them are doing so. But the litmus test is whether they have stopped the services for illegal immigrants. Why? It is costing, again, \$27 billion.

We take a look at the issues in this House. We tried to cut and make sure that illegal aliens could not vote under motor-voter, illegal aliens to this country. Under the motor-voter bill, and you know it was defeated on this House floor, we tried to stop, under the Vocational Education Program, the voluntary program, we tried to put an amendment in to where those dollars going for Americans for Volunteer Education would not go to illegal immigrants. Do you know it was voted down on this House floor?

Today, we had a motion to recommit that stated that the current rules under the National Endowment for the Arts, which state that dollars cannot go to anything else than American programs, American citizens, that we codify the House position to make sure that those funds could not go to illegal immigrants. You know that was defeated today by three votes, by three votes. Why? Why would they do this?

The more people you keep on welfare under your thumb, second and third generation, like a hypodermic needle of heroin, the more people you have beholding. "It is the economy stupid." People vote their pocketbook.

If I am trying to take away those welfare dollars, they are not going to vote for a Republican. What we would rather do is get them a job. The other side of the aisle is trying to federalize this country. It is trying to socialize this country. It is trying to homogenize this country, and it is trying to unionize this country. Why? Because if you are a Federal employee, the Republicans are trying to take the Federal Government down in size, you are going to vote Democratic, about 70 percent of them. They know that.

Why do you think, why did they put through the Hatch Act where Federal employees could take part in campaigns? To slow the power in the vote.

If we can build up that Federal bureaucracy, education volunteer pro-

gram, 100,000 new Federal workers, when AL GORE is saying we need to reinvent the Federal Government, we are building the size of the Federal Government.

Look at the health care plan that is coming up. It is going to be a big, giant bureaucracy under the Clinton plan, and it is going to cost and put the burden on the backs of the small business. Why attack small business? Because small business votes with the Chamber. It supports the private enterprise and supports Republicans, and they are trying to attack that. And that is wrong.

The only thing that is going to change that, the only items, we need a balanced budget amendment to stop the spending of the liberal Democrats. They are trying to socialize this country. I think most Americans are aware of it, and they are fed up with it, and they are tired, and I think there is going to be a revolution.

The second thing we need to do is get a balanced budget amendment along with a line-item veto, which we were denied in this House. Both of those items stop the spending by the liberal Democrats. Why do you think they wanted to wait until after 1996 for 80 percent of their spending cuts? So that they will have all of these dollars to spend and buy those votes. Fact.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. You mean 80 percent of their reduced spending increases?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Eighty percent of their reduced spending increases.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. After President Clinton's first term is when those take effect?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No. The gentleman is incorrect. After President Clinton's only term that will take effect.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I stand corrected.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Second, if you can increase the welfare amount, if you can keep people on unemployment, beholding to the Federal Government and Federal dollars, if you can increase the benefits to people that are not even American citizens, that hopefully will become American citizens, then you are going to buy those votes.

The American people are fed up with the illegal immigration problem, from the person that blew up the World Trade Center, who was an illegal immigrant that came into this country illegally—and by the way, could vote motor-voter, he had a driver's license—to the Chinese ships coming in, to the Haitian ships coming in, to the illegal immigrants in the State of California who are coming from the south and the north, from Canada. There are a lot of Canadian illegals in the State of California that should not be in and are not paying American taxes. We have got to stop it.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Maybe they are here to use our hospitals and health care system before we adopt their system.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, I think that what we need to do is work in a bipartisan mission on the health care issue, and Action '93, again, every item in there was mentioned, except with the example of two, one of those was the example of an IRA, where you could put \$5,000 a year into an IRA, tax-free, if you spent it on health care. That was a person, when they pick a system that they are going to spend their dollars on, they are going to be more frugal with those dollars. It is also going to save for when they become chronologically gifted. They will have a pot in there of health care dollars that they can apply for their twilight years.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California for yielding on this very important special order. I hope that he would have a special order next week, and I will participate the same.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I will look forward to doing that.

I thank all our participants.

Mr. Speaker, the family is under severe pressure in this country. I think we all know that intuitively. We all grow increasingly uneasy at the direction this country is heading in, this slow but steady slowing down of the economy, the prolonged recession that we are in.

The gentlemen from California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HUNTER, and I represent a State which is not merely in a recession, it is in a depression. We have never seen anything like it. You would have to go back probably to the Great Depression to see anything that rivaled this.

We are very, very concerned. Yet, people see the debate played out here. And we should make very clear, the Clinton administration and the Democrats, the liberal Democrats of this body believe that government is good and can help men and women and that, therefore, we need to have more of it so that we can offer more help.

Republicans believe, like the Founders of this great country, that government, George Washington said, is not reason, is not eloquence, it is force. And like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master.

Government unchecked will destroy our liberties. And beyond that, it will destroy the means of making a livelihood.

I do not know how anyone cannot look at the present circumstances and be terribly concerned. What is the future for our children, increasingly, as they will be victims of criminal activity, as they will be subjected to broken homes, as they will have to cope with the communicable diseases that continue to spread unabated throughout this country?

Overlaying all of this is the reality that the economy is hurting people. When people are out of jobs, their quality of life is deeply impacted.

President Clinton, during the campaign, used that phrase that the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] repeated: "It is the economy, Stupid."

He promised in his campaign pledges to get the economy going again, reduce the deficit, give us a middle-class tax cut and give us more affordable health care.

So far we have seen none of those. Indeed, instead of a middle-class tax cut, we got a tax hike on the middle class and virtually everybody else capable of paying taxes. Instead of getting the economy going again, we continued to limp along with the anemic state of affairs that we are presently in. And as for the health care situation, well, we will talk about that again next week. But I think most people have the sense that increasing governmental mandates, increasing taxes on employers and employees, and increasing government bureaucrats, in essence, further pushing us down the road to socialized medicine is not the direction we need to be heading in.

□ 2100

As for the budget deficit, as Members heard from the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], having undergone the largest tax increase in history, even by the present administration's own numbers, we will add \$1.2 trillion to the cumulative national debt at the end of this 5-year plan, and we will have annual budget deficits at the end of this 5-year plan at \$200 billion a year.

The likelihood exists, particularly if reelection is achieved by the incumbent President, that the Members will hear another passionate speech from this Chamber explaining why we as Americans once again need to sacrifice the interests of ourselves and our children in order to meet the insatiable appetite of government for taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to have this special order on the family. There is a significant economic dimension to the health of the American family. I wanted to draw that out tonight, along with some of the other very definitely direct social issues, like the pornography question we were just talking about, and the other issues that have been raised. We will look forward again to addressing Members in this Chamber and the American people concerning the health of the American family.

#### HEALTH SECURITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDERMOTT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening to talk about health care.

I am joined by two of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 weeks, anybody who has looked up at the U.S. Capitol from anywhere on the Mall has seen a strange sight, because for the past 3 weeks, during the daytime, on the street that runs between the U.S. Capitol Grounds and the Reflecting Pool on this side of the Mall, there's been a special 10-foot electronic sign running nonstop.

It is one of those signs that keeps a running minute-by-minute tally, just like the one we have seen in Times Square that keeps a running count of the national debt.

It is owned by a group called Families USA, a group that is very familiar to Members of this body as a strong and effective advocate for working families and for health care reform.

They call their sign the Health Security Meter.

It keeps a running tab, second by second, of the number of Americans who have lost their health insurance.

It has been running continuously since the President finished his health care speech to this Chamber 3 weeks ago last night.

Yesterday morning, Mr. Speaker, the Health Security Meter reached a dubious milestone.

Early yesterday morning, around the time the House was convening for the day, the Health Security Meter reached the 1½ million mark.

That means that in the 2 weeks since the President stood in this Chamber and delivered his health care speech, 1½ million Americans, and counting, have lost their health insurance.

That is about 1 person every 1.15 seconds, about 75,000 people a day, or about 2 million people a month.

Mr. Speaker, that is the human cost of this health care crisis, and the tab is running, every second, every minute, and every hour throughout this great land. We cannot afford to let this go on much longer, because it is unraveling our social fabric, reducing our productivity, affecting our competitiveness, draining our State and Federal budgets, and driving down the wages and living standards of our work force.

Mr. Speaker, these people are not strangers.

They're not slackers. They're our fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, neighbors and friends. They're people who worked hard and played by the rules all their lives—the ones who raise our families and fought our wars—the ones who have struggled to leave their children a better life than what they knew.

They are people like that man from Michigan who wrote to say that 14 years ago he was diagnosed with Hodgkin's Disease.

With the help of a strong will and some good doctors, he fought it, and by 1985, was pronounced cured—cured by everyone but his employer's insurance company, who refused to cover him because they said, "He was a bad risk."

So, after 15 years on the job, his boss was forced to lay him off, just because the insurance company would not cover him. Now he has no job—and he, his wife, and his two children have no health insurance.

Mr. Speaker, it is people like this who, after a lifetime of hard work, are seeing their very idea of security shattered before their eyes, the ones who have paid health insurance premiums for years, only to find out that when they really needed their health insurance, their health insurance wasn't there for them.

They're also the ones who thought it could never happen to them—just like most of us think it could never happen to us. It will not happen to us.

But we know that over the next 2 years, one out of every four Americans is expected to be without insurance at some point. Each of us knows somebody in our family, in our neighborhood, who we work with, who we go to church or synagogue or temple with, who has that experience.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tally of heartbreak, a tally of broken lives, a tally of families living on the edge, and it's time we put a stop to it. All of us who have served in this great institution, in this body, and perhaps locally at our State levels, have a rare opportunity to do something that we can remember for the rest of our lives. We will have stepped forward to fill this health care gap in our country.

This is what health care reform is all about. This is what it all comes down to.

As the First Lady said so eloquently in her testimony 2 weeks ago:

I hope we can agree on one thing from the outset. That when our work on health care reform is done, every American, every American, will be guaranteed a comprehensive package of benefits that can never, never, be taken away.

That's the goal. That's what we've got to stay focused on.

And while we work to fix what is wrong with our health care system while preserving what is right, while we work to build upon and improve the system we have now to make it fairer, to make it better, and to make everyone responsible, while we work to achieve the six goals of security, savings, simplicity, choice, quality, and responsibility.

We have got to remember that the bottom line of health care reform is health security for all Americans.

Three weeks ago, the President's speech started the ball rolling and framed the parameters of the debate.

Two weeks ago, the First Lady's testimony energized the call for health

care reform and sharpened the focus. Now the debate has begun.

But as the euphoria of the President's speech and the First Lady's testimony begin to fade; as we begin the bare-knuckle work on the details we can't let health care reform sink into the sludge pit of partisan politics, because the stakes are too high for our constituents.

We must stay focused on the goal of health security for all Americans, because the eyes of the Nation are focused on it, and that's what they sent us here to do. Above all issues, I think, in the last election, it ranked right at the top.

Mr. Speaker, in the past 2 weeks, a wonderful thing has happened. In the past few weeks, a national consensus for health care reform has started to form.

Seventy-one percent of the people polled in a recent Los Angeles Times poll chose the Clinton plan over letting the health care system evolve on its own.

For the first time ever, leaders from both the Democratic and Republican parties have embraced comprehensive reform.

And in a few short months, we've moved from dire concern about the health care system to shaping a proposal to help fix it.

But the Health Security Meter is still running.

Two million people are still losing their coverage every month, and the numbers keep piling up.

The most difficult questions are the ones we can't answer, like: How many senior citizens today are being forced to choose between the prescription drugs they need to stay healthy and the groceries they need to survive?

□ 2110

How many parents are putting off a doctor's visit for their kids because they do not have the coverage they need to pay for it? How many small businesses are dropping employees from coverage because they are squeezed by premiums 40 percent higher than large companies? How many entrepreneurs are not able to create the business they want because a pre-existing condition locks them into a job and a health plan that they cannot escape from? How many people want to move from welfare to work and to encompass the dignity of work but do not because they cannot afford to give up the Medicaid that covers their children, their preeminent concern? And how many businesses want to cover their employees but cannot because they will go bankrupt if they do? How many sales are companies like Ford Motor Co. losing because they spend more on health care than they do for the steel in the cars that they manufacture; \$1,100, \$1,200 per car goes to pay for the health care costs of the em-

ployees of that company and its retirees.

We have got to move more quickly on health care reform, because every day we wait the numbers just keep multiplying and piling up and piling up. None of us has all of the answers right now, but we do have a plan, the President's plan. It is a plan that rejects the big government solutions, a plan that rejects broad-based taxes, a plan that insists that small businesses be protected, a plan that preserves what is best in our system today while fixing what is wrong. It is a plan that drastically cuts the paperwork that is choking our health care system. Everybody knows about it from visits to the doctor's office and visits to the hospital, a plan that controls the costs that are crippling American businesses, hurting American families, exploding our deficit, a plan that maintains the highest-quality health care, extends health care into the preventive health care area and the mental health care area.

The President's plan preserves your right, preserves your right to choose your doctor and your health plan so that we can have a doctor our family has confidence in. It makes sure that everyone pays and contributes to health care. Everyone pays and contributes to it. And of course, it restores the sense that we are all in this together.

Above all, I think the promise of the President's health care plan is reflected in this card I hold in my hand. It is a health security card. And if you remember during his speech the President held this card up. It is a card that guarantees each American a comprehensive package of benefits equal or better than the benefits provided by most of the Fortune 500 companies.

As Franklin Roosevelt once said about Social Security, this card represents a sacred trust between the Government and its people, and can never be taken away. And as the President said in his speech, with this card, if you lose your job, or if you switch jobs, you are covered. If you leave your job to start a small business, you are covered. If you retire early, you are covered. If you or someone in your family has a preexisting medical condition, you are covered. If you get sick or a member of your family gets sick, even if it is a life-threatening illness, you are covered. And if an insurance company tries to drop you for any reason, you are still covered, because that will be illegal.

The President's health care plan guarantees a comprehensive package of benefits, and with this card you will never leave home without it. That is the ultimate goal of health care reform, to give all Americans the peace of mind to know that no matter what happens, health care will always be there for them.

And the President's plan will work. But we still have got a lot of work to do in the months ahead before we come to a vote, hopefully in the spring. And I hope we can put aside partisan politics, we can embrace each other, work to smooth out the rough edges of the President's plan, and come up with a solution that will work for all Americans, because every minute that we do not, the clock continues to run. It is at 1 million and counting since the President spoke. In the short time that I have been speaking here this evening, another 800 people have been added to the ranks of the uninsured.

We cannot wait any longer. The country and the Nation have waited long enough. We are behind every other major industrial nation in this world in terms of providing the coverage that is necessary for our workers. We have to move quickly to guarantee each American comprehensive health benefits that can never be taken away. And we must move quickly to pass President Clinton's health security plan.

I am very pleased now to yield to my colleagues who have been working very hard on this issue and who have come to the floor day after day, night after night to make a pitch for getting health care done in this country, and get it done soon, and providing people that we represent with the security that they so richly deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is truly a historic moment for our country. Health care reform was deemed a necessity in previous administrations as far back as Harry Truman. But it has taken 217 year as a Nation for a President to present a plan that will guarantee health care for every man, woman, and child.

I agree with the President that our country's health care system just does not work for too many people. And we cannot afford to ignore what is wrong with it any longer.

President Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton I believe are to be commended not just for acknowledging the problem, but for having the courage to take on the entrenched powers in Washington, to actually find a solution.

Mr. BONIOR. Will the gentleman yield just a moment on that point?

Mr. MEEHAN. Sure, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, people ought to be aware that there are entrenched powers in this city, in this country that are going to do everything they can to stop this. Many of them are huge corporations. You are seeing ads running on television now throughout the country. The money

people are going to come out against this, because it threatens, they believe, their existence.

It does not have to. All we are asking them to do is be responsible and to participate, and to be a part of solving this issue. So the gentleman is absolutely correct when he stresses the point that this is going to be attacked on a variety of different fronts as we move forward.

Mr. MEEHAN. And I do not think the American people have any doubt why we have not been able to get health care reform for the 217 years we have been waiting for it.

The truth is the ranks of the more than 37 million Americans without health insurance, most of them working men and women and their families, are growing every day. My distinguished colleague from Michigan pointed out that Families USA, over a million and counting since the President was here in this Chamber. A friend of mine in Concord, MA, Phil Villers, has been very involved with Families USA. It seems to me that in addition to people with preexisting conditions, the unemployed, the working poor, the small businesses, they are unable to obtain health care coverage or afford it even if they could find it. Lack of health care coverage or the fear of losing it is no longer something that happens to someone else. Every one of you probably knows someone who has been denied coverage or paid too much for health care, whether it be a family member, a friend, a coworker, a neighbor or ourselves. I come from a large family, seven children in my family. Members of my family have been without health insurance, and their children have been without health insurance.

I have heard many of the stories myself from people who have contacted me or written to my office in desperation.

There is the elderly couple in Lowell, MA, that is having trouble making ends meet because they pay \$3,200 a year, 25 percent of their income, for supplemental insurance to cover their prescription drugs.

There is a young Lawrence couple. He is attempting to purchase private insurance because of an anticipated layoff and the loss of health benefits. However, he has been unable to find a carrier that will cover him because he has a disabled wife and a 6-year-old child with a heart condition.

Then there is the suburban teenager who wrote to me because of her concern about her family. The business her father worked for failed, and her mother took a job as a bank teller, primarily to obtain health benefits for her family. However, it is unlikely that the mother will be eligible for coverage because she has cancer.

And the list goes on and on. And unfortunately, I have been able to do lit-

tle other than nod my head and listen, until now.

Because of an unprecedented call for change in this country, I believe that soon terms like "preexisting condition," "coverage denied," "prescription drugs not included," will be found only in history books, and not in health care manuals.

□ 2120

I believe the President has proposed a workable, feasible approach to health-care reform.

In addition to providing health care for all Americans—not just those who can afford it or are fortunate enough to have a comprehensive employee benefits package—the President's plan will help cap the escalating health-care costs that are draining our national resources and our personal savings.

The United States spends one-third more on health care than any other country in the world—14 percent of the gross national product. Our medical bills are growing at more than twice the rate of inflation. In my home State of Massachusetts—where health-care costs have risen more than 13 percent annually for the past 5 years—the average family of four spends \$5,320 each year for care.

This health-care crisis is fueling our Federal budget deficit, affecting large corporations' ability to compete in a global economy and reducing the survival rates of small companies. On average, 12 percent of corporate payrolls are eaten up by health-care costs. Small businesses—the key to job creation in our country—pay health-insurance premiums that are one-third higher than large companies. Small business need this plan.

However, our country's nearly trillion-dollar annual medical bill has not resulted in the best delivery system. For example, the United States ranks 21st in infant mortality and has the 3d worst immunization rate in the Western Hemisphere.

I agree with President Clinton that the strength of our current health-care system can be found in our skilled medical professionals, technology and institutions.

But what good is having the best health care in the world if all of our citizens cannot access it?

After spending the past 8 months talking to more than 1,000 health-care organizations, interviewing thousands of providers and consumers, and reading more than 700,000 letters, the First Lady and the President's task force have formulated a comprehensive health-care plan. It deserves our immediate attention and our thorough examination.

The President last week outlined the plan's six key ingredients that seem so basic, yet have been lacking for too long in the lives of millions of Americans:

**Security:** Guaranteeing comprehensive benefits for all Americans for a lifetime.

**Savings:** Controlling health-care costs that have nearly quadrupled since 1980.

**Simplicity:** Cutting down on mind-boggling paperwork that accounts for 25 percent of hospital bills.

Mr. BONIOR. Unbelievable, when you think about it, 25 percent of every dollar is spent on health care and goes just for the paperwork. In Canada—and the Speaker pro tempore here will appreciate this—it is 11 cents per dollar. But 25 cents of every dollar just for paperwork. Under the President's proposal, we will have one form. I know people are saying, "Oh, yeah, I got to see it." One form, simple. We will not have doctors, nurses, people throughout this country using their time to do paperwork instead of practicing what they went to school to learn: providing health care for their own constituencies.

Mr. MEEHAN. I have had four health care forms in my district in Massachusetts, and I have listened to doctors talk about having to hire more people simply to deal with the paperwork. Simplicity is absolutely critical.

**Quality:** emphasizing improved care and efficient delivery of services.

**Choice:** allowing the freedom to pick a doctor and a health care plan.

Mr. BONIOR. Many people today cannot even choose the plan that they want. They just get what the company gives them if they work for a company. This will allow them different options, different choices. Like, for instance, I think many employees, Federal employees have, a menu of plans from which to choose. People need that ability to choose between 20, 30, 10, or 5 different types of plans as well as, as the gentleman correctly points out, the doctor, a doctor in whom the subscriber and his family may have confidence.

Mr. MEEHAN. **Responsibility:** Encouraging a reasonable profit margin for providers and a healthier lifestyle for consumers.

I truly believe that elected officials across this country have heard the pleas of the American people and are committed to working together in a bipartisan way to reform our health-care system. The question being asked today in the Halls of the Congress is not "Will we have national health care?", but rather, "What will be included in the plan?"

I think that is an incredible difference. As a new Member, and certainly my colleague from Michigan can speak to it, we have not heard that type of optimism, "What is going to be in the plan?"

The country is ready to do it, the Congress is ready to do it.

Mr. BONIOR. I remember 20 years ago getting involved in politics and the

Campaign for National Health Security for Americans. We happened to believe at that time back in the 1970's, early 1970's, 1971, a consensus was building then, but then it sort of broke and faded, it broke away into politics and partisan bickering and we could not get the groups together. And it has taken us 20 years to march us back to the point where we are on the edge, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], has correctly pointed out, on the edge of getting it done. The question is just what kind, and the timing, I believe, is just around the corner.

Mr. MEEHAN. I want to mention a point I talked about earlier: I would caution that there are powerful forces in Washington seeking to derail our country off the course that the President has charted. Special interests have beefed up their efforts in an effort to stop health care reform; 30-second television ads, money being flown in, all to prevent the health care reform that this country has demanded. I think it is going to take a concerted effort to fight their plan to undermine a national health care plan because they are looking to maintain the status quo and prevent the change that the American people are crying out for.

Hospitals, doctors, other care providers, insurance and drug companies, large corporations, small businesses, labor groups, health consumers, need to all work together to build a comprehensive health care plan for all Americans.

I have faith in the determination of the American people to embrace the President's call for change, and I look forward to being a part of a Congress that will pass the country's first national health care legislation early next year. And I cannot imagine anything that would be more rewarding to me as a new Member of Congress, as a freshman Member of Congress, but to be here and to actively participate in finally getting the Nation's first national health care legislation approved. That would make it all worthwhile to me as a new Member of Congress, and I thank the gentleman for taking this special order.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his comments, and I could not emphasize or put more of a stamp on his last statement. It would really make it all worthwhile, all of our efforts being in this institution, being in politics in this body, to come and finish off something that has been lying out there for literally decades, making sure that all Americans have health care.

It will rival Social Security in the 1930's, Medicare in the mid-1960's. This will be that significant, that important, that revolutionary in the positive sense, for this country.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership. He is one of the newer Members of this institution who has taken on the

hard special interests and has said "No" to those who have said "No" to change. He is leading the effort to make sure that his constituents and the people of the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts have the security to which they are entitled, that it is a privilege for them to have, it is a right for them to have, and he is leading the effort in that regard, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO, who also, as much as literally any other Member of this institution, has been dogged, determined on this issue, has spoken out in the leadership meetings we have had and in the whip meetings that we have had and the groups that we put together to move legislation on the need to move with some alacrity on this, that the time is right, the country is waiting for. And I thank her again for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for having this special order this evening. I am so pleased to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], who has taken a leadership position on this issue, and my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], who has spoken eloquently tonight on the difficulties of our health care system.

□ 2130

Our Nation as we talked about and have talked about for several weeks does have a national health care crisis. There is no question, every individual knows that is the case.

One of the facts that in my view cannot be repeated often enough is that Americans spend more than \$800 billion on health care. That is what they spent last year, and it is going to be more this year. With that, we see health care costs that are continually rising and the numbers of uninsured continue to grow.

I think that we need to applaud the President for taking on the health crisis and making health care a central focus and a central project of his Presidency.

The final details are now being hammered out. In his proposal several weeks ago in this body, and I will repeat, it has been mentioned here tonight that there are six principles on which this health care proposal is founded: security of coverage, simplicity of administration, savings in costs, choice among health care plans and physicians, quality of care and individual and corporate responsibility for making that system work.

It has been what—50 or 60 years since anyone has had the courage, any President has had the courage to take on the issue. Others have tried. They have started it and let it go because in fact it is complicated. It is complex, but that should not deter us and it clearly has not deterred President Clinton.

I would like to address a couple of these principles tonight if I might. One is savings in costs and the second is security of coverage, childbirth, braces for children and operations to remove a ruptured appendix, these are not unusual medical procedures. Families face these kinds of issues every single day, but these every day kinds of medical bills like those that I have mentioned become a crippling financial burden for too many American families. If you are not adequately covered, even nonemergency procedures can be a family crisis.

Even worse, millions of mothers and fathers live in fear of the emergency that will require medical care and medical attention that they just cannot afford any longer.

Mr. BONIOR. It is like carrying a 50-pound sack of potatoes on your back all day. I mean, that is a physical term, but translated into mental anguish it is just very crippling and very distracting for people in their lives. It just eats them up. Every one of us knows someone in our families or our neighborhoods who has gone through that, who is going through it today. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct.

Ms. DELAURO. I see people at office hours every Saturday, my constituents. I do it at a Stop-and-Shop or a Wal-Mart or some major grocery store.

One woman came last week and she said that she had just been let go from her job, not her fault, they just closed up the business, and she brought with her the benefit of an extension for 18 months. Now with that up, she is faced with looking at paying either \$1,200 a quarter or \$3,000 a quarter for her insurance. She has a family and she said, "I cannot do this."

So she said, "I will keep my fingers crossed."

Imagine keeping your fingers crossed on your own health and that of your family.

Mr. BONIOR. As we pointed out, 2 million people a month lose it and have to cross their fingers.

Ms. DELAURO. And that is what they are doing. It is families who have this difficulty. Most families are lucky to have employers who are covering their health care, but they are not immune to the soaring costs.

It is not only families, but our businesses, which as we mentioned here tonight, and as costs rise workers pay larger and larger chunks of their paychecks for insurance coverage, and business spending on health care has increased 253 percent since 1980, a period when corporate profits rose only 130 percent.

So that for families, for employers and for government, the rising rates are three times what inflation is. It is really threatening the ability of private employers to maintain current benefits.

Mr. BONIOR. Let me just tell the gentlewoman a story in that regard, if the gentlewoman will allow me.

Ms. DELAURO. Sure.

Mr. BONIOR. I have a constituent in my district, this happened actually 2 years ago, but I think it is illustrative of the problem. This guy worked in a factory. He is a lovely man. He worked at a tough job. He comes home at the end of the day and he is dirty, he is tired and all he wants to do is kind of slouch down in the chair and sort of relax, maybe have a soda or a beer and just kind of let the day go by for an hour because he is exhausted.

He worked 30 years, started when he was 18 out of high school in this plant, retired, 30 years and out, had health care benefits and pension benefits.

He went to the mailbox every month to get his pension check because he was not eligible yet for Medicare or Social Security. He had a check there for about \$500 each month in pension benefits that he had built up over 30 years of service in this factory.

He told me, "Congressman, I went to my mailbox last week and there was a check there, but it was for \$32 instead of \$500, with a little note inside that said, 'That is all you are going to get from now on because your health premiums have increased so much, we are going to have to deduct that from your pension.'"

That clearly was allowed in his contract. That man's life was shattered. You can imagine, I mean, all of us think about the day we are going to retire. We are putting aside something privately or publicly or however with our employer for a pension, and then to realize one day that it has vanished. It is gone. All your dreams, all your hopes, that have gone on too long and for too many people in this country and we have got to change it.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just give you an example of a family that I visited in Wallingford, CT. It was in the midst of the Persian Gulf war. The family had lost their son in the gulf war. I went to pay my respects quietly. I was in their living room. I was speaking to the father. The mother was not there. The father was an autoworker who had just been laid off from his job and he had no health insurance.

The mother was not there at the time. She was coming in a little bit later because she was out looking for a job. She had tried several places and she was waiting to see if she could get a job, but her first criteria in accepting a job was not having to wait a year to get health care or 6 months, but wanting to get a job that would provide health care benefits immediately.

Here was this family that lost their son in the gulf war and there they were. They were frantic. They were trying to cope with the tragedy of losing a child and did not know what they were going to do; one, about their own employment, and second, about their own health care.

This is not what this Nation is about, should not be what this Nation is about.

Mr. BONIOR. This plan will rectify that. They will have that peace of mind. They will have that security. If the loss is so debilitating, they will have mental health benefits so they can have counseling to take care of a situation that saps every ounce of energy and love and emotion out of a person when you lose someone that close. It is just critical.

Just one other story and then I will let my colleague continue.

I was meeting back in my constituency with some women, about five of them. They worked in a nursing home. They came to see me, and they were members of a union, worked in a nursing home. They came to see me because none of them had any health insurance. They are taking care of our mothers, our fathers, our grandparents, and yet they themselves had no health insurance.

One of the women, I will never forget this, she told me, "Congressman, I go to bed every night and I say a prayer that my son won't get sick. I don't know what I would do."

I mean, what an incredible irony that these people who are taking care of our own cannot take care of their own because there is not the insurance and the security there for them.

They are going to get a card when we pass this plan like this, the national health security plan. It is always going to be there for them.

When I work on this issue, as I am sure both of you do, we think about people like this. That is what gives us the drive to keep going, to get it done, because as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] said so correctly and as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has illustrated, that is what is going to make it all worthwhile for us serving here, is getting something for people who deserve it, who have a right to it in this country.

□ 2140

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to pick up on something the gentleman said because I find it a major flaw in our health care system now which will be rectified in the President's plan, and that is the whole issue, which in my view helps to undermine people's security, of the absence of mental health, mental health care coverage. Neurobiological disorders like manic depressive disorder, anxiety disorder, autism, schizophrenia, can be just as debilitating as physical illnesses, and they are physical illnesses, but many health insurance programs, including Medicare, discriminate against people who suffer with these diseases. Not only is one faced with the trauma of the disease and stigmatized at the same time, but their health insurance

coverage does not extend so they get this kind of coverage, and they are faced with mounting bills and without the wherewithal to get any further help in these illnesses. It is becoming a larger and larger problem, and it is estimated that 19 percent of our adult population in the United States suffers from a diagnosable mental illness within any 6-month period of time—

Mr. BONIOR. Yeah.

Ms. DELAURO. Not a small issue, and the plan addresses this issue in a first step in terms of coverage for those who suffer with mental illness.

Mr. BONIOR. As we learn more and more about mental illness, and as we learn more and more about medicine in general and people in general, we come to understand how much physical disabilities are related. I know, and this is a very small example, but personally the tension and the pressure of the job that I have causes my own muscles to tighten and the physical problems that I have, and, as minor, and as minuscule and as sometimes irrelevant, at least compared to the problems that we have discussed that other people have had tonight, we all understand that, and know that, and that is why being able to deal with stress, being able to deal with all the mental health issues that are important in our very chaotic lives in the 21st century that we are about to enter is a critical part of good health care, quality health care, preventative health care as we move forward.

Ms. DELAURO. Another issue, I think, is if we could be assured that the quality of our care was going up with the spiraling costs, that would be one thing, but it was mentioned here for each dollar spent at a hospital that 25 cents goes to administrative book-keeping and paperwork. For small businesses that is about 40 cents. It can be up to 40 cents on the dollar.

I have had a number of my constituents contact me to express their frustrations with those bureaucratic regulations and with the paperwork so that the simplification coming down to one form I think is critical. I also think that we have to be concerned because of what happen with all of these regulations, that we are in danger of looking at serious health care fraud that to the system is about \$80 billion a year, and so what we need to do is to address that issue.

Mr. BONIOR. That is a very, very important issue, and I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] raised it because I have a constituent, Bill Ellicott in my district, who basically has a business that deals with health care fraud and making sure that there is not the double coverage payment schemes that so often go on and that really saps a lot of the resources out of the system in our country. It is an area that we can save a considerable

amount of money on to help pay for some of the things we have been talking about.

Ms. DELAURO. It is \$80 billion a year. It is 10 percent of what health care costs us. Again it has not received the attention that it needs to.

I will just give my colleague a couple of examples:

In California a scheme involving rolling laboratories fraudulently billed insurers for more than \$1 billion. A father and son team looted Medicaid for more than \$16 million by submitting bills for 400,000 phantom visits. A laboratory company was convicted of sending Medicare more than \$100 million in fraudulent blood test claims that were inflated by almost 100 percent.

We have to do something about clearing that up. We have to make this kind of effort a crime. We have to add to the efforts of the FBI and others who can ferret out this kind of effort, and we see that. Both of these kinds of issues that we are talking about with regard to mental illness and with regard to fraud are within the Clinton plan, that we take it on, that we are looking at eliminating that fraud, and we are looking at a treatment for medical illness.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that we know that there are powerful interests that are opposed to this plan. There are also, quite frankly, those amongst our ranks that believe the system is too complicated, that it is too hard to deal with. In fact, in my view there are nay sayers. People say that we cannot take this on and that Congress is ill equipped to take it on.

I think the American people disagree with this view. I told the gentleman that I go to Stop and Shops and to malls every weekend. I have had people come up and talk to me. I have had hundreds of letters, thousands of letters, and phone calls. People in my community are in favor of health care reform. They want us to move on this issue.

And I think that those who say that Congress is not up to it, to them I say I know that we say here tonight that Congress has got to be up to this challenge.

I ask the American people. I think the American people have a role to play. They are demanding us doing this, but they have a role to play as well. I think that they have got to let those of us who represent them know that they are not going to stand around for politics, and partisan bickering and nay saying. They want those of us who represent them to move on health care reform.

Mr. BONIOR. And they ought to be calling their Congress men and women, calling their Senators, letting them know, writing to them. They have to be active on this. It will save them in the long run thousands, tens of thou-

sands, of dollars over their lifetime, and it will provide them the peace and security that they want for themselves and their families. It is in their interest to tell us to move on this, to tell the timid to get out of the way because we are coming down the aisle, and we have got a good product, and we are going to enact it, and we are going to have the President sign it.

Ms. DELAURO. And they want us to work with the President.

Mr. BONIOR. They do.

Ms. DELAURO. It is not all hammered out, but they want the Congress to work with the President to pass health care reform and do it next year, and I think those who do not, who are the timid and the naysayers, will pay a price with those that they represent, and I hope the American public will write and call the Members of Congress, Members of the House and the Senate.

I want to say, Thank you, to my colleague.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for staying at this late hour and coming and talking about this as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN].

Mr. MEEHAN. I was going to point out that it is interesting, and I ask:

Can you imagine having a health care system, and you talked about the cost that it is costing all Americans, whether Americans have health insurance or not, they are paying for a system that doesn't make any sense? Can you imagine when people get seriously sick, and get rushed to the hospital, they get rushed to emergency rooms across the country?

And I have been to many of them in my own district, the emergency rooms. It does not make any sense to wait until someone gets so sick that they have to be rushed and get the most expensive possible health care rather than to provide them the preventative health care that would save the system billions and billions of dollars. It just does not make any sense, and it is happening all across the country and costing us billions and billions whether we have health insurance or not.

I see so many families without health insurance, and something happens to them, and they get sick, and they do not go and get the type of attention they need, and it is not until it is a crisis and they go into an emergency room, and then everyone pays the most expensive possible health care costs, and I think that is an important point here as well.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN] is absolutely correct, and it is a big part of the cost. It is a big part of the inefficiency that the present system has, and it is clearly something that is going to be dealt with and will be dealt with in this plan.

Well, I thank my colleagues, and I guess I should just conclude by saying that I am honored we could participate

in this trialog, I guess, three of us this evening, and equally honored that the Speaker pro tempore who is presiding this evening is the gentleman from Washington, Congressman JIM McDERMOTT, a medical doctor and a very active and knowledgeable player on this issue as well as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I expect that, when we are finished tonight, he will give us his impressions, a pointer or two, I suspect, on some of the issues we talked about. And we are, obviously, always open to his wise counsel as we move forward, so I thank my colleagues for their contributions this evening.

□ 2150

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2492

Mr. DIXON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-291)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2492) "making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 13, 18, and 24.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 14, 16, 20, 28, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, and 48, and agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$115,888,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$892,156,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$711,742,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$882,359,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$206,191,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: \$2,202,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Delete the matter proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and delete the matter proposed by the Senate; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$6,342,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$5,202,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$5,040,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$20,578,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$14,348,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, 6, 10, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, and 38.

JULIAN C. DIXON,  
LOUIS STOKES,  
RICHARD J. DURBIN,  
MARCY KAPTUR,  
DAVID E. SKAGGS,  
NANCY PELOSI,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HERB KOHL,  
PATTY MURRAY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
CONRAD BURNS,  
CONNIE MACK,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2492) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement of the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the actions agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

## RETIREMENT OF CHIEF JUDGE FRED B. UGAST

The conferees note the impending retirement of Judge Fred B. Ugast, Chief Judge of the District of Columbia Superior Court, after 20 years of judicial service, and congratulate him on his accomplishments in the areas of innovative programs, case processing efficiencies, and expanding access to court services. Chief Judge Ugast encouraged the development of the nationally recognized Civil Delay Reduction Program in 1989. His administration also developed the Specialized Felony Drug Calendar program which resulted in earlier disposition of criminal drug cases. He expanded the court's "Settlement Week" program into a formalized alternative dispute resolution program that is integrated into the civil, small claims, and domestic relations case processing systems. His administration has also emphasized expanded access to justice services.

Chief Judge Ugast's strong leadership and vision has truly enhanced the administration of justice in the District of Columbia. He leaves a lasting legacy of significant accomplishments in public service.

## DEVELOPMENT DAY CARE FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN

Homeless preschool children represent the fastest growing, most fragile and vulnerable segment of the homeless population. Currently, 725 homeless families with approximately 957 preschoolers live in shelters in the District.

Programs serving homeless preschool children in the District should receive a fair share of day care funds made available to the District through Federal child care and block grant funding such as the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-177). The Department of Human Services is urged to review its funding commitments and take expeditious steps to ensure that programs serving these homeless children are included in the allocation of available day care resources. Although McKinney Act funds are provided through the District's public schools to assist in meeting the needs of homeless school age children, the District currently has no program or special funding available to satisfy the very special developmental needs of the homeless preschool population.

The Committee encourages District officials to take the necessary creative steps to seek and use available Federal resources to meet the acute needs of homeless children and their families. In particular, District officials should improve coordination of resources directed toward the homeless and seek out additional existing funding available under the McKinney Act.

## NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION, TRAUMA AND RESEARCH CENTER

The House and Senate Subcommittees on District of Columbia Appropriations have provided significant support for the National

Child Protection, Trauma and Research Center in previous years and the conferees wish to reiterate their strong support for the project. Although the Subcommittees lack sufficient Federal funds in their 602(b) allocations at this time to fund the project, the conferees continue their strong interest in supporting the Center through the appropriations process.

#### DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

The District of Columbia is party to several court orders and consent decrees meant to alleviate overcrowding and to mandate staff levels, security requirements, and standards of health and sanitation in facilities operated by the Department of Corrections. In the past 10 years, the Department's average daily inmate population has grown from approximately 6,500 to over 11,500. In order to comply with judicial requirements and to avoid additional court fines, the District has for several years outplaced prisoner in private and public corrections facilities in other states. In light of budget constraints, however, and citing a leveling trend in prison population, the District has recently reduced its out-of-state correctional contracting.

The conferees commend the District in its efforts to secure the most cost-effective inmate housing. The conferees note, however, that according to information provided to them, the cost competitiveness and general quality of corrections contractors appear well documented. Moreover, the conferees are concerned that District inmates not be eligible for early release to reduce overcrowding as a result of returning D.C. prisoners to District-owned facilities. Even if this is not the case and inmate population is stable at an acceptable level, the prospect of future requirements makes it appear prudent to maintain some ongoing outside contracting capacity until additional new capacity is available in District-owned facilities. Should the Department of Corrections require expanded use of outside contracted prison or jail capacity the conferees will consider a supplemental or reprogramming request for the necessary increased costs, if any.

#### GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY COGENERATION FACILITY

In 1989, Georgetown University, operating under the applicable local and Federal energy policy statutes, initiated District of Columbia approvals to develop a cogeneration plant on its campus. It is the conferees' understanding that approvals for this facility include three environmental policy acts enacted by the Council of the District of Columbia and 19 regulatory approvals as well as zoning approval granted and upheld by the D.C. Court of Appeals.

The proposed facility would continue to provide the much needed steam for the University at the same time that it provides the Potomac Electric Power Company with additional capacity on its system. Because of the energy and financial savings and the need for additional power, the conferees encourage the District of Columbia to review, with the applicants, the basis for withdrawal of the environmental approval to construct the cogeneration facility.

#### TITLE I

#### FISCAL YEAR 1994 APPROPRIATIONS FEDERAL FUNDS

#### FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT FUNDS

Amendment No. 1: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which delays the obligation and expenditure of \$2,000,000 until September 30, 1994, and October 1, 1994, respectively.

#### FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION FOR CRIME AND YOUTH INITIATIVES

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$17,327,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$15,327,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have allowed the Mayor to use a portion of the appropriation for Federal Crime and Youth Initiatives for the operations of the Trauma Care Fund established in Public Law 102-382 (106 Stat. 1428).

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

#### GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$115,888,000 instead of \$118,543,000 as proposed by the House and \$114,781,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$1,107,000 above the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which requires the District to identify local sources of revenues for the account "Admission to Statehood".

#### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment, insert: \$87,293,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action appropriates \$87,293,000 instead of \$85,348,000 as proposed by the House and \$85,629,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase of \$1,664,000 above the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

#### PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$892,156,000 instead of \$907,966,000 as proposed by the House and \$877,703,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

*Police and Fire Clinic.*—The conferees were recently informed that the District has undertaken a study to examine the costs and services now provided by the Clinic and plan to have a comprehensive package developed by January 1994 that will (1) recommend a system for providing performance of duty medical services to District police and fire fighters and for determining the impact of the system on Federal agencies currently receiving services from the Clinic on a reimbursable basis; (2) compare the cost of providing these services through private health care providers; and (3) provide an implementation schedule and cost analysis for establishing the new system. The conferees request that the study and comprehensive package address the comments and recommendations of the Federal agencies using the Clinic's services. The conferees note that the Federal agencies involved probably have

not had an opportunity to consider the impact of changes proposed in the Clinic's operations on their fiscal year 1994 budgets, and therefore request District officials to make every effort to ensure that no changes are made in the availability of the Clinic's services prior to the Federal agency's concurrence with the changes or arrangement for alternative services. The conferees look forward to receiving the comprehensive package in early 1994, and direct that the Police and Fire Health Clinic continue operating in fiscal year 1994 at the fiscal year 1993 level until such time as the comprehensive plan is approved by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate. The conferees commend the District for identifying and implementing several cost cutting measures which have resulted in reducing nonpersonal services costs by \$400,000. The conferees encourage District officials to continue their efforts to identify and implement cost cutting measures relative to the Clinic's current operations.

*Fire suppression liquid.*—The conferees have received the Fire Department's report regarding the features of a fire suppression liquid concentrate called Pyrocap B-136. The Department's report indicates that the concentrate greatly reduces toxic smoke, heat, and "completely relieves the problem of burnback in cases of petroleum fires". The conferees urge the Department to use this technology whenever possible, and to place it on trucks that answer fire emergencies in several parts of the city including several inner-city areas that have high fire incident rates as well as the White House and the Federal enclave. The conferees plan to review the use of this technology with fire officials at next year's hearings.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have provided \$4,000,000 "from other Federal sources hereafter appropriated" to fund the D.C. National Guard (\$1,100,000); the Office of Emergency Preparedness (\$1,848,000); and object class 70 (equipment) of the Metropolitan Police Department (\$1,052,000).

Amendment No. 9: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate that prohibits the elimination of the Administrative Assistants to the Battalion Fire Chiefs in the Fire Department.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That in addition to the \$892,156,000 appropriated under this heading, an additional \$1,025,000 and 11 full-time equivalent positions shall be transferred from the Department of Administrative Services to the District of Columbia Court System for janitorial services, pest control, window washing, trash collection and removal, and landscaping*

, and

on page 5, after line 7 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 insert "(Including Transfer of Funds)" as a centerhead.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action deletes a proviso proposed by the Senate that would have prohibited the closing of Engine Company 3 located at 439 New Jersey Avenue, Northwest, and inserts a new proviso that transfers \$1,025,000 and 11 full-time equivalent positions from the Department of Administrative Services under Governmental Direction

and Support to the District of Columbia Court System for janitorial services, pest control, window washing, trash collection and removal, and landscaping. The conference action also inserts a new centerhead "Including Transfer of Funds" under the Public Safety and Justice appropriation heading.

Regarding the closing of Engine Company 3 located at 439 New Jersey Avenue, Northwest, the conferees have received assurances from the City Administrator that the closing "... will not impact on the level of fire protection afforded the U.S. Capitol or any part of the Capitol Hill area" and that the "Fire Department anticipates upgrading Ambulance Number 15, which is currently housed at Engine Company 3, to an Advanced Life Support unit staffed with paramedics ... during the first quarter of fiscal year 1994. It will be moved to one of the four fire stations within a mile of the U.S. Capitol."

This action by the conferees is taken on the condition that District officials, at least 15 days prior to the closing of Engine Company 3, fully brief appropriate officials of the Architect of the Capitol on the District's plans for closing Engine Company 3 and continuing to provide the excellent service to the Capitol complex that has been provided in the past. The conferees stress the statement made by the head of the Architect's fire protection division that, "there needs to be assurance that the excellent service provided by the Fire Department in the past will not be diminished by any proposed change."

The conference agreement provides the transfer of \$1,025,000 and 11 positions, to the D.C. Court System. The conferees were informed by the executive officer of the courts that the Department of Administrative Services has agreed to the transfer of these resources to the Court System. The executive officer further stated that while the Department of Administrative Services "appears to do the best it can under difficult circumstances, the Courts suffer the consequences of reductions in service delivery."

#### PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$711,742,000 instead of \$711,813,000 as proposed by the House and \$710,742,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference action reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 12: Allocates \$3,474,000 for the Commission on the Arts and Humanities as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,540,000 as proposed by the House. The reduction of \$66,000 below the House allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 13: Allocates \$4,500,000 for the D.C. School of Law as proposed by the House instead of \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$1,000,000 above the Senate allowance reflects the restoration of \$1,000,000 that was included in final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 14: Allocates \$487,000 for the Education Licensure Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of \$492,000 as proposed by the House. The conference agreement reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

#### HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$382,359,000 instead of \$914,830,000 as proposed by the House and \$869,587,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$12,772,000 above the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 16: Provides that \$20,905,000 is to remain available until expended for the District's employees' disability compensation program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,905,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of \$3,000,000 above the House allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

#### PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$206,191,000 instead of \$215,749,000 as proposed by the House and \$203,939,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$2,252,000 above the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

*Water and Sewer Utility Administration.*—The conference action abolishes 51 positions to reflect final action by the Mayor and Council on the District's fiscal year 1994 budget amendment (H. Doc. 103-136).

#### REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

Amendment No. 18: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have authorized the use of funds appropriated under this heading to pay the debt service for the first year on \$50,000,000 that the District would have been authorized to borrow under capital outlay as matching funds for constructing or modernizing the George Washington University Hospital.

Amendment No. 19: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$306,264,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$306,264,000 instead of \$312,948,000 as proposed by the House and \$316,948,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The reduction of \$6,684,000 below the House allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The Senate allowance included \$4,000,000 to cover the first year debt service for \$50,000,000 in general obligation bonds the District would have issued under amendment number 24 to provide matching funds for modernization of the George Washington University Hospital. Section 6 of the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-590; 104 Stat. 2929) authorizes a total of \$50,000,000 to George Washington University Hospital as matching funds for the purpose of constructing or modernizing their medical facility.

#### PAY ADJUSTMENT

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$81,680,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70,680,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of \$11,000,000 above the House allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

#### SEVERANCE PAY

Amendment No. 21: Insert new heading and paragraph as proposed by the Senate and appropriates \$2,202,000 instead of \$11,033,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease of \$8,831,000 below the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The Senate action reflected the mayor's proposal as submitted to the Council.

#### D.C. GENERAL HOSPITAL DEFICIT PAYMENT

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

#### D.C. GENERAL HOSPITAL DEFICIT PAYMENT

*For the purpose of reimbursing the General fund for costs incurred for the operation of the D.C. General Hospital pursuant to D.C. Law 1-134, the D.C. General Hospital Commission Act of 1977, \$10,000,000.*

#### ENERGY ADJUSTMENTS

*The Mayor shall reduce appropriations and expenditures for energy costs in the amount of \$482,000 within one of several of the various appropriation headings of this Act.*

#### COMMUNICATIONS ADJUSTMENTS

*The Mayor shall reduce appropriations and expenditures for communications costs in the amount of \$158,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act.*

#### CONTRACTUAL SERVICES ADJUSTMENTS

*The Mayor shall reduce contractual services appropriations and expenditures within object class 40 in the amount of \$1,500,000 within one or several of the various appropriation headings in this Act. Provided, That no reductions shall be made to agencies not under the direct control of the Mayor or to the Department of Human Services.*

#### CASH RESERVE FUND

*For the purpose of a cash reserve fund to replenish the consolidated cash balances of the District of Columbia, \$3,957,000.*

, and

on page 13 line 3 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2492, strike "\$3,423,000" and insert "\$3,323,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action appropriates \$10,000,000 instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate for the D.C. General Hospital Deficit Payment to the District's general fund. The reduction of \$10,000,000 below the Senate allowance reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 104-136). The conference action also inserts three new headings and paragraphs requested by the Mayor and Council in H. Doc. 103-136 which authorize the Mayor to reduce appropriations and expenditures throughout the District government in energy (-\$482,000), communications (-\$158,000), and contractual services for all agencies under the Mayor's direct control except for the Department of Human Services (-\$1,500,000). The conference action also inserts a new heading "Cash Reserve Fund" and paragraph appropriating \$3,957,000 to replenish the consolidated cash balances of the District government as requested by the Mayor and Council in H. Doc. 103-136.

In addition, the conference action appropriates \$3,323,000 for optical and dental benefits as requested by the Mayor and Council

in H. Doc. 103-136 instead of \$3,423,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate.

PERSONAL AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES  
ADJUSTMENTS

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Delete the sum stricken by said amendment and delete the sum inserted by said amendment and strike out line 10 through and including line 14 on page 13 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492, and on page 29, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "1993" and insert in lieu thereof "1994".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action deletes reductions of \$27,062,000 proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and \$7,000,000 proposed by the Senate and deletes the heading and paragraph relative to Personal and Nonpersonal Services Adjustments which would have authorized the Mayor to reduce appropriations and expenditures throughout the District government to keep the budget in balance. The conference agreement reflects final action by the Mayor and Council on the fiscal year 1994 budget amendment transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The budget amendment distributes the reductions proposed by the House and Senate to agency budgets.

The conference action also extends for 12 months (from December 31, 1993, to December 31, 1994) the District's authority to retire up to 50 fire fighters or members of the Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department who were hired before February 14, 1980, and exclude those disability retirements from the computation of the rate of disability retirements under subsection 145(a) of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act (Public Law 96-122). The conferees have been advised by District officials that the additional 12 months are required to properly process these cases. The intent of section 132 in H.R. 2492 is to exempt up to 50 disability retirements from the trigger mechanism calculation for any period from October 1, 1993 through December 31, 1994. The trigger mechanism calculation is included in Public Law 96-122 and allows the annual Federal payment of \$52,070,000 to the police officers and fire fighters retirement fund to be reduced when the disability retirement rate exceeds an established limit.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$108,743,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$158,743,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Senate allowance include \$50,000,000 that the District government would have borrowed and transferred to George Washington University for use as matching funds for modernization of the George Washington University Hospital. Section 6 of the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-590) authorizes a total of \$50,000,000 to George Washington University Hospital for the purpose of constructing or modernizing its medical facility.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That the District of Columbia government shall transmit to the House and Senate Committees on Ap-*

*propriations, the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, no later than April 15, 1994, a proposed plan providing for the financing of the capital rehabilitation and revitalization of the medical infrastructure within the District of Columbia: Provided further, That this plan shall include how the capital needs of all hospitals will be addressed: Provided further, That this plan shall specifically address the currently authorized George Washington University project as part of the overall plan.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action deletes language proposed by the Senate that would have allocated \$50,000,000 of the funds borrowed under Capital Outlays solely for the purpose of carrying out section 6 of Public Law 101-590 (104 Stat. 2929) and would have required the funds to be transferred within 45 days of receipt of the bond proceeds and inserts in lieu thereof a proviso that requires the District government to transmit a plan by April 15, 1994, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs. The plan is to provide proposals for the financing of the capital rehabilitation and revitalization of the medical infrastructure within the District of Columbia. The conferees request that the plan include how the capital needs of all hospitals will be addressed and how the plan will specifically address the currently authorized George Washington University project as part of the overall plan.

*The George Washington University Hospital.*—The history of federal support to hospitals in Washington, D.C. dates to June 1941 when the Congress enacted the National Defense Public Works Act that has become known as the Lanham Act (Public Law 137, 77th Congress; 55 Stat. 361). The Lanham Act provided for the construction of waterworks, sewage disposal systems, streets, and hospitals. It was through this authority that the current George Washington University Hospital was built. In 1946, the Congress enacted the Washington Hospital Center Act (Public Law 648, 79th Congress) which provided for the consolidation of three District hospitals into the Washington Hospital Corporation. This Act was amended several times to include the other hospitals in the city. In the 1968 District of Columbia Hospital and Medical Facilities Construction amendments, funds were authorized for seven hospitals because the District was unable to raise the necessary matching funds to make use of Hill-Burton funds. In 1990, the Congress enacted the Trauma Care Systems Planning and Development Act which authorized a 50-percent matching federal grant for George Washington University Hospital to complete its estimated \$100 million modernization project.

The conferees believe that the above history makes it clear that the Federal government has historically played a significant role in financing the construction, renovation, and expansion of medical care facilities in the District of Columbia. Since the last use of the original 1946 Act, the enactment of the District's Home Rule Act has changed the relationship between the District and Federal governments. This change necessitates a review of the funding mechanism for District hospital capital projects. The conference agreement includes language requiring such a review and submission of a plan contemporaneous with the submission of the District's fiscal year 1995 budget on April 15, 1994.

The conferees note that, according to information available to them, most states and some local governments provide financial assistance to health care facilities within their jurisdictions. It has not been necessary for the District government to address this matter since Home Rule; however, it has now become necessary. As noted above the current physical plants of most of the hospitals in the District are approximately the same age and will soon, if they do not now, require substantial rehabilitation, renovation or reconstruction. As a general rule the financing of the capital needs of public hospitals requires some public assistance from government at some level. To ensure that help is applied evenly and that everyone knows what the procedure is there must be a plan. The conferees have asked the District government to develop and submit such a plan. In developing this plan, the conferees anticipate that the District will make use of available resources, including the Mayor's Task Force on Long Term Strategies to Improve the District of Columbia Public Health Care Delivery systems, the D.C. Hospital Association, the General Accounting Office and other interested public and private organizations.

This plan will specifically address the George Washington University Medical Center because it has an existing authorization to undertake a project of renovation and construction. George Washington University Hospital is a private institution with a public mission. It is the closest emergency medical facility to the White House, State Department and most foreign embassies. Everyone is familiar with the heroic efforts of its staff in March 1981 after an assassination attempt on the President of the United States. The hospital has specific emergency arrangements with the White House for such occasions and undertakes additional preparedness during events such as summit conferences and major world meetings that take place in Washington, D.C. What goes unreported, but is more compelling, are the everyday crises that befall visitors or government workers downtown that find their way to the George Washington University Hospital. The emergency room currently sees 50,000 patients in a space designed for 30,000 annually. The University's own consultant has stated that the facility is 38 percent too small. Planning for expansion and renovation has identified minimum needs of \$100 million. Included are expansion of the emergency room, additional operating rooms, and expanded critical care areas as well as physical, mechanical and space requirements for modern medical technology.

*Children's National Medical Center.*—Similarly, Children's National Medical Center has undertaken construction to house the National Child Protection, Trauma and Research Center. There is now nowhere in the District for such facilities to seek financial assistance. This omission should be addressed and a policy decision reached as to how such projects will be handled, currently and in the future.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which allows the Washington Aqueduct to use \$500,000 of the funds borrowed under this heading to initiate construction of modifications to the Little Falls Dam facility to allow passage for anadromous fish on the Potomac River.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 27: Deletes section 135 proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate and deletes a new section 135 proposed by

the Senate. The House language stricken by the Senate and the Senate language deleted by the conferees are identical and would have prohibited the Mayor from contracting out for goods and services now provided by District employees until the Mayor submitted to the Council and the Council approved revised contracting policies and procedures that (1) provided a cost analysis for each contract and (2) showed that contracting out would provide savings of at least 10 percent over the duration of the contract.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate that would have prohibited the Mayor from awarding certain contracts over \$1,000,000 until after the Council had approved the proposed contract award.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the section number named in said amendment, insert: 137

, and

on page 33, line 11 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "Sec. 137" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 135"

, and

on page 33, line 23 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "Sec. 138" and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 136".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action changes section number 139 proposed by the Senate which requires the Mayor to report to the Congress within 90 days on the status of construction of a new Federal prison in the District of Columbia that was previously authorized.

The conference action also makes technical changes by renumbering sections 137 and 138 to 135 and 136, respectively, to reflect action by the conferees on amendment numbers 27 and 28.

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert:

**SEC. 138. AMENDMENTS TO CHARTER FOR GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES.**

(a) **LEGAL DOMICILE.**—The first section of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.", approved August 11, 1939 (hereafter referred to as "the Act"), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The District of Columbia shall be the legal domicile of the corporation."

(b) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—  
(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 5 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. The corporation shall be licensed and regulated by the District of Columbia in accordance with the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia."

(2) **REPEAL.**—The Act is amended by striking section 7.

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT OF REGULATORY COSTS BY THE CORPORATION.**—The Act (as amended by subsection (b) of this section) is amended by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

"Sec. 7. The corporation shall reimburse the District of Columbia for the costs of insurance regulation (including financial and market conduct examinations) of the corporation and its affiliates and subsidiaries by the District of Columbia."

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect October 1, 1993.

SEC. 139. (a) Title IV of the District of Columbia Omnibus Budget Support Act of 1992 (D.C. Law 9-145) is hereby repealed, and any provision of the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act amended by such title is restored as if such title had not been enacted into law.

(b) Subsection (a) shall apply beginning September 10, 1992.

SEC. 140. Section 422(3) of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act of 1973, approved December 24, 1973 (87 Stat. 790; D.C. Code, sec. 1-242(3)), is amended by striking the period at the end of the fourth sentence and inserting the following:

"... and except that nothing in this section shall prohibit the District from paying an employee overtime pay in accordance with section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 207)."

SEC. 141. Effective October 1, 1993, there is hereby established pursuant to the District of Columbia Fund Accounting Act of 1980, effective June 14, 1980 (D.C. Law 3-70; D.C. Code, sec. 47-371 et seq.), a Cash Reserve Fund to replenish the consolidated cash balances of the District of Columbia.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference action changes the section number from 140 as proposed by the Senate to 138 and adds a new section as proposed by the Senate amending the congressional charter for Group Hospitalization, Inc. to establish the District of Columbia as the legal domicile for the corporation. The language requires the corporation to be licensed in and regulated by the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia government. The amendments are permanent legislation and takes effect October 1, 1993, instead of on the date of enactment of this Act. Identical substantive language was included in section 137 of the FY 1993 D.C. Appropriations Act (Public Law 102-382; 106 Stat. 1435) for a one-year period with the understanding that specific authorizing legislation would be enacted. The language in Public Law 102-382 will expire September 30, 1993.

Section 139 repeals three amendments to the District of Columbia Retirement Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 96-122) that were included as part of the District's Omnibus Budget Support Act of 1992. Testimony was received from the Board's chairman requesting the repeal of these amendments. In a follow-up letter dated September 21, 1993, the Board chairman stated "As fiduciaries charged with the responsibility of managing the retirement funds for the District's police officers, fire fighters, teachers, and judges... the Board believed that the District's actions dangerously eroded the independence of the Board, and had therefore looked to Congress for relief." The three amendments that are being repealed: (1) provided the District with the authority to determine the source of funding for the Board's administrative expenses and eliminated the prohibitions on the District against specifying how the Board could spend its appropriated budget; (2) permitted the District to include grant funds in its annual contribution to the retirement funds; and (3) eliminated congressionally mandated prohibitions against "party-in-interest" transactions which were specifically designed by the Congress to guard against conflicts of interest and to ensure arms-length transactions between the Board and the District government. According to the September 21, 1993, letter referred to earlier, the Board chairman states that

the repeal of the three amendments are necessary "... to ensure the continued independence of the Board and financial security of the Funds ..."

The conference action also adds two new sections requested by the Mayor and Council in H. Doc. 103-136. Section 140 amends the Home Rule Act to clarify the District's authority to pay overtime to District government employees in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The report accompanying the District's request states that this change will reduce recordkeeping costs and the higher costs of more generous overtime provisions for employees hired prior to enactment of the District's Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978. The report further states that this amendment will not affect overtime provisions in existing compensation settlements.

Section 141 establishes a cash reserve fund to replenish the consolidated cash balances of the District government.

TITLE II

FISCAL YEAR 1993 SUPPLEMENTAL DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS GOVERNMENTAL DIRECTION AND SUPPORT (INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$14,231,000

, and

on page 35, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "\$10,587,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,242,000"

, and

on page 37, line 4 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 after "Provided," insert:

"That \$7,000,000 of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, shall be available solely for District of Columbia employees' disability compensation: Provided further,"

, and

on page 37, line 11 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "(Rescission)" and insert in lieu thereof "Including Rescission"

, and

on page 37, line 12 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 strike out "Of" and insert in lieu thereof "For an additional amount for "Public works", \$23,447,000: Provided, That of"

, and

on page 37, line 16 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 after "rescinded" insert "for a net increase of \$20,176,000"

, and

on page 44, line 14 of the House engrossed bill H.R. 2492 insert "SEC. 203. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title shall be deemed to be available for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993."

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$14,231,000 instead of \$15,133,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,501,000 as proposed by the Senate. The decrease below the House and Senate allowances reflects the District's revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

The conference agreement also rescinds \$10,242,000 under the Economic Development and Regulation appropriation title instead of

\$10,587,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate. The reduction of \$345,000 below the House and Senate allowance relates to the Office of International Business as reflected in the District's final action on the revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993, too late for consideration by the House or the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to a new proviso requested by the District under "Human Support Services" that allows \$7,000,000 to remain available until expended for employees' disability compensation.

Under the Public Works appropriation title the conference action inserts "Including Rescission" as a centerhead and appropriates an additional \$23,447,000 requested by the District in H. Doc. 193-136 for payment to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to cover the July-September 1992 quarterly operating subsidy. This action provides a net increase of \$20,176,000 under the Public Works appropriation title instead of a rescission of \$3,271,000 as proposed by the House and the Senate. The District's fiscal year 1992 supplemental request included a \$26,000,000 reduction to reflect a change in the method used by the District to make its quarterly payments to WMATA. The District proposed to change from a forward-payment basis to a pay-behind basis. Although the proposal was not approved, the necessary budget authority was not provided. The conference action provides the budget authority required in order for the District to legally pay WMATA the amount owed for fiscal year 1992. The conferees have been informed that with this action the District has sufficient authority to pay the remaining fiscal year 1992 quarterly payment and all four fiscal year 1993 quarterly payments in accordance with current policies followed by WMATA and the Compact jurisdictions.

The conference action also inserts a new section 203 that deems the appropriations and language provisions in Title II to be available for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993. This language in effect ratifies all obligations and expenditures made in anticipation of the enactment of the District's fiscal year 1993 supplemental request as approved in title II of this Act.

Amendment No. 32: Rescinds \$6,342,000 instead of \$4,760,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,162,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects the District's revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136).

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$7,889,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a net increase of \$7,889,000 instead of \$10,373,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,339,000 as proposed by the Senate. The action by the conferees reflects the District's revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The reduction of \$450,000 in the net increase below the Senate allowance reflects a reduction in contractual services in the Office of City Administrator/Deputy Mayor for Operations.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$5,202,000 for a net decrease of \$5,040,000 instead of \$1,047,000 for a net decrease of \$9,540,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,047,000 for a net decrease of \$4,540,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference action reflects the District's revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The increase of \$500,000 in the net decrease proposed by the Senate reflects a reduction in the District's Employer-Assisted Housing Program.

PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment Nos. 36 and 37: Rescind \$20,578,000 for a net decrease of \$14,348,000 instead of \$18,921,000 for a net decrease of \$12,691,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,078,000 for a net decrease of \$14,848,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects the District's revised fiscal year 1993 supplemental request that was transmitted to Congress September 13, 1993 (H. Doc. 103-136). The reduction of \$500,000 below the net decrease proposed by the Senate reflects an increase for the purchase of police vehicles and radio equipment.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that unspent funds remaining in the personal and nonpersonal services budget of the Metropolitan Police Department at the end of fiscal year 1993 shall remain available for the exclusive use of the Metropolitan Police Department for the purchase of equipment in fiscal year 1994. The House language provided for the carryover of unspent nonpersonal services funds.

Amendment No. 39: Corrects a misspelling in the printing of the bill as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment Nos. 40 and 41: Appropriate \$4,000,000 for the public schools of the District for a net decrease of \$3,257,000 in the Public Education System appropriation as proposed by the Senate instead of a net decrease of \$7,257,000 in the Public Education System appropriation as proposed by the House. The Senate action reflects the District's revised supplemental request for fiscal year 1993 which was not available at the time the bill was under consideration by the House.

HUMAN SUPPORT SERVICES  
(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

Amendment Nos. 42 and 43: Appropriate \$81,772,000 for a net increase of \$79,551,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$70,772,000 for a net increase of \$68,551,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement reflects the District's revised supplemental request for fiscal year 1993 which was not available at the time the bill was under consideration by the House.

REPAYMENT OF LOANS AND INTEREST

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$11,059,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$19,051,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement reflects the District's revised supplemental request for fiscal year 1993 which was not available at the

time the bill was under consideration by the House.

PERSONAL AND NONPERSONAL SERVICES  
ADJUSTMENTS

Amendment No. 45: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which would have authorized the Mayor to reduce \$29,730,000 in fiscal year 1993 appropriations and expenditures throughout the District government to keep the budget in balance because of declining local revenues. The Senate action agreed to by the conferees reflects the District government's revised supplemental request for fiscal year 1993 which was not available at the time the bill was under consideration by the House. The revised supplemental request allocates the reduction proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate to agency budgets reflected throughout Title II of the bill.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment Nos. 46, 47, and 48: Delete language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate concerning requirements of the Buy American Act as codified under 41 U.S.C. 10a et seq. These provisions already apply to all procurements made by the District of Columbia government since 41 U.S.C. 5a defines the word "department" as follows: "The word 'department' as used in this Act shall be construed to include independent establishments, other agencies, wholly owned Government corporations \* \* \* and the government of the District of Columbia \* \* \*".

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follow:

<i>Federal Funds</i>	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	\$688,000,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	705,101,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	700,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	698,000,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994 .....	700,000,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	+12,000,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	-5,101,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+2,000,000
<i>District of Columbia Funds</i>	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	\$3,988,421,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	3,740,382,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	3,753,705,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	3,777,932,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994 .....	3,740,382,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	(248,039,000)
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	0

House bill, fiscal year 1994 (13,323,000)  
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 (37,550,000)

JULIAN C. DIXON,  
LOUIS STOKES,  
RICHARD J. DURBIN,  
MARCY KAPTUR,  
DAVID E. SKAGGS,  
NANCY PELOSI,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

HERB KOHL,  
PATTY MURRAY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
CONRAD BURNS,  
CONNIE MACK,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2445

Mr. BEVILL submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-292)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 24, 27, 35, and 47.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 18, 19, 21, 25, 26, 33, 34, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, and 46, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,688,990,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$13,819,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following: *which 18 are for replacement only*, \$3,223,910,000 to remain available until expended; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$3,595,198,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$5,181,855,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$16,560,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 4, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 29, 30, 31, 32, 36, and 39.

TOM BEVILL,  
VIC FAZIO,  
JIM CHAPMAN,  
DOUGLAS "PETE"

PETERSON,  
ED PASTOR,  
CARRIE MEEK,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DEAN A. GALLO,  
HAROLD ROGERS,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

*Manager on the Part of the House.*

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
HARRY REID,  
J. ROBERT KERREY,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
DON NICKLES,  
SLADE GORTON,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2445) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The language and allocations set forth in House Report 103-135 and Senate Report 103-147 should be complied with unless specifically addressed to the contrary in the conference report and statement of the managers. Report language included by the House which is not changed by the report of the Senate or the conference, and Senate report language which is not changed by the conference is approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers, while repeating some report language for emphasis, does not intend to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein. In cases in which the House or Senate have directed the submission of a report, such report is to be submitted to both House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Corps of Engineers. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$207,540,000 for General Investigations as proposed by the House instead of \$208,544,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that the San Joaquin River Basin, South Sacramento County Streams, California, study will include an examination of the water resources problems that were to be addressed by the Northern California Streams, Morrison Stream Group, California, study proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes \$150,000 for the Newport Bay Harbor, California, project as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to utilize those funds to initiate feasibility phase studies for the project as authorized by section 841 of Public Law 99-662. Environmental preservation benefits associated with the authorization to modify the existing Federal project at Newport Bay Harbor by extending channels into the upper Newport Bay shall be consolidated with other benefits to be derived from the project and be fully evaluated.

The conferees note that the limitation on the San Joaquin River, Pine Flat Dam, Fish and Wildlife Restoration, California, study described in House Report 102-555 relative to involuntary acquisition of water rights, storage rights and land is not intended to apply to investigations of the enlargement of Pine Flat Reservoir or the construction of off-stream reservoirs, which are to be included in the study.

The conferees have provided \$500,000 for a reconnaissance study to investigate the feasibility of flood control and other water resource improvements for the City of Winters, California, near Dry Creek, Chickahominy Slough and Moody Slough.

The conferees have provided \$600,000 for the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, to prepare a reconnaissance study and transmit to Congress a report addressing solutions for facilitating fish migration on the Sacramento River, California. The investigation shall emphasize the potential for modifying the existing Sacramento River Deep Water Ship Channel and ship lock for use as a supplemental route for anadromous fish migration. The Delta channel could potentially provide a migration route for anadromous fish which would bypass Delta channels and agricultural diversions east of Rio Vista.

The conference agreement includes \$800,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct flood control studies for St. Louis City and County, Jefferson and Ste. Genevieve Counties, Missouri. The conferees expect the Corps, in conducting this regional flood control study, to work closely with local communities. At the request of the communities, the Corps should consider both structural solutions and nonstructural alternatives (such as the relocation of individuals and businesses).

The conference agreement includes \$2,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct studies of the reaches of the upper Mississippi and lower Missouri Rivers and their tributaries that were flooded in 1993. From within those funds, the conferees direct the Secretary of the Army to initiate preliminary activities on a study to assess the adequacy of current flood control measures on the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries. The study should focus on identifying public facilities, industrial, petrochemical, hazardous waste and other facilities which

require additional flood protection, assess the adequacy of current flood control measures, examine the differences in Federal cost-sharing for construction and maintenance of flood control projects on the upper and lower Mississippi River system, evaluate the cost-effectiveness of alternative flood control projects, and recommend improvements to the current flood control system.

The conferees recognize the need to undergo a feasibility study of erosion control in order to protect the historic Montauk Point Lighthouse located on Long Island, New York. Therefore, the conferees encourage the Army Corps of Engineers to implement a feasibility study in fiscal year 1994 should the Corps identify the necessary funds from its accounts that are both available and unexpended during fiscal year 1994.

Within the amount provided for Research and Development, the conference agreement includes \$2,000,000, \$800,000 above the budget request, for activities related to zebra mussel control.

The conferees have provided \$600,000 for the Corps of Engineers to conduct a watershed management study of the Cypress Valley Watershed, Texas, in close coordination with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. This study is to be conducted under the authority of the resolution of the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation for the Cypress Bayou Basin.

The conference agreement includes \$1,000,000 for Corps of Engineers flood data collection activities instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$300,000 for the initiation of a construction technology transfer project between the Corps of Engineers construction-related research activities and Indiana State University as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

Central Basin Groundwater Project, California, \$750,000;

Los Angeles County Water Conservation, California, \$100,000;

Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, California, \$300,000;

Norco Bluffs, California, \$150,000;

Rancho Palos Verdes, California, \$80,000;

Biscayne Bay, Florida, \$700,000;

Lake George, Hobart, Indiana, \$200,000;

Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana, \$310,000;

Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana, \$400,000;

Hazard, Kentucky, \$250,000;

Brockton, Massachusetts, \$350,000;

Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey, \$17,000,000;

Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania, \$400,000;

Juniata River Basin, Pennsylvania, \$450,000;

Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$300,000;

Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia, \$400,000;

Monongahela River Comprehensive, West Virginia, \$600,000; and

West Virginia Comprehensive, West Virginia, \$500,000;

Provided, That notwithstanding ongoing studies using previously appropriated funds, and using \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to conduct hydraulic modeling, foundations analysis and related de-

sign, and mapping efforts in continuing preconstruction engineering and design for the additional lock at the Kentucky Dam, Kentucky, project, in accordance with the Kentucky Lock Addition Feasibility Report approved by Report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 1, 1992; Provided further, That using \$250,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to include the study of the Alafia River as part of the Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida, feasibility study; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$250,000 of available funds to complete a detailed project report, and plans and specifications for a permanent shore erosion protection project at Geneva State Park, Ashtabula County, Ohio; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$400,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue preconstruction engineering and design, including preparation of the special design report, initiation of National Environmental Policy Act document preparation, and initiation of hydraulic model studies for the Kaunapau Harbor navigation study, Lanai, Hawaii; Provided further, That using \$4,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to proceed with detailed designs and plans and specifications, including detailed cost estimates, for the master plan of the Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana, project; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to limit the Columbia River Navigation Channel, Oregon and Washington, feasibility study to the investigation of the feasibility of constructing a navigation channel not to exceed 43 feet in depth from the Columbia River entrance to the Port of Portland/Port of Vancouver and to modify the Initial Project Management Plan accordingly; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$400,000 of the funds appropriated herein to initiate a reconnaissance study, including economic and environmental studies, for the Pocatigo River and Swamp, South Carolina, project; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$90,000 of the funds appropriated herein to complete the reconnaissance study of the Black Fox and Oakland Spring wetland area in Murfreesboro, Tennessee; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$200,000 of available funds to initiate the planning and design of remedial measures to restore the environmental integrity and recreational boating facilities at Old Hickory Lake, Tennessee, in the vicinity of Drakes Creek Park, in accordance with the reconnaissance study findings dated September 1993; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$4,460,000 of available funds to complete preconstruction engineering and design for the Ste. Genevieve, Missouri, flood control project authorized by section 401(a) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 (100 stat. 4118) so that the project will be ready for construction by October 1, 1994; Provided further, That all plans, specifications and design documents shall be currently reviewed in order to expedite the project; Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to undertake preconstruction engineering and design of the Virginia Beach Erosion Control and Hurricane Protection, Virginia, project, includ-

ing storm water collection and discharge, as authorized by section 102(cc) of Public Law 102-580

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions contained in both the House- and Senate-passed bills for the following projects: Central Basin Groundwater, California; Little Calumet River Basin (Cady Marsh Ditch), Indiana; Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana; Hazard, Kentucky; Brockton, Massachusetts; Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia; Monongahela River Comprehensive, West Virginia; and West Virginia Comprehensive, West Virginia.

The conference agreement restores provisions included by the House and stricken by the Senate for the following projects: Los Angeles County Water Conservation, California; Los Angeles River Watercourse Improvement, California; Norco Bluffs, California; Rancho Palos Verdes, California; Biscayne Bay, Florida; Lake George, Hobart, Indiana; Broad Top Region, Pennsylvania; Juniata River Basin, Pennsylvania; and Lackawanna River Basin Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania.

The conference agreement restores funding levels proposed by the House and amended by the Senate for the following projects: Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida; Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana; and Passaic River Mainstem, New Jersey. The conference agreement also includes additional directive language for the Tampa Harbor, Alafia River and Big Bend, Florida, and the Indianapolis, White River, Central Waterfront, Indiana, projects.

The conference agreement deletes a provision proposed by the Senate for the McCook and Thorton Reservoirs, Illinois, project.

The conference agreement includes provisions proposed by the Senate for the following projects: Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky; Geneva State Park, Ohio; Kaunapau Harbor, Hawaii; Columbia River Navigation Channel, Oregon; Pocatigo River and Swamp, South Carolina; Black Fox and Oakland Spring Wetland, Tennessee; Old Hickory Lake, Tennessee; Ste. Genevieve, Missouri; and Virginia Beach, Virginia. The conference agreement provides \$2,000,000 for the Kentucky Lock and Dam, Kentucky, project instead of \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$1,255,875,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$1,255,875,000 for Construction, General, excluding the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project, instead of \$1,296,167,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House had proposed a total of \$1,389,138,000 for Construction, General, including the Red River Waterway project. Including the Red River Waterway project, the conference agreement appropriates a total of \$1,400,875,000 for Construction, General.

While not including construction funding for the Montgomery Point Lock and Dam, Arkansas, project, the conferees express support for the project and urge the Corps of Engineers to continue to expedite the engineering and design so that construction can

begin as soon as a favorable recommendation is reached by the executive branch, preferably for the fiscal year 1995 budget cycle. At that time, the Committees stand ready to consider a budget proposal.

Within available funds, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to implement the hillside erosion component included in the Swan Lake Habitat Restoration and Enhancement, Illinois, project, which is an important feature of the Upper Mississippi River System Environmental Management Program.

The conference agreement includes an additional \$100,000 for the Winfield Locks and Dam, West Virginia, project for technical assistance to communities around the project site to help those communities understand and analyze the remedial options for the toxic and hazardous materials on the site as authorized by section 347 of Public Law 102-580 as proposed by the House and the Senate. The conferees require that any consultant contracted with to provide analysis of the remedial options be totally independent of the Army Corps of Engineers.

Within the Corps of Engineers Continuing Authorities Programs, the conferees direct the Corps to undertake the projects described in the House and Senate reports. For the Northport, Alabama, project, the conference agreement includes \$1,050,000 for design and construction of the project as proposed by the House. In addition, under the Section 205 program, the conference agreement includes \$100,000 for the Corps of Engineers to initiate and complete plans and specifications for the Feather Creek flood control project in Clinton, Indiana.

The conference agreement includes \$11,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers Aquatic Plant Control Program as proposed by the House. The conferees direct that the additional funds provided above the budget request be utilized as described in the House report.

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

Rillito River, Arizona, \$4,200,000;  
 Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California, \$4,000,000;  
 Sacramento River Flood Control Project (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California, \$400,000;  
 San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California, \$12,000,000;  
 Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration Project, California, \$4,000,000;  
 Central and Southern Florida, Florida, \$17,850,000;  
 Kissimmee River, Florida, \$5,000,000;  
 Melaleuca Quarantine Facility, Florida, \$1,000,000;  
 Casino Beach, Illinois, \$820,000;  
 McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois, \$13,000,000;  
 O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois, \$5,000,000;  
 Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, \$2,700,000;  
 Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Jefferson Parish), Louisiana, \$200,000;  
 Anacostia River, Maryland and District of Columbia, \$700,000;  
 Clinton River Spillway, Michigan, \$2,000,000;  
 Silver Bay Harbor, Minnesota, \$2,600,000;  
 Stillwater, Minnesota, \$2,400,000;  
 Sowashee Creek, Mississippi, \$3,240,000;  
 Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey, \$1,000,000;  
 New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, \$3,900,000;

Rochester Harbor, New York, \$4,000,000;  
 Wilmington Harbor Ocean Bar, North Carolina, \$5,266,000;

West Columbus, Ohio, \$9,000,000;  
 Lackawanna River Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania, \$2,000,000;

South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania, \$10,000,000;

Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island (for 2 elevated water storage towers and the relocation of sewer lines), \$1,875,000;

Lake O' The Pines-Big Cypress Bayou, Texas, \$300,000;

Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, \$4,000,000;

Wallisville Lake, Texas, \$1,000,000;  
 Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia, \$1,000,000;

Southern West Virginia Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, West Virginia, \$3,500,000; and

State Road and Ebner Coulees, LaCrosse and Shelby, Wisconsin, \$1,467,000: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$3,500,000 of available funds to initiate and complete construction of the Finn Revetment portion of the Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas and Louisiana, project: Provided further, That the Chief of Engineers is directed to use a fully funded contract for the construction of the Finn Revetment: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue the Red River Levees and Bank Stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, project, including the completion of studies to improve the stability of the levee system from Index, Arkansas, to the Louisiana state line and the continuation of rehabilitation work underway: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to expend \$500,000 in fiscal year 1994 to initiate reconstruction of the Sacramento River floodwall between miles 58 and 60 of the Sacramento River, California, as an essential portion of the Sacramento Urban Levee Reconstruction project pursuant to the Sacramento River Flood Control Act to 1917, as amended, and the Local Cooperation Agreement signed on June 4, 1990: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, shall (1) use \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to carry out engineering and design for the relocation of the comfort and lifeguard stations on the Atlantic Coast of New York City, from Rockaway Inlet to Norton Point, New York, project as authorization by section 1076 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-240; 105 Stat. 2015), and (2) not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, report to Congress on the results of the expenditure of funds required under paragraph (1): Provided further, That with \$2,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Bethel, Alaska, project authorized by Public Law 99-662, including but not limited to initiating lands and damages, erosion control construction, and continued related engineering and construction management: Provided further, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to the construction of the Bethel, Alaska, project: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$24,119,000 of the funds appropriated herein to continue the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity, Louisiana, Hurricane Protection project, including continued

construction of parallel protection along the Orleans and London Avenue Outfall Canals and the award of continuing contracts for construction of this parallel protection under the same terms and conditions specified for such work under this heading in Public Law 102-377: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to use \$450,000 of the funds appropriated herein to complete the repair and restoration of a safe condition of the existing Tulsa and West Tulsa local protection project, Oklahoma, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1941, Public Law 73-228: Provided further, That with \$5,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate construction of the Pike County, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, with initial efforts concentrated in the communities of Buskirk and McCarr, in accordance with the Huntington District Commander's preliminary draft detailed project report for Pike County, Kentucky, dated March 1993, using continuing contracts: Provided further, That with \$700,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate construction, using continuing contracts, of the Williamsburg, Kentucky, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, in accordance with Plan B of the approved draft specific project report for Williamsburg, Kentucky, dated April 1993: Provided further, That with \$19,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue to undertake structural and non-structural work associated with the Harlan, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367, and if further directed to design and construct a system to collect and transport sewage from the unincorporated community of Rio Vista to the Harlan, Kentucky, treatment plant, as part of the Harlan, Kentucky, element: Provided further, That with \$5,365,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue to undertake structural and non-structural work associated with the Matewan, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367: Provided further, That with \$3,500,000 of the funds appropriated herein, to remain available until expended, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, element of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project authorized by section 202 of Public Law 96-367 using continuing contracts: Provided further, That no fully allocated funding policy shall apply to construction of the Matewan, West Virginia, Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia, Barbourville, Kentucky, and Harlan, Kentucky, elements of the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River and Upper Cumberland River project: Provided further, That with \$1,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction, using continuing contracts, of the Salyersville, Kentucky, cut through channels project: Provided

further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to initiate and complete construction of offshore breakwaters at Grand Isle, Louisiana, as an integral part of the repair of features of the Grand Isle and Vicinity, Louisiana, project damaged by Hurricane Andrew using funds previously appropriated for that purpose in the fiscal year 1992 Dire Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, Public Law 102-368, which are available for this work: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue construction of the section 14 bank stabilization program at McGregor Park in Clarksville, Tennessee, utilizing heretofore appropriated funds until the Federal funds limit of \$500,000 is reached or bank protection for the entire park is completed: Provided further, That using \$6,300,000 of the funds appropriated herein, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to continue with the authorized Ouchita River Levees, Louisiana, project in orderly but expeditious manner and within the amount, \$3,800,000 shall be used to continue rehabilitation or replacement of all deteriorated drainage structures which threaten the security of this critical protection, and \$2,500,000 shall be used to repair the river bank at Columbia, Louisiana, which is eroding and placing the project levee protecting the city in imminent danger of failure: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is directed to utilize \$3,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein to provide design and construction assistance for a water transmission line from the northern part of Beaver Lake, Arkansas, into Benton and Washington Counties, Arkansas, as authorized by section 220 of Public Law 102-580; and in addition, \$145,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated for construction of the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project as authorized by law, and the Secretary of the Army is directed to continue the second phase of construction of Locks and Dams 4 and 5; complete construction of Howard Capout, McDade, Elm Grove, Cecile, Curtis, Sunny Point, and Eagle Bend Phase 1 and Phase II revetments in Pools 4 and 5, and levee modifications in Pool 5, all of which are previously directed to be initiated; and award continuing contracts in fiscal year 1994 for construction of the following features of the Red River Waterway which are not to be considered fully funded: recreation facilities in Pools 4 and 5, Piermont/Nicholas and Sunny Point Capouts, Lock and Dam 4 Upstream Dikes, Lock and Dam 5 Downstream Additional Control Structure, Wells Island Road Revetment, and construction dredging in Pool 4; and as authorized by laws, and the Secretary is further directed to provide annual reimbursement to the project's local sponsor for the Federal share of management costs for the Bayou Bodcau Mitigation Area as authorized by Public Law 101-640, the Water Resources Development Act of 1990.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions contained in both the House- and Senate-passed bills for the following projects: Rillito River, Arizona; Coyote and Berryessa Creeks, California; Sacramento River Flood Control (Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District), California; San Timoteo Creek (Santa Ana River Mainstem), California; Sonoma Baylands Wetland Demonstration, California; Kissimmee River, Florida; O'Hare Reservoir, Illinois; Pike County, Kentucky; Salyersville, Kentucky; Williamsburg, Kentucky; Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Jefferson Parish), Louisiana; Anacostia

River, Maryland and District of Columbia; Stillwater, Minnesota; Sowshee Creek, Mississippi; Molly Ann's Brook, New Jersey; Lake O' The Pines-Big Cypress Bayou, Texas; Red River Basin Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma; Wallisville Lake, Texas; and Southern West Virginia Environmental Restoration and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, West Virginia. The provisions for the Pike County, Kentucky, Salyersville, Kentucky, and Williamsburg, Kentucky, projects have been amended to provide additional directive language to the Secretary of the Army.

The conference agreement restores provisions included by the House and stricken by the Senate for the following projects: Melaleuca Quarantine Facility, Florida; McCook and Thornton Reservoirs, Illinois; Clinton River Spillway, Michigan; Silver Bay Harbor, Minnesota; Rochester Harbor, New York; Wilmington Harbor Ocean Bar, North Carolina; Lackawanna River Greenway Corridor, Pennsylvania; South Central Pennsylvania Environmental Restoration Infrastructure and Resource Protection Development Pilot Program, Pennsylvania; Richmond Filtration Plant, Virginia; and State Road and Ebner Coulees, LaCrosse and Shelby, Wisconsin.

The conference agreement provides \$17,850,000 for the Central and Southern Florida, Florida, project as proposed by the House instead of \$9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides \$820,000 for the Casino Beach, Illinois, project as proposed by the House instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides \$2,700,000 for the Des Moines Recreational River and Greenbelt, Iowa, project as proposed by the House instead of \$1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provides \$3,900,000 for the New York Harbor Collection and Removal of Drift, New York and New Jersey, project as proposed by the House instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement amends House language for the Red River Emergency Bank Protection, Arkansas, project; the Barboursville, Kentucky, project; the Harlan, Kentucky, project; and the Lake Pontchartrain and Vicinity (Hurricane Protection), Louisiana, project as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also provides additional directive language for the Harlan, Kentucky, project.

The conference agreement restores House language stricken by the Senate for the West Columbus, Ohio, project amended to provide \$9,000,000 for the project instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement deletes a House provision regarding the Fort Point, Galveston, Texas, project as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes provisions proposed by the Senate for the following projects: Quonset Point-Davisville, Rhode Island; Red River Levees and Bank Stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas; Atlantic Coast of New York, New York; Bethel, Alaska; Tulsa and West Tulsa, Oklahoma; Matewan, West Virginia; Hatfield Bottom, West Virginia; Grand Isle, Louisiana; McGregor Park, Clarksville, Tennessee; Ouachita River Levees, Louisiana; and Beaver Lake, Arkansas. The provision regarding the McGregor Park project has been amended to make a technical correction.

The conference agreement appropriates \$145,000,000 for the Red River Waterway, Mississippi River to Shreveport, Louisiana, project as proposed by the Senate. The House had included \$65,000,000 for the project within

the amount appropriated in Amendment No. 3.

The conferees adopt the House report language on the Kissimmee River, Florida, project and add the following. The Corps of Engineers is directed to sign a single Project Cooperation Agreement with the South Florida Water Management District as authorized by section 46 of Public Law 100-676 and section 101(8) of Public Law 102-580 no later than February 1, 1994, in accordance with the Memorandum to the South Atlantic Division Commander dated February 17, 1993, and signed by the Jacksonville Deputy District Engineer for Project Management.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the Beaver Lake, Arkansas, water transmission line project authorized by section 220 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1992.

The conferees agree with the language in the Senate report regarding the West Des Moines, Des Moines, Iowa, project.

The conferees agree with the language in the House report regarding the Red River Chloride Control, Texas and Oklahoma, project and note that the features to be developed include Areas VI, VII, IX, XIII, XIV, and Crowell Brine Lake.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, ARKANSAS, ILLINOIS, KENTUCKY, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, MISSOURI, AND TENNESSEE

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$348,875,000 for Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries, as proposed by the Senate instead of \$352,475,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the House report regarding the Yazoo Basin, Mississippi, Demonstration Erosion Control Program and the Wickliffe Bluff, Kentucky, project.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$1,688,990,000 for Operation and Maintenance, General instead of \$1,691,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,673,704,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$1,869,000 for the Chena River Lakes, Alaska, project. The amount provided includes \$200,000 for the Corps of Engineers to investigate possible solutions to groundwater flooding that is occurring downstream of Moose Creek Dam and \$250,000 for the Corps of Engineers to develop a plan to mitigate fishery impacts. The Senate had proposed that the study of flooding problems be performed under the General Investigations account.

The conferees note that the rock rubble mound entrance jetties at Newport Bay Harbor, California, may require structural rehabilitation work and ask that the Corps of Engineers survey the need and report back to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for consideration in fiscal year 1995.

Within available funds, the conferees direct the Corps of Engineers to continue studying alternatives for whitewater releases at the John W. Flannagan Dam, Virginia.

The conferees agree with the language contained in the Senate report for the St. Georges Bridge, Delaware, project.

Amendment No. 7: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$400,000 for the Los Angeles River (Sepulveda Basin to Arroyo Seco), California, project.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes the word "and" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$2,500,000 for the Flint River Flood Control, Michigan, project.

Amendment No. 10: Restores “; and” proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Restores House language stricken by the Senate that provides \$250,000 for the New Madrid County Harbor, Missouri, project.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides \$5,000,000 for the Corps of Engineers to undertake critical maintenance work on the Kentucky River, Kentucky, Locks and Dams 5-14 and directs the Corps to transfer those facilities to the Commonwealth of Kentucky; directs the Secretary of the Army to maintain a minimum conservation pool level of 475.5 feet at Wister Lake, Oklahoma; and directs the Secretary of the Army to complete long-term dredged material disposal plans for the existing Columbia River navigation project, including associated fish and wildlife studies.

#### GENERAL EXPENSES

Amendment No. 13: Restores House language stricken by the Senate which provides that not to exceed \$54,855,000 of funds provided in the Act shall be available for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and deletes language proposed by the Senate which provided that not to exceed \$58,255,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief of Engineers unless the Secretary of the Army determines that additional funds are required and notified the Committee on Appropriations of the House and Senate of the reasons therefore.

The conferees agree with the language in the House report regarding billbacks and project management.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Amendment No. 14: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that in fiscal year 1994, the Secretary of the Army shall advertise for competitive bid at least 7,500,000 cubic yards of the hopper dredge volume accomplished with Government-owned dredges in fiscal year 1992 and which, notwithstanding the provisions of the section, authorizes the Secretary of the Army to use the Corps of Engineers dredge fleet to undertake projects under certain conditions. The conferees view the 7,500,000 cubic yards as a target, not a floor, and expect contract awards to reflect this.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which will permit the Corps of Engineers to reprogram funds to continue the construction of projects in order to prevent the termination of contracts or the delay of scheduled work.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes language proposed by the Senate regarding the removal or demolition of residential structures in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio.

The conferees have agreed not to include bill language proposed by the Senate regarding the removal or demolition of residential structures in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio. However, the conferees urge the Corps

of Engineers not to remove or demolish any residential structure that is subject to an easement or right-of-way in favor of the United States for the containment or impoundment of waters in the Muskingum River Basin, Ohio, until such time as the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works and Transportation of the House of Representatives have had the opportunity to review and address the policy in the next Water Resources Development authorization legislation.

Amendment No. 17: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

*SEC. 108. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the City of Galveston, Texas, fee simple absolute title to a parcel of land containing approximately 605 acres known as the San Jacinto Disposal Area located on the east end of Galveston Island, Texas, in the W.A.A. Wallace Survey, A-647 and A-648, City of Galveston, Galveston County, Texas, being part of the old Fort San Jacinto site, at the fair market value of such parcel to be determined in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d). Such conveyance shall only be made by the Secretary of the Army upon the agreement of the Secretary and the City as to all compensation due herein.*

*(b) COMPENSATION FOR CONVEYANCE.—Upon receipt of compensation from the City of Galveston, the Secretary shall convey the parcel as described in subsection (a). Such compensation shall include—*

*(1) conveyance to the Department of the Army of fee simple absolute title to a parcel of land containing approximately 564 acres on Pelican Island, Texas, in the Eneas Smith Survey, A-190, Pelican Island, City of Galveston, Galveston County, Texas, adjacent to property currently owned by the United States. The fair market value of such parcel will be determined in accordance with the provision of subsection (d); and*

*(2) payment to the United States of an amount equal to the difference of the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) and the fair market value of the parcel to be conveyed pursuant to paragraph (1) of this section.*

*(c) DISPOSITION OF SPOIL.—Costs of maintaining the Galveston Harbor and Channel will continue to be governed by the Local Cooperation Agreement (LCA) between the United States of America and the City of Galveston dated October 18, 1973, as amended. Upon conveyance of the parcel described in subsection (a), the Department of the Army shall be compensated directly for the present value of the total costs to the Department for disposal of dredge material and site preparation pursuant to the LCA, in excess of the present value of the total costs that would have been incurred if this conveyance had not been made.*

*(d) DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.—The fair market value of the land to be conveyed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) shall be determined by independent appraisers using the market value method.*

*(e) NAVIGATIONAL SERVITUDE.—*

*(1) DECLARATION OF NONNAVIGABILITY; PUBLIC INTEREST.—Unless the Secretary finds, after consultation with local and regional public officials (including local and regional public planning organizations), that the proposed projects to be undertaken within the parcel described in subsection (a) are not in the public interest then, subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), such*

*parcel is declared to be nonnavigable waters of the United States.*

*(2) LIMITS ON APPLICABILITY; REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.—The declaration under paragraph (1) shall apply only to those parts of the parcel described in subsection (a) which are or will be bulkheaded and filled or otherwise occupied by permanent structures, including marina facilities. All such work is subject to all applicable Federal statutes and regulations including, but not limited to, sections 9 and 10 of the Act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U.S.C. 401 and 403), commonly known as the Rivers and Harbors Appropriations Act of 1899, section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.*

*(3) EXPIRATION DATE.—If, 20 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, any area or part thereof described in subsection (a) is not bulkheaded or filled or occupied by permanent structures, including marina facilities, in accordance with the requirements set out in paragraph (2), or if work in connection with any activity permitted in paragraph (2) is not commenced within 5 years after issuance of such permits, then the declaration of nonnavigability for such area or part thereof shall expire.*

*(f) SURVEY AND STUDY.—The 605-acre parcel and the 564-acre parcel shall be surveyed and further legally described prior to conveyance. Not later than 60 days following enactment of this Act, if he deems it necessary, the Secretary of the Army shall complete a review of the applicability of section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to the said parcels.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees have included a provision proposed by the Senate authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the City of Galveston, Texas, a 605-acre parcel of land known as the San Jacinto Disposal Area in exchange for a 564-acre parcel of land on Pelican Island, Texas, known as the Pelican Island Alternative Disposal site together with payment to the United States of an amount equal to the difference in the agreed upon fair market values of the two parcels of land plus the present value of certain increased costs directly attributable to this transaction. The Senate provision has been amended to make technical corrections. The conveyances shall occur upon agreement by the Secretary and the City with respect to all compensation due under the provisions of this amendment.

The San Jacinto Disposal Area is currently used by the Army Corps of Engineers for the disposal of spoils dredged from the channel leading into Galveston Bay. The Pelican Island site, however, offers the Corps an alternate site for future spoils deposit that will serve as a viable spoils site substantially longer than would the San Jacinto site.

The fair market value of the parcels to be conveyed shall be determined by three independent appraisers, each a member in good standing of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, using the market value method. One appraiser each shall be selected by the Corps and the City of Galveston, and one appraiser shall be selected by mutual agreement of the two parties.

If the fair market values as determined by the three appraisers are not the same and the difference between the high and low values is ten percent or less, the three values shall be averaged to determine fair market value. If the high and low values differ by more than ten percent, the appraisers shall attempt to agree upon a fair market value. If the three fail to agree, the three appraisers shall jointly select a fourth appraiser who

shall independently appraise each tract. The highest and lowest of the four appraisals shall be discarded and the two remaining appraisals averaged to determine fair market value.

Costs of maintaining the Galveston Harbor and Channel will continue to be governed by the Local Cooperation Agreement between the United States of America and the City of Galveston dated October 18, 1973, as amended. This provision also provides that the Department of the Army shall be compensated for the present value of costs to the Department that will be incurred under the Local Cooperation Agreement which exceed the

present value of costs that would have been incurred had this transaction not occurred. The provisions of the amendment extinguish any rights of the United States of navigational servitude over the San Jacinto Disposal Area.

Wetlands created in a disposal area by the Department of the Army through active spoil operations are "non-jurisdictional". Accordingly, any wetlands on the San Jacinto Disposal Area require no mitigation.

The conferees understand that wetlands on the 564-acre Pelican Island parcel were also created by the Department of the Army during spoilage operations. This parcel was

spoiled upon and navigational servitude rights claimed until removed by the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1991. The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

The conferees understand that the Army Corps of Engineers' internal Feasibility Study (1991) included a wetlands mitigation plan characterized as "Plan 2" which was acceptable to the Corps and other participating agencies. If the Secretary determined that wetlands mitigation of the Pelican Island parcel is necessary, it shall be accomplished in accordance with Plan 2.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
ALABAMA					
(N)	CHICKASAW CREEK, AL.....	253,000	---	253,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN HUNTSVILLE - MADISON COUNTY, AL.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	MUSCLE SHOALS, AL.....	---	---	300,000	---
ALASKA					
(N)	ANCHOR POINT HARBOR, AK.....	180,000	---	180,000	---
(FDP)	CHENA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE STUDY, AK.....	122,000	---	122,000	---
(N)	CHIGNIK HARBOR, AK.....	---	50,000	---	50,000
(N)	COOK INLET, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(RDP)	KAKE HARBOR, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	KETCHIKAN HARBOR, AK.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	NORTHERN SEA COMMERCIAL ROUTE STUDY, AR.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	SAND POINT HARBOR, AK.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD AREA RIVERS, AK.....	188,000	---	188,000	---
(N)	SEWARD HARBOR, AK.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	SEWARD, LOWELL CREEK, AK.....	142,000	---	142,000	---
(N)	ST. PAUL HARBOR, AK.....	---	---	125,000	---
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS AND DRY STRAITS, AK.....	170,000	---	170,000	---
ARIZONA					
	COMBINED ARIZONA RECONNAISSANCE STUDY, AZ.....	---	---	280,000	---
	GILA RIVER, GILLESPIE DAM TO YUMA, AZ.....	---	---	1,000,000	---
	GILA RIVER AND TRIBS, LOWER SANTA CRUZ RIVER, AZ.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	HASSAYAMPA RIVER AT WICKENBURG, AZ.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	RIO SALADO AREA, TEMPE AZ.....	---	---	750,000	---
(FDP)	TUCSON DRAINAGE AREA, AZ.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
ARKANSAS					
	ARKANSAS RIVER, TUCKER CREEK, AR.....	---	---	475,000	---
(FDP)	ARKANSAS RIVER WETLANDS AND FLOOD CONTROL, AR.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA RIVER BASIN, HOT SPRINGS, AR.....	650,000	---	650,000	---
(SPE)	WHITE RIVER WETLANDS, AR & MO.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
CALIFORNIA					
(FC)	AMERICAN RIVER WATERSHED, CA.....	---	2,000,000	---	4,000,000
	CALLEGUAS CREEK, CA.....	---	---	130,000	---
(FC)	CARNEROS CREEK, CA.....	---	600,000	---	600,000
	CENTRAL BASIN GROUNDWATER PROJ, WHITTIER NARROWS, CA..	---	---	750,000	---
	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, ORANGE COUNTY, CA.....	---	---	275,000	---
	CITY OF WINTERS, CA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	COAST OF CA, SOUTH COAST REGION (ORANGE COUNTY).....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	CRESCENT CITY HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY (DEEPENING), CA.....	162,000	---	162,000	---
(FC)	KAWEAH RIVER, CA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
	LACDA WATER CONSERVATION, CA.....	---	---	100,000	---
	LEONARD RANCH, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA.....	---	2,000,000	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	---	3,633,000	---	3,633,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER WATERCOURSE IMPROVEMENT, CA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LOWER MISSION CREEK, CA.....	---	79,000	---	79,000
(SP)	MALIBU COASTAL AREA, CA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	MARIN COUNTY SHORELINE, SAN CLEMENTE CREEK, CA.....	280,000	---	280,000	---
	MARINA DEL RAY, CA.....	---	---	175,000	---
(SP)	MISSION BAY, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MISSION ZANJA CREEK, CA.....	341,000	---	341,000	---
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	122,000	---	122,000
	NORCO BLUFFS, SANTA ANA RIVER, CA.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, CACHE CREEK BASIN (LAKE CO), CA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, UPR SACRAMENTO R, F&WL HABITAT RESTORATI	250,000	---	550,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, WESTSIDE TRIBUTARIES TO YOLO BYPASS, CA.	350,000	---	450,000	---
(FDP)	N CA STREAMS, YUBA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	NAPA RIVER, CA.....	---	700,000	---	900,000
(N)	NEWPORT BAY HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	NORTHERN LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CA.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	NOYO RIVER AND HARBOR (BREAKWATER), CA.....	---	550,000	---	550,000
(SP)	OCEANSIDE SHORELINE, CA.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(SP)	PACIFIC COAST SHORELINE, CARLSBAD, CA.....	260,000	---	260,000	---
(FDP)	PAJARO RIVER AT WATSONVILLE, CA.....	197,000	---	197,000	---
(N)	POINT ARENA (BREAKWATER), CA.....	245,000	---	245,000	---
(N)	PORT HUENEME, CA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	RANCHO PALOS VERDES, CA.....	---	---	80,000	---
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FISH MIGRATION.....	---	---	600,000	---
(SPE)	SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA, CA.....	900,000	---	900,000	---
(SP)	SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, OCEAN BEACH, CA.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	215,000	---	215,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN R BASIN, PINE FLAT DAM, F&WL HABITAT RESTO	240,000	---	240,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, ARROYO PASAJERO (FRESNO CO),	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, CALIENTE CREEK STREAM GROUP,.	300,000	---	300,000	---
	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, FIREBAUGH AND MENDOTA, CA....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SAN JOAQUIN R MAIN STEM & TRI	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER BASIN, SOUTH SACRAMENTO COUNTY STRMS	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SAN LORENZO RIVER, CA.....	---	100,000	---	300,000
(FC)	SAN RAFAEL CANAL, CA.....	---	1,210,000	---	1,210,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	---	360,000	---	360,000
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	95,000	---	95,000	---
(N)	SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER, CA.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
(FDP)	SEVEN OAKS AND PRADO DAMS WATER CONSERVATION, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	SILVER STRAND SHORELINE, CORONADO, CA.....	---	---	275,000	---
	SONOMA COUNTY VERNAL POOLS, CA.....	---	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER PENITENCIA CREEK, CA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	WEST SACRAMENTO, CA.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	WHITewater RIVER BASIN, CA.....	150,000	---	150,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
COLORADO					
(FDP)	BOXELDER, SPRING, AND DRY CREEKS, FT COLLINS, CO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	MANITOU SPRINGS, CO.....	360,000	---	360,000	---
(FC)	RALSTON AND LEYDEN CREEKS, CO.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
CONNECTICUT					
(FDP)	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT COASTAL FLOODING, CT.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(COM)	CONNECTICUT R BSN - NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE, CT, MA, NH	100,000	---	100,000	---
DELAWARE					
(N)	C&D CANAL - BALTIMORE HBR CONN CHANNELS, DE & MD (DEEP	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE BAY COASTLINE, DE & NJ.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(SP)	DELAWARE COAST FROM CAPE HENLOPEN TO FENWICK ISLAND, D	210,000	---	210,000	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER MAIN CHANNEL DEEPENING, DE, NJ, & PA...	---	4,000,000	---	4,000,000
FLORIDA					
(SP)	BISCAYNE BAY, FL.....	---	---	700,000	---
(FDP)	BREVARD COUNTY, FL.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	COAST OF FLORIDA STUDY, FL.....	780,000	---	780,000	---
(SP)	COLLIER COUNTY, FL.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(SP)	DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FL.....	65,000	---	65,000	---
(FDP)	FORT PIERCE BEACH, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	HILLSBORO CANAL, FL.....	37,000	---	37,000	---
(N)	HILLSBORO INLET, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(BE)	MARTIN COUNTY, FL.....	---	282,000	---	282,000
(BE)	MIAMI RIVER SEDIMENTS.....	---	---	---	300,000
(BE)	NASSAU COUNTY, FL.....	---	229,000	---	229,000
(N)	PALM VALLEY BRIDGE, FL.....	---	980,000	---	980,000
(BE)	PANAMA CITY BEACHES, FL.....	---	1,280,000	---	1,280,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	---	850,000	---	850,000
(FDP)	PERDIDO KEY, FL.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	266,000	---	266,000	---
(N)	PORT EVERGLADES, FL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(N)	ST JOHNS RIVER WATER QUALITY, FL.....	---	---	400,000	---
(N)	ST PETERSBURG (SEC. 216), FL.....	---	---	100,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, ALAFIA RIVER AND BIG BEND, FL.....	130,000	---	250,000	---
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, SEDDON CHANNEL, FL.....	---	---	600,000	---
GEORGIA					
(BE)	ATLANTA COMBINED SEWER OVERFLOW TREATMENT, GA.....	---	---	---	200,000
(BE)	GLYNN COUNTY BEACHES, GA.....	---	200,000	---	200,000
(N)	LOWER SAVANNAH RIVER BASIN, GA & SC.....	100,000	---	100,000	---

		CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
HAWAII					
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR MODIFICATION, OAHU, HI.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(N)	KIKIAOLA SMALL BOAT HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	---	180,000	---	180,000
(N)	KAUMALAPAU HARBOR, HI.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	WAILUPE STREAM FLOOD CONTROL STUDY, OAHU, HI.....	330,000	---	330,000	---
IDAHO					
(FDP)	LOWER BOISE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES STUDY, ID.....	227,000	---	227,000	---
ILLINOIS					
(FDP)	ALEXANDER AND PULASKI COUNTIES, IL.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
(RDP)	CHICAGO RIVER, NORTH BRANCH (1946 MOD), IL.....	147,000	---	147,000	---
(BE)	CHICAGO SHORELINE, IL.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(FDP)	DES PLAINES RIVER, IL.....	381,000	---	381,000	---
(RDP)	FREEPORT, IL.....	140,000	---	140,000	---
	ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL, IL.....	---	---	---	500,000
	ILLINOIS SHORELINE EROSION, IL.....	---	---	150,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTHEAST CHICAGO, IL.....	377,000	---	377,000	---
(RCP)	UPPER MISSISSIPPI & ILLINOIS NAV STUDY, IL, IA, MN, MO	8,500,000	---	8,500,000	---
(RDP)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	35,000	---	35,000	---
INDIANA					
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, MARION COUNTY (SOUTH), IN.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER (NORTH), IN.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	INDIANAPOLIS, WHITE RIVER, CENTRAL WATERFRONT, IN....	300,000	---	300,000	3,700,000
	LAKE GEORGE, HOBART, IN.....	---	---	---	200,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN (CADY MARSH DITCH), IN....	---	---	---	310,000
	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER BASIN, DYER, IN.....	---	---	150,000	---
	KOONTZ LAKE, IN.....	---	---	200,000	---
	OHIO RIVER SHORELINE FLOOD PROTECTION, IN.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	ORANGE COUNTY (LOST RIVER), IN.....	243,000	---	243,000	---
(FDP)	ST JOSEPH RIVER, SOUTH BEND, IN.....	100,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	UPPER TIPPECANOE RIVER BASIN, IN.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	WABASH RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, IN & IL (MIDDLE REAC	155,000	---	300,000	---
	WABASH RIVER, BREVOORT LEVEE, IN.....	---	---	200,000	---
IOWA					
(FC)	GREEN BAY LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DIST.....	---	---	330,000	---
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, IA, IL, & MO.....	---	---	250,000	---
(FC)	MUSCATINE ISLAND LEVEE AND DRAINAGE DISTRICT, IA.....	---	213,000	---	213,000
(FC)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, PUMPING FACILITIES, IA.....	---	100,000	---	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS					
TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
KANSAS					
(FC)	ARKANSAS CITY, KS.....	---	115,000	---	115,000
(FDP)	MARYSVILLE, KS.....	77,000	---	77,000	---
(RCP)	SALINA, KS.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(FC)	TOPEKA, KS.....	---	---	---	225,000
(FDP)	TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KS & MO.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	WINFIELD, KS.....	---	284,000	---	284,000
KENTUCKY					
(FDP)	EAST FORK OF THE LITTLE SANDY RIVER, KY.....	143,000	---	143,000	---
	GRAYSON LAKE REALLOCATION STUDY.....	---	---	85,000	---
	HAZARD, KY.....	---	---	---	2,000,000
	KENTUCKY LOCK AND DAM, LOCK ADDITION, KY.....	---	---	---	250,000
(N)	MCALPINE LOCKS AND DAM, IN & KY.....	---	2,180,000	---	2,180,000
	METROPOLITAN CINCINNATI, NORTHERN KENTUCKY, KY.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, BEARGRASS CREEK, KY.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN LOUISVILLE, POND CREEK, KY.....	---	1,250,000	---	1,250,000
(FDP)	SALT RIVER BASIN, KY.....	225,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	UNIONTOWN/OHIO RIVER MAINSTEM STUDY, KY, IL & IN.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
LOUISIANA					
(FDP)	AMITE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	160,000	---	160,000	---
	BAYOU LAFOURCHE AND LAFOURCHE-JUMP WATERWAY, LA.....	---	---	---	200,000
(FDP)	BOSSIER PARISH, LA.....	830,000	---	830,000	---
(FC)	COMITE RIVER, LA.....	---	1,200,000	---	1,200,000
(FC)	EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH, LA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY LOCKS, LA.....	1,300,000	---	1,300,000	---
(FDP)	JEFFERSON - ORLEANS PARISHES, LA.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(N)	LAKE CHARLES SHIP CHAN, BY-PASS AND GEN ANCHORAGE AREA MERMENEAU, VERMILLION, & CALCASIEU RIVERS & BAYOU TECHE.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET BANK EROSION, LA.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	OUACHITA PARISH, LA.....	600,000	---	600,000	---
(FC)	WEST BANK - EAST OF HARVEY CANAL, LA.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
MARYLAND					
(FDP)	ANACOSTIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MD & DC.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR ANCHORAGES AND CHANNELS, MD.....	585,000	---	585,000	---
	BALTIMORE METROPOLITAN WATER RESOURCES, MD.....	---	---	292,000	---
MASSACHUSETTS					
(N)	BOSTON HARBOR, MA.....	---	330,000	---	330,000
	BROCTON, MA.....	---	---	350,000	---
(FC)	SAUGUS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MA.....	---	1,640,000	---	1,640,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
MINNESOTA					
(FDP)	CROOKSTON, MN.....	110,000	---	110,000	---
	RED RIVER AT GRAND MARAIS OUTLET, MN.....	---	---	200,000	---
MISSISSIPPI					
(FDP)	EAST FORK BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION, MS.....	165,000	---	165,000	---
(FDP)	HANCOCK, HARRISON AND JACKSON COUNTIES, MS.....	550,000	---	550,000	---
	JACKSON COUNTY INDUSTRIAL WATER SUPPLY, MS.....	---	---	40,000	---
(FDP)	JACKSON METROPOLITAN AREA, MS.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
	LOWNDES COUNTY PORT BARGE FLEETING AREA.....	---	---	50,000	---
(FDP)	PASCAGOULA RIVER BASIN, MS.....	260,000	---	260,000	---
MISSOURI					
(FC)	BLUE RIVER BASIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	---	350,000	---	350,000
(FC)	COLDWATER CREEK, MO.....	---	48,000	---	48,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER, VICINITY OF ST LOUIS, MO.....	50,000	---	50,000	---
(RCP)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, UNIT L-246, CUTOFF LAKE, ..	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	RIVER DES PERES, MO.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
	ST LOUIS REGION, MO.....	---	---	800,000	---
	STE GENEVIEVE, MO.....	---	---	---	3,200,000
(FDP)	SWOPE PARK INDUSTRIAL AREA, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	59,000	---	59,000	---
NEBRASKA					
(FDP)	ANTELOPE CREEK, LINCOLN, NE.....	15,000	---	15,000	---
(FDP)	BURT-WASHINGTON COUNTIES, NE.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
(FC)	WOOD RIVER, GRAND ISLAND, NE.....	---	109,000	---	109,000
NEVADA					
(FDP)	BATTLE MOUNTAIN, NV.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	LAS VEGAS WASH AND TRIBUTARIES, PITTMAN WASH, NV.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
	LOWER TRUCKEE RIVER, NV.....	---	---	400,000	---
(FC)	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	---	3,685,000	---	3,685,000
NEW JERSEY					
(N)	ARTHUR KILL CHNL EXTENSION-CARTERET, NJ TO HOWLAND HOO	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SP)	BARNEGAT INLET TO LITTLE EGG INLET, NJ.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(SP)	BRIGANTINE INLET TO GREAT EGG HARBOR INLET, NJ.....	380,000	---	380,000	---
(SP)	CAPE MAY POINT, NJ.....	250,000	---	---	---
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER COMPREHENSIVE NAVIGATION STUDY, NJ, PA.	158,000	---	158,000	---
	HACKENSACK RIVER BASIN, NJ & NY.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	LOWER CAPE MAY MEADOWS, NJ.....	490,000	---	740,000	---
(FC)	LOWER SADDLE RIVER, BERGEN COUNTY, NJ.....	---	1,300,000	---	1,300,000
(FDP)	MANASQUAN RIVER BASIN, NJ.....	140,000	---	140,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HBR AND ADJACENT CHANNELS, CLAREMONT TERMINAL	---	500,000	---	500,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATES		CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE	
		INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING	INVESTIGATIONS	PLANNING
(SP)	PASSAIC RIVER MAINSTEM, NJ.....	---	---	---	17,000,000
(SP)	RARITAN BAY AND SANDY HOOK BAY, NJ.....	320,000	---	320,000	---
	RARITAN RIVER BASIN, GREEN BROOK SUB-BASIN, NJ.....	---	---	---	2,800,000
	SOUTH RIVER AT OLD BRIDGE AND SAYREVILLE, NJ.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SP)	TOWNSENDS INLET TO CAPE MAY INLET, NJ.....	490,000	---	490,000	---
	NEW MEXICO				
(FDP)	ALBUQUERQUE ARROYOS, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM...	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	ESPANOLA VALLEY, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	130,000	---	130,000	---
(FDP)	LAS CRUCES, EL PASO AND VICINITY, NM.....	70,000	---	70,000	---
(FDP)	RIO RANCHO, RIO GRANDE AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	ROCKY ARROYO/DARK CANYON, PECOS RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES,	390,000	---	390,000	---
(FDP)	SAN JUAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NM.....	450,000	---	450,000	---
	NEW YORK				
(RCP)	ADDISON, NY.....	160,000	---	160,000	---
	ARTHUR KILL CHANL-HOWLAND HOOK MARINE TRMNL, NY & NJ..	---	---	---	500,000
	EAST RIVER, NY.....	---	---	500,000	---
	HUDSON RIVER HABITAT RESTORATION, NY.....	---	---	300,000	---
(SP)	JAMAICA BAY, MARINE PARK AND PLUMB BEACH, NY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(SP)	LONG BEACH ISLAND, NY.....	90,000	---	90,000	---
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR ANCHORAGE AREAS, NY.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
	NORTH SHORE OF LONG ISLAND, NY.....	---	---	500,000	---
(SPE)	ONONDAGA LAKE, NY (SEC 401, P L 101-596).....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	RARITAN BAY ANCHORAGES, NY AND NJ CHANNELS, NY & NJ...	200,000	---	200,000	---
(SPE)	REYNOLD'S CHANNEL AND NEW YORK STATE BOAT CHANNEL, NY.	350,000	---	350,000	---
	SOUTH SHORE OF STATEN ISLAND, NY.....	---	---	475,000	---
	YONKERS SHORELINE, NY.....	---	---	400,000	---
	NORTH CAROLINA				
(FC)	BRUNSWICK COUNTY BEACHES, OCEAN ISLE BEACH PORTION, NC	---	216,000	---	216,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR-NORTHEAST (CAPE FEAR) RIVER, NC.....	1,100,000	---	1,100,000	---
(SP)	DARE COUNTY BEACHES, NC.....	210,000	---	210,000	---
(BE)	FORT FISHER AND VICINITY, NC.....	---	338,000	---	338,000
	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	---	---	50,000	---
	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	---	---	---	158,000
(FC)	SUGAR CREEK BASIN, NC & SC.....	---	656,000	---	656,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR OCEAN BAR, NC.....	---	734,000	---	734,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, CHANNEL WIDENING, NC.....	---	660,000	---	660,000
	NORTH DAKOTA				
(FDP)	GRAND FORKS, ND.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(FDP)	LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD AND LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND..	50,000	---	50,000	---

		CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
OHIO					
(FDP)	DAYTON, OH (MIAMI RIVER BASIN).....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	LAKE ERIE TO OHIO RIVER, OH & PA.....	---	---	500,000	---
(FC)	METROPOLITAN REGION OF CINCINNATI, DUCK CREEK, OH, KY.	---	490,000	---	490,000
OKLAHOMA					
(FDP)	BIRD CREEK BASIN, OK.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH CANADIAN RIVER, OK.....	125,000	---	125,000	---
OREGON					
(FDP)	AMAZON CREEK WETLANDS, OR.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER NAVIGATION CHANNEL DEEPENING, OR & WA..	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES, OR & WA...	---	641,000	---	641,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR (DEEP DRAFT NAVIGATION).....	---	830,000	---	830,000
(FDP)	JOHNSON CREEK, OR.....	285,000	---	285,000	---
(FDP)	MIDDLE FORK WILLAMETTE FISHERY RESORATION, OR.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(FDP)	SOUTH SANTIAM FISHERY RESTORATION, OR.....	300,000	---	300,000	---
	TRESTLE BAY RESTORATION, OR.....	---	---	100,000	---
(FDP)	WILLAMETTE RIVER TEMPERATURE CONTROL, OR.....	700,000	---	700,000	---
(FC)	WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN REVIEW.....	---	---	130,000	---
PENNSYLVANIA					
	BROAD TOP REGION, PA.....	---	---	---	400,000
(FC)	CHARTIERS CREEK, PA.....	---	250,000	---	250,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA (REALLOCATION).....	---	283,000	---	283,000
	JUNIATA RIVER BASIN, PA.....	---	---	450,000	---
	LACKAWANNA RIVER CORRIDOR, PA.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, OLYPHANT, PA.....	---	275,000	---	275,000
(FC)	LACKAWANNA RIVER, SCRANTON, PA.....	---	553,000	---	553,000
(FDP)	LEHIGH RIVER BASIN, PA.....	290,000	---	290,000	---
(N)	LOCKS AND DAMS 2, 3 AND 4, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	---	4,400,000	---	4,400,000
(FDP)	MILTON, PA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	SAW MILL RUN, PA.....	---	460,000	---	460,000
(FDP)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER BASIN, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN AREA, PA.....	170,000	---	170,000	---
(FDP)	SUSQUEHANNA RIVER BASIN FISH RESTORATION, PA, NY & MD.	300,000	---	300,000	---
(FC)	WYOMING VALLEY (LEVEE RAISING), PA.....	---	818,000	---	818,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
PUERTO RICO					
(FC)	ARECIBO RIVER, PR.....	---	400,000	---	400,000
(FC)	RIO DE LA PLATA, PR.....	---	231,000	---	575,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE DE LOIZA, PR.....	---	800,000	---	800,000
(FDP)	RIO GUANAJIBO, PR.....	256,000	---	306,000	---
(FDP)	RIO NIGUA AT SALINAS, PR.....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.....	---	1,208,000	---	1,208,000
SOUTH CAROLINA					
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC (DEEPENING/WIDENING).....	725,000	---	725,000	---
(FDP)	CHARLESTON STORM DAMAGE REDUCTION, SC.....	370,000	---	370,000	---
	POCOTALIGO RIVER AND SWAMP, SC.....	---	---	400,000	---
(SP)	SOUTH CAROLINA SHORES, NORTH PORTION, SC.....	188,000	---	188,000	---
SOUTH DAKOTA					
(FC)	ABERDEEN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	150,000	---	150,000
(FC)	BIG SIOUX RIVER, SIOUX FALLS, SD.....	---	300,000	---	300,000
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER ENVIRONMENTAL, SD.....	30,000	---	30,000	---
(RCP)	OAHE DAM TO LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FC)	WATERTOWN AND VICINITY, SD.....	---	370,000	---	370,000
TENNESSEE					
	BLACK FOX, OAKLAND SPRINGS WETLAND AREA.....	---	---	90,000	---
	KNOXVILLE, TN.....	---	---	250,000	---
TEXAS					
(FDP)	BOWIE COUNTY LEVEE, TX.....	75,000	---	75,000	---
(FC)	BRAYS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	1,000,000	---	1,000,000
(RCP)	BUFFALO BAYOU & TRIBUTARIES - ADDICKS & BARKER RESERVO COLONIAS ALONG U.S.-MEXICO BORDER, TX.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	464,000	---	464,000	---
(FC)	CYPRESS CREEK, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	500,000	---	500,000
	CYPRESS VALLEY WATERSHED, TX.....	---	---	600,000	---
(FC)	DALLAS FLOODWAY EXTENSION, TRINITY RIVER PROJECT, TX..	---	700,000	---	700,000
(RCP)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O' THE PINES, TX.....	325,000	---	325,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - ARANSAS NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, TX.....	939,000	---	939,000	---
(RCP)	GIWW - CORPUS CHRISTI BAY TO PORT ISABEL, TX.....	225,000	---	225,000	---
	GIWW - HIGH ISLAND TO BRAZOS RIVER, TX.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	GRAHAM, TX (BRAZOS RIVER BASIN).....	100,000	---	100,000	---
(FC)	GREENS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	---	800,000	---	800,000
(N)	HOUSTON - GALVESTON NAVIGATION CHANNELS, TX.....	---	692,000	---	692,000
	JEFFERSON COUNTY, TX.....	---	---	300,000	---
(FDP)	LOWER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	NECHES RIVER AND TRIBS, SALT WATER BARRIER, TX.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FDP)	NORTH BOSQUE RIVER WATERSHED, TX.....	450,000	---	450,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
(FDP)	PECAN BAYOU LAKE, TX.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FDP)	PLAINVIEW, BRAZOS RIVER BASIN, TX.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, CHANNEL TO ORANGE, TX.....	265,000	---	265,000	---
(FC)	SHOAL CREEK, AUSTIN, TX.....	---	213,000	---	213,000
(FC)	SOUTH MAIN CHANNEL, TX.....	---	1,500,000	---	1,500,000
(FDP)	UPPER TRINITY RIVER BASIN, TX.....	830,000	---	830,000	---
UTAH					
(FDP)	SEVIER RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, UT.....	200,000	---	200,000	---
VERMONT					
(FDP)	WINOOSKI RIVER AND TRIBUTAIRES, ICE FLOW, VT.....	169,000	---	169,000	---
VIRGINIA					
(SPE)	CHESAPEAKE BAY SHORELINE, HAMPTON, VA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(SPE)	JAMES RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION STUDY, SANDBRIDGE BEACH, VA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	---	2,000,000	---	780,000
WASHINGTON					
(SPE)	CHIEF JOSEPH POOL RAISING, WA.....	535,000	---	535,000	---
(RCP)	HOWARD HANSON DAM (ADDITIONAL STORAGE), WA.....	350,000	---	350,000	---
(FDP)	NOOKSACK RIVER, WA.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
(FDP)	SKAGIT RIVER, WA.....	382,000	---	382,000	---
WEST VIRGINIA					
(FC)	ISLAND CREEK AT LOGAN, WV.....	---	225,000	---	225,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, WV.....	---	---	400,000	---
(COM)	KANAWHA RIVER BASIN COMPREHENSIVE, WV (MARLINTON/GREEN)	324,000	---	324,000	---
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER NAVIGATION, WV.....	309,000	---	309,000	---
(N)	MARMET LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	---	1,878,000	---	1,878,000
(RDP)	MONONGAHELA RIVER COMPREHENSIVE, WV.....	---	---	600,000	---
(RDP)	OCEANA, WV.....	400,000	---	400,000	---
(RDP)	WEST VIRGINIA COMPREHENSIVE, WV.....	---	---	500,000	---
WISCONSIN					
(FC)	LOWER KINNICKINNIC RIVER, MILWAUKEE, WI.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	---	---	200,000	---
(FC)	PORTAGE, WI.....	---	100,000	---	100,000
WYOMING					
(FDP)	JACKSON HOLE RESTORATION, WY.....	438,000	---	438,000	---

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET INVESTIGATIONS	ESTIMATES PLANNING	CONFERENCE INVESTIGATIONS	ALLOWANCE PLANNING
REVIEW OF AUTHORIZED PROJECTS					
	COORDINATION STUDIES WITH OTHER AGENCIES.....	9,340,000	---	9,340,000	---
COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA					
MISCELLANEOUS					
	COASTAL FIELD DATA COLLECTION.....	3,600,000	---	4,000,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL DATA STUDIES.....	150,000	---	150,000	---
	ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICE PARTNERSHIPS.....	1,500,000	---	1,500,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN MANAGEMENT SERVICES.....	7,600,000	---	7,600,000	---
	FLOOD PLAIN STUDIES, MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI.....	---	---	2,000,000	---
	GREAT LAKES REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS (SEC. 401).....	---	---	250,000	---
	HARBORS - DREDGED MATERIAL DISPOSAL AREA STUDY.....	1,000,000	---	1,000,000	---
	HYDROLOGIC STUDIES.....	490,000	---	490,000	---
	INTERNATIONAL WATER STUDIES.....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	PRECIPITATION STUDIES (NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE).....	500,000	---	500,000	---
	REMOTE SENSING/GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM SUPPORT..	250,000	---	250,000	---
	SEC. 219 ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS.....	---	---	1,500,000	---
	SEC. 307 WATER QUALITY PROJECTS.....	---	---	2,000,000	---
	SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTERS.....	250,000	---	250,000	---
	STREAM GAGING (U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY).....	690,000	---	690,000	---
	TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.....	900,000	---	900,000	---
	TOTAL.....	17,430,000	---	23,580,000	---
	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	32,700,000	---	33,000,000	---
	SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	122,374,000	61,430,000	153,271,000	96,797,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-26,204,000	---	-42,528,000	---
	TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....	96,170,000	61,430,000	110,743,000	96,797,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:					
	(N) NAVIGATION				
	(BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL				
	(FC) FLOOD CONTROL				
	(MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER				
	(SP) SHORELINE PROTECTION				
	(FDP) FLOOD DAMAGE PREVENTION				
	(RCP) REVIEW OF COMPLETED PROJECT				
	(RDP) REVIEW OF DEFERRED PROJECT				
	(COMP) COMPREHENSIVE				
	(SPEC) SPECIAL				

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
ALABAMA			
(N)	BAYOU LA BATRE, AL.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, VICINITY OF JACKSO	2,000,000	2,000,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY WILDLIFE MITIGATION, AL	15,000,000	15,000,000
(FC)	VILLAGE CREEK, JEFFERSON COUNTY, AL.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
	WILLIAM BACON OLIVER LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	---	4,000,000
ALASKA			
	BETHEL, AK.....	---	2,000,000
(N)	KODIAK HARBOR, AK.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	SITKA HARBOR, AK.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	CLIFTON, AZ.....	3,700,000	3,700,000
(FC)	HOLBROOK, AZ.....	1,600,000	1,600,000
	NOGALES WASH, AZ.....	---	200,000
	RILLITO RIVER, AZ.....	---	4,200,000
ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR (DAM SAFETY).....	10,000,000	10,000,000
	BEAVER LAKE, AR, ENVIRONMENTAL INFRASTRUCTURE.....	---	3,000,000
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR (WATER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT).....	525,000	525,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM (POWERHOUSE), AR (MAJOR REHAB)	2,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARK RVR NAV SYSTEM, LOCKS AND DAMS, A	11,100,000	11,100,000
	RED RIVER EMERGENCY BANK PROTECTION, AR.....	---	3,500,000
	RED RIVER BELOW DENISON DAM LEVEE & BANK STABIL, AR...	---	3,500,000
CALIFORNIA			
	COYOTE AND BERRYESSA CREEKS, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(FC)	GUADALUPE RIVER, CA.....	14,400,000	14,400,000
(FC)	MARYSVILLE/YUBA CITY LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	800,000	800,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAMS, CA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	---	450,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
(FC)	REDBANK AND FANCHER CREEKS, CA.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	550,000	550,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER BANK PROTECTION PROJECT, CA.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER DEEPWATER SHIP CHANNEL, CA.....	---	100,000
	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT (GCID), CA....	---	400,000
	SACRAMENTO URBAN AREA LEVEE RECONSTRUCTION, CA.....	---	500,000
(FC)	SACRAMENTO RIVER FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, CA (DEF CORR).	2,350,000	2,350,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY TO STOCKTON, CA.....	750,000	750,000
(FC)	SAN LUIS REY RIVER, CA.....	6,792,000	6,792,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER MAINSTEM, CA.....	120,000,000	118,750,000
(FC)	SANTA PAULA CREEK, CA.....	645,000	645,000
	SONOMA BAYLANDS WETLANDS RESTORATION, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	4,838,000	4,838,000
(FC)	WILDCAT AND SAN PABLO CREEKS, CA.....	2,739,000	2,739,000
(E)	YOLO BASIN WETLANDS, SACRAMENTO RIVER, CA.....	2,063,000	2,063,000
COLORADO			
(FC)	ALAMOSA, CO.....	800,000	800,000
DELAWARE			
(FC)	DELAWARE COAST PROTECTION, DE.....	185,000	185,000
FLORIDA			
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR DEEPENING, FL.....	4,996,000	4,996,000
	CANAVERAL HARBOR SAND BYPASS, FL.....	---	4,800,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA, FL.....	7,600,000	17,850,000
(FC)	DADE COUNTY, FL.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
(BE)	DUVAL COUNTY, FL.....	8,590,000	8,590,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	1,600,000	400,000
(FC)	FOUR RIVER BASINS, FL.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
	KISSIMMEE RIVER, FL.....	---	5,000,000
(BE)	LEE COUNTY, FL (REIMBURSEMENT).....	1,760,000	1,760,000
	MANATEE HARBOR, FL.....	---	3,000,000
	MELALEUCA QUARANTINE FACILITY, FL.....	---	1,000,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR CHANNEL, FL.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
	PALM BEACH COUNTY BEACHES (OCEAN RIDGE), FL.....	---	200,000
(BE)	PINELLAS COUNTY, FL.....	400,000	1,900,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
GEORGIA			
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, GA & SC.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
HAWAII			
(FC)	ALENAIO STREAM, HAWAII, HI.....	3,578,000	3,578,000
(N)	KAWAIHAE SMALL BOAT HARBOR, HAWAII, HI.....	4,210,000	4,210,000
(N)	MAALAEA HARBOR, MAUI, HI.....	4,640,000	4,640,000
ILLINOIS			
(FC)	ALTON TO GALE ORGANIZED LEVEE DISTRICT, IL & MO (DEF C CASINO BEACH, IL.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	EAST ST LOUIS, IL.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
(N)	FOUR LOCKS, ILLINOIS WATERWAY, IL (MAJOR REHAB).....	5,200,000	5,200,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 13, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)..	5,060,000	5,060,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 15, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL (MAJOR REHAB)..	11,330,000	11,330,000
(N)	LOCK AND DAM 25, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, IL & MO (MAJOR REH	1,600,000	1,600,000
(FC)	LOVES PARK, IL.....	4,200,000	4,200,000
(N)	MCCOOK AND THORNTON RESERVOIRS, IL.....	---	13,000,000
(N)	MELVIN PRICE LOCK AND DAM, IL & MO.....	20,350,000	7,850,000
(N)	O'HARE RESERVOIR, IL.....	---	5,000,000
(N)	OLMSTED LOCKS AND DAM, IL & KY.....	110,314,000	110,314,000
(N)	UPPER MISS RIVER SYSTEM ENV MGMT PROG, IL, IA, MO, MN.	19,455,000	19,455,000
INDIANA			
(FC)	EVANSVILLE, IN.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	FORT WAYNE METROPOLITAN AREA, IN.....	---	500,000
(FC)	LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, IN.....	16,000,000	16,000,000
IOWA			
(N)	DES MOINES RECREATIONAL RIVER AND GREENBELT, IA.....	---	2,700,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER FISH AND WILDLIFE MITIGATION, IA, NE, K	11,800,000	11,800,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER LEVEE SYSTEM, IA, NE, KS & MO.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PERRY CREEK, IA.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	THURMAN TO HAMBURG, PUMPING FACILITIES, IA.....	---	825,000
(FC)	WEST DES MOINES, DES MOINES, IA.....	2,070,000	2,070,000
KENTUCKY			
(FC)	FRANKFORT, SOUTH FRANKFORT, KY.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
(FC)	SALYERSVILLE, KY.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	1,400,000	1,400,000
LOUISIANA			
(FC)	ALOHA - RIGOLETTE, LA.....	2,967,000	2,967,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN STORM WATER DISCHARGE.....	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (HURRICANE PROTECT	9,619,000	24,119,000
(FC)	LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN AND VICINITY, LA (JEFFERSON PARISH)	---	200,000
(FC)	LAROSE TO GOLDEN MEADOW, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)....	2,977,000	2,977,000
(N)	OUACHITA RIVER LEVEES, LA.....	---	6,300,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER SHIP CHANNEL, GULF TO BATON ROUGE, L	6,161,000	6,161,000
(FC)	NEW ORLEANS TO VENICE, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION).....	1,233,000	1,233,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY, MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT, L	32,847,000	145,000,000
(FC)	WESTWEGO TO HARVEY CANAL, LA (HURRICANE PROTECTION)...	5,770,000	5,770,000
MAINE			
	ST. JOHN RIVER (IRRIG/CONSERV).....	---	252,000
MARYLAND			
	ANACOSTIA RIVER, MD & DC.....	---	700,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	TOWN BROOK, QUINCY AND BRAINTREE, MA.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
MICHIGAN			
	CLINTON RIVER SPILLWAY, MI.....	---	2,000,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BASSETT CREEK, MN.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(FC)	CHASKA, MN.....	5,600,000	5,600,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR CHANNEL EXTENSION, MN & WI.....	886,000	886,000
(FC)	ROCHESTER, MN.....	22,130,000	22,130,000
(FC)	SILVER BAY HARBOR, MN.....	---	2,600,000
(FC)	ST PAUL, MN.....	3,651,000	3,651,000
	STILLWATER, MN.....	---	2,400,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	---	800,000
	SOWASHEE CREEK, MS.....	---	3,240,000
(FC)	TOMBIGBEE RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, MS & AL.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
MISSOURI			
(FC)	BLUE RIVER CHANNEL, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	16,900,000	16,900,000
(FC)	BRUSH CREEK, KANSAS CITY, MO.....	5,200,000	5,200,000
(FC)	CAPE GIRARDEAU - JACKSON, MO.....	7,800,000	7,800,000
(FC)	MERAMEC RIVER BASIN, VALLEY PARK LEVEE, MO.....	3,489,000	3,489,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BTWN THE OHIO AND MO RIVERS (REG WORKS), MO	4,535,000	4,535,000
NEBRASKA			
(FC)	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	74,000	74,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	2,881,000	2,881,000
NEVADA			
	TROPICANA AND FLAMINGO WASHES, NV.....	---	3,000,000
NEW JERSEY			
	MOLLY ANN'S BROOK, NJ.....	---	1,000,000
	NEW YORK HARBOR & ADJACENT CHANNELS, PORT JERSEY, NJ..	---	1,500,000
	SALEM RIVER, NJ.....	---	1,500,000
(BE)	SANDY HOOK TO BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	34,800,000	34,800,000
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ACEQUIAS IRRIGATION SYSTEM, NM.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
(FC)	ALAMOGORDO, NM.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	COCHITI WETFIELDS, NM.....	10,552,000	10,552,000
(FC)	MIDDLE RIO GRANDE FLOOD PROTECTION, BERNALILLO TO BELE	2,125,000	2,125,000
(FC)	RIO GRANDE FLOODWAY, SAN ACACIA TO BOSQUE DEL APACHE,.	9,000,000	9,000,000
NEW YORK			
(BE)	ATLANTIC COAST OF NYC, ROCKAWAY INLET TO NORTON POINT,	8,756,000	10,756,000
	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET-ROCKAWAY INLET & JAMAICA BAY, NY..	---	3,280,000
(N)	KILL VAN KULL AND NEWARK BAY CHANNEL, NY & NJ.....	28,500,000	28,500,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR COLLECTION AND REMOVAL OF DRIFT, NY &.	2,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	NORTH ELLENVILLE, NY (DEF CORR).....	1,900,000	1,900,000
	ONONDAGA LAKE STORM WATER DISCHARGE.....	---	2,000,000
	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	---	4,000,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	AIWW - REPLACEMENT OF FEDERAL HIGHWAY BRIDGES, NC.....	4,550,000	4,550,000
(FC)	CAROLINA BEACH AND VICINITY, NC.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	LAKE GASTON, AQUATIC VEGETATION, NC & VA.....	---	200,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	7,020,000	7,020,000
(BE)	WEST ONSLOW BEACH AND NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	110,000	110,000
	WILMINGTON HARBOR OCEAN BAR, NC.....	---	5,266,000
(FC)	WRIGHTSVILLE BEACH, NC.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (DAM SAFETY).....	1,300,000	1,300,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND (MAJOR REHAB).....	800,000	800,000
(FC)	SHEYENNE RIVER, ND.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER BASIN, ND.....	9,200,000	9,200,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
OHIO			
(FC)	MILL CREEK, OH.....	1,900,000	1,900,000
	WEST COLOMBUS, OH.....	---	9,000,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	FRY CREEKS, BIXBY, OK.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	MINGO CREEK, TULSA, OK.....	14,500,000	14,500,000
OREGON			
(N)	BONNEVILLE NAVIGATION LOCK, OR & WA.....	7,422,000	7,422,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE I, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)..	7,600,000	7,600,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE POWERHOUSE PHASE II, OR & WA (MAJOR REHAB)..	1,000,000	1,000,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE SECOND POWERHOUSE, OR & WA.....	6,500,000	6,500,000
	COLUMBIA RIVER INDIAN TRIBE IN LIEU FISHING SITES.....	---	3,900,000
(FC)	ELK CREEK LAKE, OR.....	450,000	450,000
	UMPQUA RIVER, WINCHESTER BAY, OR.....	---	100,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	GRAYS LANDING, LOCK AND DAM 7, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA..	22,000,000	22,000,000
	LACKAWANNA RIVER, PA.....	---	2,000,000
(FC)	LOCK HAVEN, PA.....	17,917,000	17,917,000
(N)	POINT MARION, LOCK AND DAM 8, MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA &.	4,700,000	4,700,000
(BE)	PRESQUE ISLE PENINSULA, PA (PERMANENT).....	410,000	410,000
	SOUTH CENTRAL PA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, PA.....	---	10,000,000
(FC)	TURTLE CREEK, PA.....	1,074,000	1,074,000
PUERTO RICO			
(FC)	PORTUGUES AND BUCANA RIVERS, PR.....	15,600,000	15,600,000
(FC)	RIO PUERTO NUEVO, PR.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
RHODE ISLAND			
	NARRAGANSETT TOWN BEACH, NARRAGANSETT, RI.....	---	150,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	5,820,000	5,820,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	10,500,000	---
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL DAM AND LAKE, WILDLIFE MITIGATION, S	4,839,000	4,839,000
TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL DAM, TN (DAM SAFETY).....	6,800,000	6,800,000
TEXAS			
(FC)	BEALS CREEK, BIG SPRING, TX.....	600,000	600,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	9,300,000	9,300,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	CLEAR CREEK, TX.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX.....	10,700,000	10,725,000
(FC)	EL PASO, TX.....	10,500,000	10,500,000
(N)	FREEMPORT HARBOR, TX.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
(N)	GIWW - BRAZOS RIVER FLOODGATES, TX (MAJOR REHAB).....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(N)	GIWW - SARGENT BEACH, TX.....	3,875,000	3,875,000
(FC)	LAKE WICHITA, HOLLIDAY CREEK AT WICHITA FALLS, TX....	4,000,000	4,000,000
(FC)	MCGRATH CREEK, WICHITA FALLS, TX.....	100,000	100,000
(N)	MOUTH OF COLORADO RIVER, TX.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	5,600,000	5,600,000
(FC)	RED RIVER CHLORIDE, TX & OK.....	2,000,000	4,000,000
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX (DAM SAFETY).....	12,500,000	12,500,000
(FC)	SAN ANTONIO CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, TX.....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	SIMS BAYOU, HOUSTON, TX.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
(FC)	TAYLORS BAYOU, TX.....	3,300,000	3,300,000
	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	---	1,000,000
VIRGINIA			
(FC)	JAMES R OLIN FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, VA.....	4,100,000	4,100,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS (DEEPENING), VA.....	1,700,000	1,700,000
	RICHMOND FILTRATION PLANT, VA.....	---	1,000,000
(FC)	ROANOKE RIVER UPPER BASIN, HEADWATERS AREA, VA.....	900,000	900,000
(BE)	VIRGINIA BEACH, VA (REIMBURSEMENT).....	850,000	850,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
WASHINGTON			
(FC)	CHEHALIS RIVER, SOUTH ABERDEEN AND COSMOPOLIS, WA.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH ADDITIONAL UNITS, WA.....	2,268,000	2,268,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER JUVENILE FISH MITIGATION, WA, OR & ID..	48,300,000	49,500,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR, WA.....	7,200,000	7,200,000
(MP)	LOWER SNAKE RIVER FISH & WILDLIFE COMPENSATION, WA, OR	5,000,000	5,000,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA (DAM SAFETY ASSURANCE).....	16,900,000	16,900,000
WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	LEVISA AND TUG FORKS AND UPPER CUMBERLAND RIVER, WV, V	17,100,000	45,600,000
(FC)	MOOREFIELD, WV.....	500,000	500,000
(FC)	PETERSBURG, WV.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	ROBERT C BYRD LOCKS AND DAM, WV & OH.....	22,000,000	22,000,000
	SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, WV..	---	3,500,000
(N)	WINFIELD LOCKS AND DAM, WV.....	56,500,000	56,600,000
WISCONSIN			
	STATE ROAD AND EBNER COULEES, WI.....	---	1,467,000
MISCELLANEOUS			
	AQUATIC PLANT CONTROL (1965 ACT).....	8,500,000	11,000,000
	BEACH EROSION CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 103).....	1,500,000	2,000,000
	CLEARING AND SNAGGING (SECTION 208).....	500,000	500,000
	EMERGENCY STREAMBANK & SHORELINE PROTECTION (SEC. 14).	7,500,000	7,500,000
	EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION.....	18,920,000	18,920,000
	FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS (SECTION 205).....	22,000,000	22,000,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - BOARD EXPENSES.....	35,000	35,000
	INLAND WATERWAYS USERS BOARD - CORPS EXPENSES.....	170,000	170,000
	NAVIGATION MITIGATION (SECTION 111).....	500,000	500,000
	NAVIGATION PROJECTS (SECTION 107).....	3,000,000	4,100,000
	PROJECT MODIFICATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF THE ENVIRONME	7,500,000	8,130,000
	WETLAND AND AQUATIC HABITAT CREATION.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-65,486,000	-165,406,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION GENERAL.....		1,206,237,000	1,400,875,000

TYPE OF PROJECT:  
 (N) NAVIGATION  
 (BE) BEACH EROSION CONTROL  
 (FC) FLOOD CONTROL  
 (MP) MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER

1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000
9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000	14,000,000
15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000
18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	18,000,000
19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000
22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000	22,000,000
23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000
25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000
27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000
28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000	28,000,000
29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000
34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000
35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000	37,000,000
38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000
39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000
41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000	41,000,000
42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000	42,000,000
43,000,000	43,000,000	43,000,000	43,000,000
44,000,000	44,000,000	44,000,000	44,000,000
45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000	45,000,000
46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000
47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000
48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000
49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000	49,000,000
50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
51,000,000	51,000,000	51,000,000	51,000,000
52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000
53,000,000	53,000,000	53,000,000	53,000,000
54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000
55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
56,000,000	56,000,000	56,000,000	56,000,000
57,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000	57,000,000
58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000	59,000,000
60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000
61,000,000	61,000,000	61,000,000	61,000,000
62,000,000	62,000,000	62,000,000	62,000,000
63,000,000	63,000,000	63,000,000	63,000,000
64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000
65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000	65,000,000
66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000	66,000,000
67,000,000	67,000,000	67,000,000	67,000,000
68,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000	68,000,000
69,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000	69,000,000
70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000
71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000	71,000,000
72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000	72,000,000
73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000	73,000,000
74,000,000	74,000,000	74,000,000	74,000,000
75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
76,000,000	76,000,000	76,000,000	76,000,000
77,000,000	77,000,000	77,000,000	77,000,000
78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000	78,000,000
79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000	79,000,000
80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
81,000,000	81,000,000	81,000,000	81,000,000
82,000,000	82,000,000	82,000,000	82,000,000
83,000,000	83,000,000	83,000,000	83,000,000
84,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000	84,000,000
85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
86,000,000	86,000,000	86,000,000	86,000,000
87,000,000	87,000,000	87,000,000	87,000,000
88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000	88,000,000
89,000,000	89,000,000	89,000,000	89,000,000
90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000	90,000,000
91,000,000	91,000,000	91,000,000	91,000,000
92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000	92,000,000
93,000,000	93,000,000	93,000,000	93,000,000
94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000
95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
96,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000	96,000,000
97,000,000	97,000,000	97,000,000	97,000,000
98,000,000	98,000,000	98,000,000	98,000,000
99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000
1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000	1,000,000,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
SURVEYS:			
GENERAL STUDIES:			
(FDP)	MORGANZA, LA TO THE GULF OF MEXICO.....	300,000	300,000
(FDP)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA, MS.....	2,020,000	2,020,000
(FDP)	JACKSON AND TRENTON, TN.....	610,000	610,000
(FDP)	REELFOOT LAKE, TN.....	400,000	400,000
	COLLECTION AND STUDY OF BASIC DATA.....	315,000	315,000
PRECONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND DESIGN:			
	EASTERN ARKANSAS REGION (COMPREHENSIVE REGION), AR	---	2,400,000
	LOWER WHITE RIVER, BIG CREEK & TRIBUTARIES, AR....	---	175,000
SUBTOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....		3,645,000	6,220,000
CONSTRUCTION			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	91,300,000	91,300,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, PHILLIPS COUNTY, AR.....	512,000	512,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	23,400,000	23,400,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS BASIN, AR & MO, CONSOLIDATED.....	10,100,000	10,100,000
(FC)	WHITEMAN'S CREEK, AR.....	260,000	260,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, FLOODWAY SYSTEM, LA.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	28,000,000	28,000,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI AND LOUISIANA ESTUARINE AREAS, MS & LA....	2,100,000	2,100,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, LA.....	4,600,000	4,600,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
(FC)	HORN LAKE CREEK & TRIBUTARIES (INCL COW PEN CREEK), MS	331,000	331,000
(FC)	SARDIS DAM, MS (DAM SAFETY).....	11,528,000	11,528,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(37,743,000)	(37,743,000)
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	8,322,000	8,322,000
(FC)	DEMONSTRATION EROSION CONTROL, MS.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	REFORMULATION UNIT, MS.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
(FC)	UPPER YAZOO PROJECTS, MS.....	4,100,000	4,100,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER F&WL MITIGATION LANDS, MS.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS.....	696,000	696,000
(FC)	NONCONNAH CREEK, TN & MS.....	200,000	200,000
(FC)	WEST TENNESSEE TRIBUTARIES, TN.....	2,400,000	2,400,000
SUBTOTAL, CONSTRUCTION.....		225,874,000	225,874,000
MAINTENANCE			
(FC)	CHANNEL IMPROVEMENT, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.....	66,579,000	66,579,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - NORTH BANK, AR.....	583,000	583,000
(FC)	LOWER ARKANSAS RIVER - SOUTH BANK, AR.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER LEVEES, AR, IL, KY, LA, MS, MO & TN.	4,916,000	4,916,000
(FC)	ST FRANCIS RIVER BASIN, AR & MO.....	9,129,000	9,129,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS, AR & LA.....	2,217,000	2,217,000
(FC)	WHITE RIVER BACKWATER, AR.....	1,652,000	1,652,000
(FC)	ATCHAFALAYA BASIN, LA.....	13,694,000	13,694,000
(FC)	BATON ROUGE HARBOR DEVILS SWAMP, LA.....	230,000	230,000
(FC)	BAYOU COCODRIE AND TRIBUTARIES, LA.....	120,000	120,000
(FC)	BONNET CARRE, LA.....	710,000	710,000
(FC)	LOWER RED RIVER - SOUTH BANK LEVEES, LA.....	8,000	8,000
(FC)	MISSISSIPPI DELTA REGION, CAERNARVON, LA.....	39,000	39,000
(FC)	OLD RIVER, LA.....	4,736,000	4,736,000
(FC)	TENSAS BASIN, RED RIVER BACKWATER, LA.....	2,620,000	2,620,000
(N)	GREENVILLE HARBOR, MS.....	269,000	269,000
(N)	VICKSBURG HARBOR, MS.....	217,000	217,000
	YAZOO BASIN, MS:	(18,443,000)	(26,243,000)
(FC)	ARKABUTLA LAKE, MS.....	2,244,000	3,444,000
(FC)	BIG SUNFLOWER RIVER, MS.....	1,672,000	1,672,000
(FC)	ENID LAKE, MS.....	2,333,000	3,833,000
(FC)	GREENWOOD, MS.....	1,421,000	1,421,000
(FC)	GRENADA LAKE, MS.....	2,677,000	4,177,000
(FC)	MAIN STEM, MS.....	2,784,000	2,784,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, MS.....	2,465,000	4,665,000
(FC)	TRIBUTARIES, MS.....	1,330,000	2,730,000
(FC)	WILL M WHITTINGTON AUX CHAN, MS.....	410,000	410,000
(FC)	YAZOO BACKWATER, MS.....	447,000	447,000
(FC)	YAZOO CITY, MS.....	660,000	660,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	3,782,000	4,282,000
(N)	MEMPHIS HARBOR (MCKELLAR LAKE), TN.....	1,595,000	1,595,000
(FC)	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.....	1,348,000	1,348,000
(FC)	MAPPING.....	948,000	948,000
SUBTOTAL, MAINTENANCE.....		133,860,000	142,160,000
REDUCTION FOR SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....		-20,379,000	-25,379,000
TOTAL, FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.....		343,000,000	348,875,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:			
(N)	NAVIGATION		
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL		

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
ALABAMA			
(FC)	ALABAMA - COOSA COMPREHENSIVE WATER STUDY, AL.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
(N)	ALABAMA - COOSA RIVER, AL.....	4,681,000	6,800,000
(N)	BLACK WARRIOR AND TOMBIGBEE RIVERS, AL.....	15,496,000	20,000,000
(N)	DOG AND FOWL RIVERS, AL.....	---	529,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, AL.....	3,014,000	4,000,000
(MP)	MILLERS FERRY LOCK & DAM - WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY LAK	3,169,000	3,169,000
(N)	MOBILE HARBOR, AL.....	23,024,000	25,000,000
(MP)	ROBERT F HENRY LOCK AND DAM, AL.....	5,878,000	5,878,000
(N)	TENNESSEE - TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY, AL & MS.....	18,049,000	20,000,000
(MP)	WALTER F GEORGE LOCK AND DAM, AL & GA.....	6,842,000	6,842,000
ALASKA			
(N)	ANCHORAGE HARBOR, AK.....	1,750,000	1,750,000
(FC)	CHENA RIVER LAKES, AK.....	1,419,000	1,869,000
(N)	DILLINGHAM HARBOR, AK.....	603,000	603,000
(N)	HOMER HARBOR, AK.....	292,000	292,000
(N)	KETCHIKAN, THOMAS BASIN, AK.....	270,000	270,000
(N)	NINILCHIK HARBOR, AK.....	191,000	191,000
(N)	NOME HARBOR, AK.....	349,000	349,000
(N)	WRANGELL NARROWS, AK.....	70,000	70,000
AMERICAN SAMOA			
(N)	OFU HARBOR, AS.....	255,000	255,000
ARIZONA			
(FC)	ALAMO LAKE, AZ.....	982,000	982,000
(FC)	PAINTED ROCK DAM, AZ.....	876,000	876,000
(FC)	TUCSON DIVERSION CHANNEL, AZ.....	---	550,000
(FC)	WHITLOW RANCH DAM, AZ.....	102,000	102,000
ARKANSAS			
(MP)	BEAVER LAKE, AR.....	4,295,000	4,295,000
(MP)	BLAKELY MT DAM - LAKE OUACHITA, AR.....	4,147,000	4,147,000
(FC)	BLUE MOUNTAIN LAKE, AR.....	1,123,000	1,123,000
(MP)	BULL SHOALS LAKE, AR.....	5,185,000	5,185,000
(MP)	DARDANELLE LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	6,691,000	6,691,000
(MP)	DEGRAY LAKE, AR.....	7,209,000	7,209,000
(FC)	DEQUEEN LAKE, AR.....	1,014,000	1,014,000
(FC)	DIERKS LAKE, AR.....	1,026,000	1,026,000
(FC)	GILLHAM LAKE, AR.....	1,007,000	1,007,000
(MP)	GREENS FERRY LAKE, AR.....	4,737,000	4,737,000
(N)	HELENA HARBOR, AR.....	480,000	480,000
(N)	MCCLELLAN - KERR ARKANSAS RIVER NAVIGATION SYSTEM, AR.	26,247,000	26,247,000
(FC)	MILLWOOD LAKE, AR.....	2,254,000	2,254,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	NARROWS DAM - LAKE GREESON, AR.....	4,072,000	4,072,000
(FC)	NIMROD LAKE, AR.....	1,313,000	1,313,000
(MP)	NORFORK LAKE, AR.....	3,702,000	3,702,000
(N)	OSCEOLA HARBOR, AR.....	602,000	602,000
(N)	OUACHITA AND BLACK RIVERS, AR & LA.....	5,625,000	5,625,000
(MP)	OZARK - JETA TAYLOR LOCK AND DAM, AR.....	5,797,000	5,797,000
(N)	WHITE RIVER, AR.....	2,110,000	2,110,000
(N)	YELLOW BEND PORT, AR.....	139,000	139,000
CALIFORNIA			
(FC)	BLACK BUTTE LAKE, CA.....	1,505,000	1,505,000
(FC)	BUCHANAN DAM - H V EASTMAN LAKE, CA.....	1,507,000	1,507,000
(FC)	COYOTE VALLEY DAM (LAKE MENDOCINO), CA.....	2,363,000	2,363,000
(FC)	DRY CREEK (WARM SPRINGS) LAKE AND CHANNEL, CA.....	2,968,000	2,968,000
(FC)	FARMINGTON DAM, CA.....	146,000	146,000
(FC)	HIDDEN DAM - HENSLEY LAKE, CA.....	1,948,000	1,948,000
(N)	HUMBOLDT HARBOR AND BAY, CA.....	3,322,000	3,322,000
(FC)	ISABELLA LAKE, CA.....	918,000	918,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBOR MODEL, CA.....	155,000	155,000
(N)	LOS ANGELES - LONG BEACH HARBORS, CA.....	95,000	495,000
(FC)	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA, CA.....	3,390,000	3,590,000
	LOS ANGELES COUNTY DRAINAGE AREA (HANSEN DAM), CA.....	---	2,790,000
	LOS ANGELES RIVER (SEPULVEDA BASIN TO ARROYO SECO), CA.....	---	400,000
(N)	MARINA DEL REY, CA.....	2,105,000	2,105,000
(FC)	MERCED COUNTY STREAM GROUP, CA.....	176,000	176,000
(FC)	MOJAVE RIVER DAM, CA.....	190,000	190,000
(N)	MORRO BAY HARBOR, CA.....	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	NAPA RIVER, CA.....	2,397,000	2,197,000
(FC)	NEW HOGAN LAKE, CA.....	1,734,000	1,734,000
(MP)	NEW MELONES LAKE (DOWNSTREAM CHANNEL), CA.....	849,000	849,000
(N)	OAKLAND HARBOR, CA.....	2,593,000	2,593,000
	OCEANSIDE EXPERIMENTAL SAND BYPASS, CA.....	---	4,000,000
(N)	OCEANSIDE HARBOR, CA.....	845,000	845,000
(N)	PETALUMA RIVER, CA.....	1,850,000	1,850,000
(FC)	PINE FLAT LAKE, CA.....	2,064,000	2,064,000
(N)	RICHMOND HARBOR, CA.....	2,342,000	2,342,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER (30 FOOT PROJECT), CA.....	404,000	404,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES (DEBRIS CONTROL), CA.....	882,000	882,000
(N)	SACRAMENTO RIVER SHALLOW DRAFT CHANNEL, CA.....	151,000	151,000
(N)	SAN DIEGO HARBOR, CA.....	150,000	150,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY - DELTA MODEL STRUCTURE, CA.....	2,221,000	2,221,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO BAY LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, CA.....	896,000	896,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR AND BAY (DRIFT REMOVAL), CA.....	2,208,000	2,208,000
(N)	SAN FRANCISCO HARBOR, CA.....	1,952,000	1,952,000
(N)	SAN JOAQUIN RIVER, CA.....	1,427,000	1,427,000
(N)	SAN PABLO BAY AND MARE ISLAND STRAIT, CA.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
(FC)	SANTA ANA RIVER BASIN, CA.....	2,824,000	2,824,000
(N)	SANTA BARBARA HARBOR, CA.....	1,625,000	1,625,000
	SANTA CRUZ HARBOR, CA.....	---	100,000
(FC)	SUCCESS LAKE, CA.....	1,459,000	2,259,000
(N)	SUISUN BAY CHANNEL, CA.....	2,020,000	2,020,000
(FC)	TERMINUS DAM (LAKE KAWEAH), CA.....	1,307,000	1,307,000
(N)	VENTURA HARBOR, CA.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
(N)	YUBA RIVER, CA.....	19,000	19,000
COLORADO			
(FC)	BEAR CREEK LAKE, CO.....	362,000	362,000
(FC)	CHATFIELD LAKE, CO.....	663,000	663,000
(FC)	CHERRY CREEK LAKE, CO.....	534,000	534,000
(FC)	JOHN MARTIN RESERVOIR, CO.....	2,336,000	2,336,000
(FC)	TRINIDAD LAKE, CO.....	655,000	655,000
CONNECTICUT			
(FC)	BLACK ROCK LAKE, CT.....	434,000	434,000
(FC)	COLEBROOK RIVER LAKE, CT.....	509,000	509,000
(FC)	HANCOCK BROOK LAKE, CT.....	237,000	237,000
(FC)	HOP BROOK LAKE, CT.....	787,000	787,000
(FC)	MANSFIELD HOLLOW LAKE, CT.....	524,000	524,000
(FC)	NORTHFIELD BROOK LAKE, CT.....	334,000	334,000
(FC)	STAMFORD HURRICANE BARRIER, CT.....	205,000	205,000
(FC)	THOMASTON DAM, CT.....	514,000	514,000
(FC)	WEST THOMPSON LAKE, CT.....	519,000	519,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
DELAWARE			
(N)	CEDAR CREEK, DE.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	CHESAPEAKE AND DELAWARE CANAL - ST GEORGES BRIDGE REPL	14,000,000	14,000,000
(N)	INDIAN RIVER INLET AND BAY, DE.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, DELAWARE R TO CHESAPEAKE BAY, D	11,200,000	11,200,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, REHOBOTH BAY TO DELAWARE BAY, D	37,000	37,000
(N)	MISPELLION RIVER, DE.....	1,040,000	1,040,000
(N)	MURDERKILL RIVER, DE.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, DE.....	3,447,000	3,447,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
(N)	POTOMAC AND ANACOSTIA RIVERS (DRIFT REMOVAL), DC.....	689,000	689,000
(N)	POTOMAC BELOW WASHINGTON, DC.....	575,000	575,000
(N)	WASHINGTON HARBOR, DC.....	30,000	30,000
FLORIDA			
(N)	AIWW, NORFOLK TO ST JOHNS RIVER, FL, GA, SC, NC & VA..	1,115,000	1,115,000
(N)	ANCLOTE RIVER, FL.....	630,000	630,000
(N)	CANAVERAL HARBOR, FL.....	2,195,000	2,195,000
(FC)	CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN, FL.....	8,189,000	8,189,000
(N)	CHARLOTTE HARBOR, FL.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	CLEARWATER PASS, FL.....	290,000	290,000
(N)	ESCAMBIA - CONECUH RIVERS, FL.....	431,000	431,000
(N)	FERNANDINA HARBOR, FL.....	1,610,000	1,610,000
(N)	FORT MYERS BEACH FL.....	430,000	430,000
(N)	FORT PIERCE HARBOR, FL.....	906,000	906,000
(N)	HORSESHOE COVE, FL.....	---	500,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, CALOOSAHATCHEE R TO ANCLOTE R..	134,000	375,000
(N)	INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, JACKSONVILLE TO MIAMI, FL.....	2,940,000	2,940,000
(N)	JACKSONVILLE HARBOR, FL.....	5,840,000	5,840,000
(MP)	JIM WOODRUFF LOCK AND DAM, LAKE SEMINOLE, FL, AL & GA.	5,642,000	5,642,000
(N)	LONG BOAT PASS, FL.....	875,000	875,000
(N)	MIAMI HARBOR, FL.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	OKEECHOBEE WATERWAY, FL.....	4,284,000	4,284,000
(N)	OKLAWAHA RIVER, FL.....	67,000	67,000
(N)	PALM BEACH HARBOR, FL.....	1,225,000	1,225,000
(N)	PANAMA CITY HARBOR, FL.....	391,000	391,000
(N)	PONCE DE LEON INLET, FL.....	65,000	65,000
(N)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, FL.....	3,044,000	3,044,000
(N)	ST AUGUSTINE HARBOR, FL.....	467,000	467,000
(N)	ST LUCIE INLET, FL.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	TAMPA HARBOR, FL.....	3,636,000	3,636,000
(N)	WITHLACOOCHIE RIVER, FL.....	50,000	50,000
GEORGIA			
(MP)	ALLATOONA LAKE, GA.....	5,016,000	5,016,000
(N)	APALACHICOLA CHATTAHOOCHEE AND FLINT RIVERS, GA, AL &.	3,959,000	3,959,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, GA.....	1,877,000	1,877,000
(N)	BRUNSWICK HARBOR, GA.....	3,474,000	3,474,000
(MP)	BUFORD DAM AND LAKE SIDNEY LANIER, GA.....	6,426,000	6,426,000
(MP)	CARTERS DAM AND LAKE, GA.....	3,793,000	3,793,000
(MP)	HARTWELL LAKE, GA & SC.....	7,350,000	7,350,000
(MP)	J STROM THURMOND LAKE, GA & SC.....	7,021,000	7,021,000
(MP)	RICHARD B RUSSELL, GA.....	4,915,000	4,915,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR LONG TERM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, GA.....	481,000	481,000
(N)	SAVANNAH HARBOR, GA.....	9,634,000	9,634,000
(N)	SAVANNAH RIVER BELOW AUGUSTA, GA.....	156,000	156,000
(MP)	WEST POINT DAM AND LAKE, GA & AL.....	4,690,000	4,690,000
HAWAII			
(N)	BARBERS POINT HARBOR, HI.....	94,000	94,000
(N)	HONOLULU HARBOR, HI.....	100,000	100,000
(N)	PORT ALLEN HARBOR, KAUAI, HI.....	2,489,000	2,489,000
IDAHO			
(MP)	ALBENI FALLS DAM, ID.....	5,725,000	5,725,000
(MP)	DWORSHAK DAM AND RESERVOIR, ID.....	7,108,000	7,108,000
(FC)	LUCKY PEAK LAKE, ID.....	899,000	899,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
ILLINOIS			
(N)	CALUMET HARBOR AND RIVER, IL.....	1,693,000	1,693,000
(FC)	CARLYLE LAKE, IL.....	3,332,000	3,332,000
(N)	CHICAGO HARBOR, IL.....	1,901,000	1,901,000
(N)	CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	476,000	476,000
(FC)	FARM CREEK RESERVOIRS, IL.....	410,000	410,000
(N)	ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL, IL.....	110,000	110,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (LMVD PORTION), IL.....	1,001,000	1,001,000
(N)	ILLINOIS WATERWAY (NCD PORTION), IL & IN.....	19,332,000	19,332,000
(N)	KASKASKIA RIVER NAVIGATION, IL.....	1,723,000	1,723,000
(N)	LAKE MICHIGAN DIVERSION, IL.....	434,000	434,000
(FC)	LAKE SHELBYVILLE, IL.....	3,937,000	3,937,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS (LMVD PORTION), IL	13,071,000	13,071,000
(N)	MISS R BETWEEN MO R AND MINNEAPOLIS, IL, IA, MN, MO & NORTH BRANCH CHICAGO RIVER, IL.....	85,590,000	85,590,000
(FC)	REND LAKE, IL.....	3,704,000	3,704,000
(N)	WAUKEGAN HARBOR, IL.....	505,000	505,000
INDIANA			
(FC)	BEVERLY SHORES, IN.....	48,000	48,000
(FC)	BROOKVILLE LAKE, IN.....	520,000	520,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY HARBOR, IN.....	1,302,000	1,302,000
(N)	BURNS WATERWAY SMALL BOAT HARBOR, IN.....	150,000	150,000
(FC)	CAGLES MILL LAKE, IN.....	530,000	530,000
(FC)	CECIL M HARDEN LAKE, IN.....	784,000	784,000
(FC)	HUNTINGTON LAKE, IN.....	534,000	534,000
(N)	INDIANA HARBOR, IN.....	369,000	369,000
(N)	MICHIGAN CITY HARBOR, IN.....	71,000	449,000
(FC)	MISSISSINewa LAKE, IN.....	704,000	704,000
(FC)	MONROE LAKE, IN.....	1,027,000	1,027,000
(FC)	PATOKA LAKE, IN.....	530,000	530,000
(FC)	SALAMONIE LAKE, IN.....	772,000	772,000
IOWA			
(FC)	CORALVILLE LAKE, IA.....	2,837,000	2,837,000
(FC)	MISSOURI RIVER - KENSLERS BEND, NE TO SIOUX CITY, IA..	65,000	65,000
(N)	MISSOURI RIVER - SIOUX CITY TO MOUTH, IA, NE, KS & MO.	5,473,000	5,473,000
(FC)	RATHBUN LAKE, IA.....	2,832,000	2,832,000
(FC)	RED ROCK DAM - LAKE RED ROCK, IA.....	2,976,000	2,976,000
(FC)	SAYLORVILLE LAKE, IA.....	3,258,000	3,258,000
KANSAS			
(FC)	CLINTON LAKE, KS.....	1,410,000	1,410,000
(FC)	COUNCIL GROVE LAKE, KS.....	734,000	734,000
(FC)	EL DORADO LAKE, KS.....	480,000	480,000
(FC)	ELK CITY LAKE, KS.....	809,000	809,000
(FC)	FALL RIVER LAKE, KS.....	845,000	845,000
(FC)	HILLSDALE LAKE, KS.....	675,000	675,000
(FC)	JOHN REDMOND DAM AND RESERVOIR, KS.....	2,182,000	2,182,000
(FC)	KANOPOLIS LAKE, KS.....	1,194,000	1,194,000
(FC)	MARION LAKE, KS.....	894,000	894,000
(FC)	MELVERN LAKE, KS.....	1,482,000	1,482,000
(FC)	MILFORD LAKE, KS.....	1,737,000	1,737,000
(FC)	PEARSON - SKUBITZ BIG HILL LAKE, KS.....	871,000	871,000
(FC)	PERRY LAKE, KS.....	1,795,000	1,795,000
(FC)	POMONA LAKE, KS.....	1,921,000	1,921,000
(FC)	TORONTO LAKE, KS.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	TUTTLE CREEK LAKE, KS.....	1,726,000	1,726,000
(FC)	WILSON LAKE, KS.....	1,256,000	1,256,000
KENTUCKY			
(MP)	BARKLEY DAM AND LAKE BARKLEY, KY.....	6,574,000	6,574,000
(FC)	BARREN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,416,000	1,416,000
(N)	BIG SANDY HARBOR, KY.....	1,035,000	1,035,000
(FC)	BUCKHORN LAKE, KY.....	907,000	1,407,000
(FC)	CARR FORK LAKE, KY.....	1,061,000	1,061,000
(FC)	CAVE RUN LAKE, KY.....	810,000	810,000
(FC)	DEWEY LAKE, KY.....	965,000	965,000
(N)	ELVIS STAHR (HICKMAN) HARBOR, KY.....	525,000	525,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(FC)	FISHTRAP LAKE, KY.....	1,121,000	1,121,000
(FC)	GRAYSON LAKE, KY.....	815,000	815,000
(N)	GREEN AND BARREN RIVERS, KY.....	1,574,000	1,574,000
(FC)	GREEN RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,312,000	1,312,000
(N)	KENTUCKY RIVER, KY.....	1,009,000	1,009,000
(MP)	LAUREL RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,850,000	1,850,000
(N)	LICKING RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY.....	19,000	19,000
(FC)	MARTINS FORK LAKE, KY.....	613,000	613,000
(FC)	MIDDLESBORO CUMBERLAND RIVER BASIN, KY.....	42,000	42,000
(FC)	NOLIN LAKE, KY.....	1,756,000	1,756,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV....	58,502,000	59,002,000
(N)	OHIO RIVER OPEN CHANNEL WORK, KY, IL, IN, OH, PA & WV..	6,243,000	6,243,000
(FC)	PAINTSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	742,000	742,000
(FC)	ROUGH RIVER LAKE, KY.....	1,271,000	1,271,000
(FC)	TAYLORSVILLE LAKE, KY.....	851,000	1,271,000
(MP)	WOLF CREEK DAM - LAKE CUMBERLAND, KY.....	4,200,000	4,200,000
(FC)	YATESVILLE LAKE, KY.....	842,000	842,000
LOUISIANA			
(N)	ATCHAFALAYA RIVER AND BAYOUS CHENE, BOEUF AND BLACK, L	6,150,000	9,150,000
(N)	BARATARIA BAY WATERWAY, LA.....	815,000	815,000
(FC)	BAYOU BODCAU RESERVOIR, LA.....	431,000	431,000
(FC)	BAYOU PIERRE, LA.....	25,000	25,000
(N)	BAYOU TECHE, LA.....	940,000	940,000
(FC)	CADDO LAKE, LA.....	115,000	115,000
(N)	CALCASIEU RIVER AND PASS, LA.....	9,176,000	9,176,000
(N)	FRESHWATER BAYOU, LA.....	1,860,000	1,860,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, LA & TX SECTION.....	13,795,000	13,795,000
(N)	HOUMA NAVIGATION CANAL, LA.....	2,250,000	2,250,000
(N)	LAKE PROVIDENCE HARBOR, LA.....	301,000	301,000
(N)	MADISON PARISH PORT, LA.....	49,000	49,000
(N)	MERMENTAU RIVER, LA.....	1,525,000	1,525,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - BATON ROUGE TO GULF OF MEXICO, LA..	40,470,000	42,970,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER - GULF OUTLET, LA.....	12,810,000	12,810,000
(N)	MISSISSIPPI RIVER OUTLETS AT VENICE, LA.....	2,470,000	2,470,000
(N)	RED RIVER WATERWAY - MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO SHREVEPORT,..	5,908,000	5,908,000
(FC)	REMOVAL OF AQUATIC GROWTH, LA.....	1,698,000	1,698,000
(FC)	WALLACE LAKE, LA.....	184,000	184,000
MARYLAND			
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), MD.....	371,000	371,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS),	431,000	431,000
(N)	BALTIMORE HARBOR AND CHANNELS, MD & VA.....	10,470,000	10,470,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, MD.....	45,000	45,000
(N)	CHESTER RIVER, MD.....	350,000	350,000
(FC)	CUMBERLAND, MD AND RIDGELEY, WV.....	94,000	94,000
(N)	HERRING BAY AND ROCKHOLD CREEK, MD.....	66,000	66,000
(N)	HONGA RIVER AND TAR BAY, MD.....	820,000	820,000
(N)	ISLAND CREEK ST GEORGE ISLAND, MD.....	45,000	45,000
(FC)	JENNINGS RANDOLPH LAKE, MD & WV.....	1,318,000	1,318,000
(N)	NANTICOKE RIVER NORTHWEST FORK, MD.....	40,000	40,000
(N)	NORTHEAST RIVER, MD.....	55,000	55,000
(N)	OCEAN CITY HARBOR AND INLET AND SINEPUXENT BAY, MD....	67,000	67,000
(N)	RHODES POINT TO TYLERTON, MD.....	403,000	403,000
(N)	SLAUGHTER CREEK, MD.....	380,000	380,000
(N)	TRED AVON RIVER, MD.....	69,000	69,000
(N)	WICOMICO RIVER, MD.....	633,000	633,000
MASSACHUSETTS			
(FC)	BARRE FALLS DAM, MA.....	362,000	362,000
(FC)	BIRCH HILL DAM, MA.....	302,000	302,000
(FC)	BUFFUMVILLE LAKE, MA.....	441,000	441,000
(N)	CAPE COD CANAL, MA.....	9,731,000	9,731,000
(FC)	CHARLES RIVER NATURAL VALLEY STORAGE AREA, MA.....	177,000	177,000
(FC)	CONANT BROOK LAKE, MA.....	153,000	153,000
(FC)	EAST BRIMFIELD LAKE, MA.....	333,000	333,000
(FC)	HODGES VILLAGE DAM, MA.....	348,000	348,000
(FC)	KNIGHTVILLE DAM, MA.....	439,000	439,000
(FC)	LITTLEVILLE LAKE, MA.....	414,000	414,000
(FC)	NEW BEDFORD FAIRHAVEN ACUSHNET HURRICANE BARRIER, MA..	198,000	198,000
(FC)	TULLY LAKE, MA.....	428,000	428,000
(FC)	WEST HILL DAM, MA.....	435,000	435,000
(FC)	WESTVILLE LAKE, MA.....	453,000	453,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
MICHIGAN			
(N)	ARCADIA HARBOR, MI.....	49,000	49,000
(N)	BOLLES HARBOR, MI.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	CHANNELS IN LAKE ST CLAIR, MI.....	218,000	218,000
(N)	CHARLEVOIX HARBOR, MI.....	556,000	556,000
(N)	DETROIT RIVER, MI.....	3,577,000	3,577,000
	FLINT RIVER FLOOD CONTROL, MI.....	---	2,500,000
(N)	FRANKFORT HARBOR, MI.....	798,000	798,000
(N)	GRAND HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	930,000	930,000
(N)	GRELICKVILLE, MI.....	119,000	119,000
(N)	HARBOR BEACH HARBOR, MI.....	80,000	80,000
(N)	HOLLAND HARBOR, MI.....	488,000	488,000
(N)	INLAND ROUTE, MI.....	44,000	44,000
(N)	KEWEENAW WATERWAY, MI.....	752,000	752,000
(N)	LAC LA BELLE, MI.....	126,000	126,000
(N)	LELAND HARBOR, MI.....	123,000	123,000
(N)	LITTLE LAKE HARBOR, MI.....	165,000	165,000
(N)	LUDINGTON HARBOR, MI.....	2,563,000	2,563,000
(N)	MANISTEE HARBOR, MI.....	252,000	252,000
(N)	MENOMINEE HARBOR, MI & WI.....	192,000	192,000
(N)	MONROE HARBOR, MI.....	1,451,000	1,451,000
(N)	MUSKEGON HARBOR, MI.....	164,000	164,000
(N)	NEW BUFFALO HARBOR, MI.....	99,000	99,000
(N)	ONTONAGON HARBOR, MI.....	3,544,000	3,544,000
(N)	PENTWATER HARBOR, MI.....	144,000	144,000
(N)	PRESQUE ISLE HARBOR, MI.....	942,000	942,000
(N)	ROUGE RIVER, MI.....	135,000	135,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI.....	2,675,000	2,675,000
(N)	SAGINAW RIVER, MI (DIKE DISPOSAL).....	300,000	300,000
(FC)	SEBEWAING RIVER (ICE JAM REMOVAL), MI.....	13,000	13,000
(N)	SOUTH HAVEN HARBOR, MI.....	1,142,000	1,142,000
(N)	ST CLAIR RIVER, MI.....	1,003,000	1,003,000
(N)	ST JAMES HARBOR, MI.....	90,000	90,000
(N)	ST JOSEPH HARBOR, MI.....	1,210,000	1,210,000
(MP)	ST MARYS RIVER, MI.....	15,115,000	15,115,000
MINNESOTA			
(FC)	BIGSTONE LAKE WHETSTONE RIVER, MN & SD.....	497,000	497,000
(N)	DULUTH - SUPERIOR HARBOR, MN & WI.....	4,290,000	4,290,000
(N)	GRAND MARAIS HARBOR, MN.....	171,000	171,000
(FC)	LAC QUI PARLE LAKES, MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	796,000	796,000
(N)	MINNESOTA RIVER, MN.....	145,000	145,000
(FC)	ORWELL LAKE, MN.....	1,362,000	1,362,000
(FC)	RED LAKE RIVER, MN.....	177,000	177,000
(N)	RESERVOIRS AT HEADWATERS OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MN.....	2,996,000	2,996,000
	SAUK LAKE, MN.....	---	40,000
MISSISSIPPI			
(N)	BILOXI HARBOR, MS.....	838,000	838,000
(N)	CLAIBORNE COUNTY PORT, MS.....	3,000	3,000
(FC)	EAST FORK, TOMBIGBEE RIVER, MS.....	592,000	592,000
(N)	GULFPORT HARBOR, MS.....	2,146,000	2,146,000
(N)	MOUTH OF YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	165,000	165,000
(FC)	OKATIBBEE LAKE, MS.....	1,431,000	1,431,000
(N)	PASCAGOULA HARBOR, MS.....	3,606,000	3,606,000
	PASS CHRISTIAN HARBOR, MS.....	---	693,000
(N)	PEARL RIVER, MS & LA.....	270,000	270,000
(N)	ROSEDALE HARBOR, MS.....	403,000	403,000
(N)	YAZOO RIVER, MS.....	79,000	79,000
MISSOURI			
(N)	CARUTHERSVILLE HARBOR, MO.....	392,000	392,000
(MP)	CLARENCE CANNON DAM AND MARK TWAIN LAKE, MO.....	4,993,000	4,993,000
(FC)	CLEARWATER LAKE, MO.....	2,550,000	2,550,000
(MP)	HARRY S TRUMAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, MO.....	8,815,000	8,815,000
(FC)	LITTLE BLUE RIVER LAKES, MO.....	841,000	841,000
(FC)	LONG BRANCH LAKE, MO.....	663,000	663,000
(N)	MISS RIVER BETWEEN OHIO AND MO RIVERS, MO & IL (REG WO.....	14,565,000	14,565,000
	NEW MADRID COUNTY HARBOR, MO.....	---	250,000
(FC)	POMME DE TERRE LAKE, MO.....	1,695,000	1,695,000
(FC)	SMITHVILLE LAKE, MO.....	1,076,000	1,076,000
(N)	SOUTHEAST MISSOURI PORT, MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MO.....	202,000	202,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	STOCKTON LAKE, MO.....	3,093,000	3,093,000
(MP)	TABLE ROCK LAKE, MO.....	4,660,000	4,660,000
(FC)	UNION LAKE, MO.....	17,000	17,000
(FC)	WAPPAPELLO LAKE, MO.....	10,000	10,000
MONTANA			
(MP)	FT PECK DAM AND LAKE, MT.....	3,657,000	3,786,000
(MP)	LIBBY DAM, LAKE KOOCANUSA, MT.....	7,409,000	7,409,000
NEBRASKA			
(MP)	GAVINS POINT DAM, LEWIS AND CLARK LAKE, NE & SD.....	5,778,000	5,778,000
(FC)	HARLAN COUNTY LAKE, NE.....	1,632,000	1,632,000
	MISSOURI NATIONAL RECREATIONAL RIVER, NE & SD.....	---	200,000
(MP)	MISSOURI R MASTER WTR CONTROL MANUAL, NE, IA, KS, MO..	1,000,000	1,000,000
(FC)	PAPILLION CREEK & TRIBUTARIES LAKES, NE.....	594,000	594,000
(FC)	SALT CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, NE.....	688,000	688,000
NEVADA			
(FC)	MARTIS CREEK LAKE, NV & CA.....	405,000	405,000
(FC)	PINE AND MATHEWS CANYONS LAKES, NV.....	276,000	276,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE			
(FC)	BLACKWATER DAM, NH.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	EDWARD MACDOWELL LAKE, NH.....	377,000	377,000
(FC)	FRANKLIN FALLS DAM, NH.....	689,000	689,000
(FC)	HOPKINTON - EVERETT LAKES, NH.....	1,023,000	1,023,000
(FC)	OTTER BROOK LAKE, NH.....	445,000	445,000
(FC)	SURRY MOUNTAIN LAKE, NH.....	442,000	442,000
NEW JERSEY			
(N)	BARNEGAT INLET, NJ.....	1,050,000	1,050,000
(N)	COLD SPRING INLET, NJ.....	826,000	826,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA TO THE SEA, NJ, PA & DE..	12,669,000	12,669,000
(N)	DELAWARE RIVER, PHILADELPHIA, PA TO TRENTON, NJ.....	260,000	260,000
	MAURICE RIVER, NJ.....	---	1,500,000
(N)	NEW JERSEY INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NJ.....	3,007,000	3,007,000
(N)	NEWARK BAY, HACKENSACK AND PASSAIC RIVER, NJ.....	1,420,000	1,420,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER TO ARTHUR KILL CUT-OFF, NJ.....	60,000	60,000
(N)	RARITAN RIVER, NJ.....	700,000	700,000
NEW MEXICO			
(FC)	ABIQUIU DAM, NM.....	1,245,000	1,245,000
(FC)	COCHITI LAKE, NM.....	1,739,000	1,739,000
(FC)	CONCHAS LAKE, NM.....	866,000	866,000
(FC)	GALISTEO DAM, NM.....	271,000	271,000
(FC)	JEMEZ CANYON DAM, NM.....	849,000	849,000
(FC)	SANTA ROSA DAM AND LAKE, NM.....	799,000	799,000
(FC)	TWO RIVERS DAM, NM.....	327,000	327,000
NEW YORK			
(FC)	ALMOND LAKE, NY.....	356,000	356,000
(FC)	ARKPORT DAM, NY.....	188,000	188,000
(N)	BAY RIDGE AND RED HOOK CHANNELS, NY.....	495,000	495,000
(N)	BLACK ROCK CHANNEL AND TONAWANDA HARBOR, NY.....	1,435,000	1,435,000
(N)	BUFFALO HARBOR, NY.....	585,000	585,000
(N)	BUTTERMILK CHANNEL, NY.....	50,000	50,000
(N)	EAST RIVER, NY.....	195,000	195,000
(N)	EAST ROCKAWAY INLET, NY.....	1,258,000	1,258,000
(FC)	EAST SIDNEY LAKE, NY.....	351,000	351,000
(N)	EASTCHESTER CREEK, NY.....	70,000	70,000
(N)	FIRE ISLAND TO JONES INLET, NY.....	1,870,000	1,870,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER CHANNEL, NY.....	940,000	940,000
(N)	HUDSON RIVER, NY.....	2,127,000	2,127,000
(N)	JAMAICA BAY, NY.....	500,000	500,000
(N)	JONES INLET, NY.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	LAKE MONTAUK HARBOR, NY.....	60,000	60,000
(FC)	MT MORRIS LAKE, NY.....	1,366,000	1,366,000
(N)	NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY CHANNELS, NY.....	2,050,000	2,050,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (DRIFT REMOVAL), NY & NJ.....	4,470,000	4,470,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS)..	740,000	740,000
(N)	NEW YORK HARBOR, NY.....	5,734,000	5,734,000
(N)	PORTCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	295,000	295,000
(N)	ROCHESTER HARBOR, NY.....	92,000	92,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(N)	SHINNECOCK INLET, NY.....	100,000	100,000
(FC)	SOUTHERN NEW YORK FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS, NY.....	692,000	692,000
(FC)	WHITNEY POINT LAKE, NY.....	489,000	489,000
NORTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, NC.....	6,117,000	6,117,000
(FC)	B EVERETT JORDAN DAM AND LAKE, NC.....	1,133,000	1,133,000
(N)	BEAUFORT HARBOR, NC.....	378,000	378,000
(N)	BOGUE INLET AND CHANNEL, NC.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
(N)	CAPE FEAR RIVER ABOVE WILMINGTON, NC.....	598,000	700,000
(N)	CAROLINA BEACH INLET, NC.....	571,000	571,000
(FC)	FALLS LAKE, NC.....	987,000	987,000
(N)	LOCKWOODS FOLLY RIVER, NC.....	924,000	924,000
(N)	MANTEO (SHALLOWBAG) BAY, NC.....	6,103,000	6,103,000
(N)	MASONBORO INLET AND CONNECTING CHANNELS, NC.....	1,500,000	2,500,000
(N)	MOREHEAD CITY HARBOR, NC.....	2,595,000	2,595,000
(N)	NEW RIVER INLET, NC.....	950,000	950,000
(N)	OCRACOKE INLET, NC.....	278,000	278,000
(FC)	W KERR SCOTT DAM AND RESERVOIR, NC.....	1,670,000	1,670,000
(N)	WILMINGTON HARBOR, NC.....	6,203,000	6,203,000
NORTH DAKOTA			
(FC)	BOWMAN HALEY LAKE, ND.....	251,000	251,000
(MP)	GARRISON DAM, LAKE SAKAKAWEA, ND.....	9,098,000	9,148,000
(FC)	HOMME LAKE, ND.....	243,000	243,000
(FC)	LAKE ASHTABULA AND BALDHILL DAM, ND.....	955,000	955,000
(FC)	PIPESTEM LAKE, ND.....	361,000	361,000
(FC)	SOURIS RIVER, ND.....	96,000	96,000
OHIO			
(FC)	ALUM CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,826,000	1,826,000
(N)	ASHTABULA HARBOR, OH.....	2,155,000	2,155,000
(FC)	BERLIN LAKE, OH.....	1,575,000	1,575,000
(FC)	CAESAR CREEK LAKE, OH.....	713,000	713,000
(FC)	CLARENCE J BROWN DAM, OH.....	490,000	490,000
(N)	CLEVELAND HARBOR, OH.....	4,868,000	4,868,000
(N)	CONNEAUT HARBOR, OH.....	677,000	677,000
(FC)	DEER CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,766,000	1,766,000
(FC)	DELAWARE LAKE, OH.....	1,677,000	1,677,000
(FC)	DILLON LAKE, OH.....	1,694,000	1,694,000
(N)	FAIRPORT HARBOR, OH.....	1,185,000	1,185,000
(N)	HURON HARBOR, OH.....	867,000	867,000
(N)	LORAIN HARBOR, OH.....	437,000	437,000
(FC)	MASSILLON LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	MICHAEL J KIRWAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, OH.....	926,000	926,000
(FC)	MOSQUITO CREEK LAKE, OH.....	612,000	612,000
(FC)	MUSKINGUM RIVER LAKES, OH.....	6,170,000	6,170,000
(FC)	NORTH BRANCH KOKOSING RIVER LAKE, OH.....	244,000	244,000
(FC)	PAINT CREEK LAKE, OH.....	1,795,000	1,795,000
(FC)	ROSEVILLE LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECT, OH.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	SANDUSKY HARBOR, OH.....	963,000	963,000
(N)	TOLEDO HARBOR, OH.....	6,896,000	7,896,000
(FC)	TOM JENKINS DAM, OH.....	269,000	269,000
(FC)	WEST FORK OF MILL CREEK LAKE, OH.....	387,000	387,000
(FC)	WILLIAM H HARSHA LAKE, OH.....	640,000	640,000
OKLAHOMA			
(FC)	ARCADIA LAKE, OK.....	343,000	343,000
(FC)	BIRCH LAKE, OK.....	653,000	653,000
(MP)	BROKEN BOW LAKE, OK.....	1,413,000	1,413,000
(FC)	CANDY LAKE, OK.....	25,000	25,000
(FC)	CANTON LAKE, OK.....	1,343,000	1,343,000
(FC)	COPAN LAKE, OK.....	638,000	638,000
(MP)	EUFULA LAKE, OK.....	4,262,000	4,262,000
(MP)	FORT GIBSON LAKE, OK.....	2,868,000	2,868,000
(FC)	FORT SUPPLY LAKE, OK.....	678,000	678,000
(FC)	GREAT SALT PLAINS LAKE, OK.....	335,000	335,000
(FC)	HEYBURN LAKE, OK.....	657,000	657,000
(FC)	HUGO LAKE, OK.....	1,293,000	1,293,000
(FC)	HULAH LAKE, OK.....	400,000	400,000
(FC)	KAW LAKE, OK.....	2,149,000	2,149,000
(MP)	KEYSTONE LAKE, OK.....	2,827,000	2,827,000
(FC)	OLOGAH LAKE, OK.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	OPTIMA LAKE, OK.....	487,000	487,000
(FC)	PENSACOLA RESERVOIR - LAKE OF THE CHEROKEES, OK.....	4,000	4,000
(FC)	PINE CREEK LAKE, OK.....	1,121,000	1,121,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	ROBERT S KERR LOCK AND DAM AND RESERVOIRS, OK.....	2,861,000	2,861,000
(FC)	SARDIS LAKE, OK.....	876,000	876,000
(FC)	SKIATOOK LAKE, OK.....	1,089,000	1,089,000
(MP)	TENKILLER FERRY LAKE, OK.....	2,818,000	2,818,000
(FC)	WAURIKA LAKE, OK.....	1,202,000	1,202,000
(MP)	WEBBERS FALLS LOCK AND DAM, OK.....	2,499,000	2,499,000
(FC)	WISTER LAKE, OK.....	747,000	747,000
OREGON			
(FC)	APPLEGATE LAKE, OR.....	567,000	567,000
(FC)	BLUE RIVER LAKE, OR.....	259,000	259,000
(MP)	BONNEVILLE LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	16,200,000	16,200,000
(N)	CHETCO RIVER, OR.....	677,000	677,000
(N)	COLUMBIA & LWR WILLAMETTE R BLW VANCOUVER, WA & PORTLA	8,817,000	8,817,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT THE MOUTH, OR & WA.....	9,006,000	9,006,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WA AND THE DALLES, O	374,000	374,000
(N)	COOS BAY, OR.....	5,470,000	5,470,000
(N)	COQUILLE RIVER, OR.....	405,000	405,000
(FC)	COTTAGE GROVE LAKE, OR.....	589,000	589,000
(MP)	COUGAR LAKE, OR.....	1,101,000	1,101,000
(N)	DEPOE BAY, OR.....	---	585,000
(MP)	DETROIT LAKE, OR.....	2,160,000	2,160,000
(FC)	DORENA LAKE, OR.....	639,000	639,000
(FC)	FALL CREEK LAKE, OR.....	508,000	508,000
(FC)	FERN RIDGE LAKE, OR.....	749,000	749,000
(MP)	GREEN PETER - FOSTER LAKES, OR.....	2,610,000	2,610,000
(MP)	HILLS CREEK LAKE, OR.....	856,000	856,000
(MP)	JOHN DAY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	20,610,000	20,610,000
(MP)	LOOKOUT POINT LAKE, OR.....	4,857,000	4,857,000
(MP)	LOST CREEK LAKE, OR.....	3,663,000	3,663,000
(MP)	M McNARY LOCK AND DAM, OR & WA.....	9,434,000	9,434,000
(N)	PORT ORFORD, OR.....	226,000	226,000
(N)	ROGUE RIVER, OR.....	718,000	718,000
(N)	SIUSLAW RIVER, OR.....	733,000	733,000
(N)	SKIPANON CHANNEL, OR.....	13,000	13,000
(N)	UMPQUA RIVER, OR.....	1,301,000	1,301,000
(N)	WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OR.....	885,000	885,000
(FC)	WILLOW CREEK LAKE, OR.....	460,000	460,000
(N)	YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OR.....	1,520,000	1,520,000
PENNSYLVANIA			
(N)	ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.....	10,892,000	10,892,000
(FC)	ALVIN R BUSH DAM, PA.....	490,000	490,000
(FC)	AYLESWORTH CREEK LAKE, PA.....	172,000	172,000
(FC)	BELTZVILLE LAKE, PA.....	932,000	932,000
(FC)	BLUE MARSH LAKE, PA.....	1,498,000	1,498,000
(FC)	CONEMAUGH RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,311,000	1,311,000
(FC)	COWANESQUE LAKE, PA.....	1,398,000	1,398,000
(FC)	CROOKED CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,059,000	1,059,000
(FC)	CURWENSVILLE LAKE, PA.....	497,000	497,000
(FC)	EAST BRANCH CLARION RIVER LAKE, PA.....	994,000	994,000
(N)	ERIE HARBOR, PA.....	40,000	40,000
(FC)	FOSTER JOSEPH SAYERS DAM, PA.....	569,000	569,000
(FC)	FRANCIS E WALTER DAM, PA.....	855,000	855,000
(FC)	GENERAL EDGAR JADWIN DAM AND RESERVOIR, PA.....	537,000	537,000
(FC)	JOHNSTOWN, PA.....	1,909,000	1,909,000
(FC)	KINZUA DAM AND ALLEGHENY RESERVOIR, PA.....	1,493,000	1,493,000
(FC)	LOYALHANNA LAKE, PA.....	1,138,000	1,138,000
(FC)	MAHONING CREEK LAKE, PA.....	1,064,000	1,064,000
(N)	MONONGAHELA RIVER, PA.....	16,070,000	16,070,000
(FC)	PROMPTON LAKE, PA.....	524,000	524,000
(FC)	PUNXSUTAWNEY, PA.....	47,000	47,000
(FC)	RAYSTOWN LAKE, PA.....	2,583,000	2,583,000
(N)	SCHUYLKILL RIVER, PA.....	1,395,000	1,395,000
(FC)	SHENANGO RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,745,000	1,745,000
(FC)	STILLWATER LAKE, PA.....	295,000	295,000
(FC)	TIOGA-HAMMOND LAKES, PA.....	1,439,000	1,439,000
(FC)	TIONESTA LAKE, PA.....	1,425,000	1,425,000
(FC)	UNION CITY LAKE, PA.....	543,000	543,000
(FC)	WOODCOCK CREEK LAKE, PA.....	753,000	753,000
(FC)	YORK INDIAN ROCK DAM, PA.....	494,000	494,000
(FC)	YOUGHIOGHENY RIVER LAKE, PA.....	1,800,000	1,800,000

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
PUERTO RICO			
(N)	SAN JUAN HARBOR, PR.....	1,355,000	1,355,000
SOUTH CAROLINA			
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, SC.....	2,092,000	2,092,000
(N)	BROOKGREEN GARDEN CANAL, SC.....	5,000	5,000
(N)	CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,615,000	3,615,000
(N)	COOPER RIVER, CHARLESTON HARBOR, SC.....	3,574,000	3,574,000
(N)	FOLLY RIVER, SC.....	320,000	320,000
(N)	GEORGETOWN HARBOR, SC.....	3,070,000	3,070,000
(N)	JEREMY CREEK, SC.....	3,000	3,000
(N)	LITTLE RIVER INLET, SC & NC.....	111,000	111,000
(N)	MURRELLS INLET, SC.....	93,000	93,000
(N)	PORT ROYAL HARBOR, SC.....	1,714,000	1,714,000
(N)	SHIPYARD RIVER, SC.....	35,000	35,000
(N)	TOWN CREEK, SC.....	540,000	540,000
SOUTH DAKOTA			
(MP)	BIG BEND DAM - LAKE SHARPE, SD.....	5,980,000	5,980,000
(FC)	COLD BROOK LAKE, SD.....	182,000	182,000
(FC)	COTTONWOOD SPRINGS LAKE, SD.....	165,000	165,000
(MP)	FT RANDALL DAM - LAKE FRANCIS CASE, SD.....	9,986,000	9,986,000
(FC)	LAKE TRAVERSE, SD & MN.....	581,000	581,000
(MP)	OAHE DAM - LAKE OAHE, SD & ND.....	9,689,000	9,689,000
TENNESSEE			
(MP)	CENTER HILL LAKE, TN.....	7,533,000	7,618,000
(MP)	CHEATHAM LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	4,905,000	4,905,000
(MP)	CORDELL HULL DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	4,454,000	4,454,000
(MP)	DALE HOLLOW LAKE, TN.....	3,487,000	3,487,000
(MP)	J PERCY PRIEST DAM AND RESERVOIR, TN.....	2,640,000	2,695,000
(MP)	OLD HICKORY LOCK AND DAM, TN.....	4,920,000	4,920,000
(N)	TENNESSEE RIVER, TN.....	13,472,000	13,472,000
(N)	WOLF RIVER HARBOR, TN.....	698,000	698,000
TEXAS			
(FC)	AQUILLA LAKE, TX.....	973,000	973,000
(FC)	ARKANSAS - RED RIVER CHLORIDE CONTROL - AREA VIII, TX.....	956,000	956,000
(FC)	BARDWELL LAKE, TX.....	2,080,000	2,080,000
(FC)	BELTON LAKE, TX.....	3,267,000	3,267,000
(FC)	BENBROOK LAKE, TX.....	2,459,000	2,459,000
(N)	BRAZOS ISLAND HARBOR, TX.....	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	BUFFALO BAYOU AND TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	2,182,000	2,182,000
(FC)	CANYON LAKE, TX.....	1,378,000	1,378,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO HARLINGEN, TX.....	340,000	340,000
(FC)	COOPER LAKE AND CHANNELS, TX.....	1,034,000	1,034,000
(N)	CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	10,315,000	10,315,000
(MP)	DENISON DAM - LAKE TEXOMA, TX.....	6,045,000	6,045,000
(FC)	ESTELLINE SPRINGS EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT, TX.....	3,000	3,000
(FC)	FERRELLS BRIDGE DAM - LAKE O'THE PINES, TX.....	1,833,000	1,833,000
(N)	FREEMONT HARBOR, TX.....	5,458,000	5,458,000
(N)	GALVESTON HARBOR AND CHANNEL, TX.....	3,614,000	3,614,000
(N)	GIWW - CHANNEL TO VICTORIA, TX.....	1,607,000	1,607,000
(N)	GIWW - CHOCOLATE BAYOU, TX.....	1,570,000	1,570,000
(FC)	GRANGER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,287,000	1,287,000
(FC)	GRAPEVINE LAKE, TX.....	1,947,000	1,947,000
(N)	GREENS BAYOU CHANNEL, TX.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, TX.....	13,476,000	13,476,000
(FC)	HORDS CREEK LAKE, TX.....	983,000	983,000
(N)	HOUSTON SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	11,034,000	11,034,000
(FC)	JOE POOL LAKE, TX.....	1,029,000	1,029,000
(FC)	LAKE KEMP, TX.....	230,000	230,000
(FC)	LAVON LAKE, TX.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
(FC)	LEWISVILLE DAM, TX.....	2,371,000	2,371,000
(N)	MATAGORDA SHIP CHANNEL, TX.....	3,445,000	3,445,000
(N)	MOUTH OF THE COLORADO RIVER, TX.....	1,470,000	1,470,000
(FC)	NAVARRO MILLS LAKE, TX.....	1,219,000	1,219,000
(FC)	NORTH SAN GABRIEL DAM AND LAKE GEORGETOWN, TX.....	1,187,000	1,187,000
(FC)	O C FISHER DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	1,473,000	1,473,000
(FC)	PAT MAYSE LAKE, TX.....	860,000	860,000
(FC)	PROCTOR LAKE, TX.....	2,287,000	2,287,000
(FC)	RAY ROBERTS LAKE, TX.....	3,342,000	3,342,000
(N)	SABINE - NECHES WATERWAY, TX.....	10,045,000	10,045,000

## CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
(MP)	SAM RAYBURN DAM AND RESERVOIR, TX.....	4,326,000	5,326,000
(FC)	SOMERVILLE LAKE, TX.....	2,692,000	2,692,000
(FC)	STILLHOUSE HOLLOW DAM, TX.....	1,585,000	1,585,000
(MP)	TOWN BLUFF DAM - B A STEINHAGEN LAKE, TX.....	1,788,000	1,788,000
(N)	TRINITY RIVER & TRIBUTARIES, TX.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
(FC)	WACO LAKE, TX.....	2,599,000	2,599,000
(FC)	WALLISVILLE LAKE, TX.....	501,000	501,000
(MP)	WHITNEY LAKE, TX.....	4,278,000	4,278,000
(FC)	WRIGHT PATMAN DAM AND LAKE, TX.....	2,214,000	2,814,000
VERMONT			
(FC)	BALL MOUNTAIN LAKE, VT.....	745,000	745,000
(N)	NARROWS OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN, VT & NY.....	42,000	42,000
(FC)	NORTH HARTLAND LAKE, VT.....	509,000	509,000
(FC)	NORTH SPRINGFIELD LAKE, VT.....	584,000	584,000
(FC)	TOWNSHEND LAKE, VT.....	753,000	753,000
(FC)	UNION VILLAGE DAM, VT.....	463,000	463,000
VIRGINIA			
(N)	APPOMATTOX RIVER, VA.....	281,000	281,000
(N)	ATLANTIC INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY, VA.....	3,366,000	3,366,000
(N)	BROAD CREEK, VA.....	189,000	189,000
(N)	CHANNEL TO NEWPORT NEWS, VA.....	847,000	847,000
(N)	CHINCOTEAGUE INLET, VA.....	1,065,000	1,065,000
(FC)	GATHRIGHT DAM AND LAKE MOOMAW, VA.....	1,725,000	1,725,000
(N)	HAMPTON RDS, NORFOLK & NEWPORT NEWS HBR, VA (DRIFT REM)	525,000	525,000
(N)	HOSKINS CREEK, VA.....	511,000	511,000
(N)	JAMES RIVER CHANNEL, VA.....	1,299,000	1,299,000
(MP)	JOHN H KERR DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA & NC.....	7,401,000	7,401,000
(FC)	JOHN W FLANNAGAN DAM AND RESERVOIR, VA.....	1,293,000	1,293,000
(N)	LITTLE WICOMICO RIVER, VA.....	200,000	200,000
(N)	LYNNHAVEN INLET, VA.....	778,000	778,000
(N)	MONROE BAY AND CREEK, VA.....	400,000	400,000
(N)	NANSEMOND RIVER, VA.....	429,000	429,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR (PREVENTION OF OBSTRUCTIVE DEPOSITS), V	100,000	100,000
(N)	NORFOLK HARBOR AND CHANNELS, VA.....	7,103,000	7,103,000
(FC)	NORTH FORK OF POUND RIVER LAKE, VA.....	339,000	339,000
(N)	PAGAN RIVER, VA.....	400,000	400,000
(MP)	PHILPOTT LAKE, VA.....	2,233,000	2,233,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT ALEXANDRIA, VA.....	75,000	75,000
(N)	POTOMAC RIVER AT MT VERNON, VA.....	309,000	309,000
(N)	RUDEE INLET, VA.....	452,000	452,000
(N)	TANGIER CHANNEL, VA.....	30,000	30,000
(N)	THIMBLE SHOAL CHANNEL, VA.....	174,000	174,000
(N)	WATERWAY ON THE COAST OF VIRGINIA, VA.....	1,118,000	1,118,000
(N)	WHITINGS CREEK, MIDDLESEX CO, VA.....	195,000	195,000
(N)	WILLOUGHBY CHANNEL, VA.....	155,000	155,000
WASHINGTON			
(N)	ANACORTES HARBOR, WA.....	20,000	20,000
(N)	BELLINGHAM HARBOR, WA.....	28,000	28,000
(MP)	CHIEF JOSEPH DAM, WA.....	15,437,000	15,437,000
(N)	COLUMBIA RIVER AT BAKER BAY, WA & OR.....	18,000	18,000
(MP)	COLUMBIA RIVER SYSTEM OPERATION REVIEW, WA, ID, MT & O	640,000	640,000
(N)	EVERETT HARBOR AND SNOHOMISH RIVER, WA.....	890,000	890,000
(N)	GRAYS HARBOR AND CHEHALIS RIVER, WA.....	7,529,000	7,529,000
(FC)	HOWARD A HANSON DAM, WA.....	945,000	945,000
(MP)	ICE HARBOR LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,661,000	7,661,000
(N)	LAKE WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL, WA.....	5,165,000	5,165,000
(MP)	LITTLE GOOSE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	4,617,000	4,617,000
(MP)	LOWER GRANITE LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	5,668,000	5,668,000
(MP)	LOWER MONUMENTAL LOCK AND DAM, WA.....	7,181,000	7,181,000
(FC)	MILL CREEK LAKE, VIRGIL B BENNINGTON LAKE, WA.....	563,000	563,000
(FC)	MT ST HELENS, WA.....	451,000	451,000
(FC)	MUD MOUNTAIN DAM, WA.....	1,629,000	1,629,000
(N)	PUGET SOUND AND TRIBUTARY WATERS, WA.....	1,139,000	1,139,000
(N)	SEATTLE HARBOR, WA.....	584,000	584,000
(FC)	STILLAGUAMISH RIVER, WA.....	165,000	165,000
(N)	SWINOMISH CHANNEL, WA.....	392,000	392,000
(FC)	TACOMA, PUYALLUP RIVER, WA.....	47,000	47,000
(MP)	THE DALLES LOCK AND DAM, WA & OR.....	11,169,000	11,169,000
(N)	WATERWAY CONNECTING PORT TOWNSEND AND OAK BAY, WA.....	43,000	43,000
(N)	WILLAPA RIVER AND HARBOR, WA.....	125,000	125,000

CORPS OF ENGINEERS - OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TYPE OF PROJECT	PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE
WEST VIRGINIA			
(FC)	BEECH FORK LAKE, WV.....	935,000	935,000
(FC)	BLUESTONE LAKE, WV.....	2,643,000	3,643,000
(FC)	BURNSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,421,000	1,421,000
(FC)	EAST LYNN LAKE, WV.....	946,000	946,000
(N)	ELK RIVER HARBOR, WV.....	18,000	18,000
(FC)	ELKINS, WV.....	31,000	31,000
(N)	KANAWHA RIVER LOCKS AND DAMS, WV.....	11,509,000	11,509,000
(FC)	R D BAILEY LAKE, WV.....	1,234,000	1,234,000
(FC)	STONEWALL JACKSON LAKE, WV.....	938,000	938,000
(FC)	SUMMERSVILLE LAKE, WV.....	1,243,000	1,243,000
(FC)	SUTTON LAKE, WV.....	2,832,000	2,832,000
(N)	TYGART LAKE, WV.....	1,370,000	1,370,000
WISCONSIN			
(N)	ASHLAND HARBOR, WI.....	265,000	265,000
(N)	BIG SUAMICO HARBOR, WI.....	184,000	184,000
(N)	CORNUCOPIA HARBOR, WI.....	207,000	207,000
(FC)	EAU GALLE RIVER LAKE WISCONSIN, WI.....	477,000	477,000
(N)	FOX RIVER, WI.....	2,781,000	2,781,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI.....	1,833,000	1,833,000
(N)	GREEN BAY HARBOR, WI (DIKE DISPOSAL).....	30,000	30,000
(N)	KEWAUNEE HARBOR, WI.....	290,000	290,000
(FC)	LA FARGE LAKE, WI.....	70,000	70,000
(N)	MANITOWOC HARBOR, WI.....	775,000	775,000
(N)	MILWAUKEE HARBOR, WI.....	2,874,000	2,874,000
(N)	PORT WASHINGTON HARBOR, WI.....	259,000	259,000
(N)	SAXON HARBOR, WI.....	132,000	132,000
(N)	SHEBOYGAN HARBOR, WI.....	793,000	793,000
(N)	STURGEON BAY, WI.....	326,000	326,000
(N)	TWO RIVERS HARBOR, WI.....	86,000	86,000
WYOMING			
(FC)	JACKSON HOLE LEVEES, WY.....	1,015,000	1,015,000
MISCELLANEOUS			
	COASTAL INLET RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
	COST SHARE BEACH DISPOSAL (SECTION 933).....	600,000	600,000
	DREDGING RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	3,487,000	3,487,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL DREDGING (SECTION 312).....	---	750,000
	ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW GUIDE FOR OPERATIONS (ERGO).....	4,000,000	4,000,000
	INSPECTION OF COMPLETED WORKS.....	6,889,000	6,889,000
	MONITORING OF COMPLETED COASTAL PROJECTS.....	2,100,000	2,100,000
	NATIONAL DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	20,000	20,000
	NATIONAL EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM (NEPP).....	7,000,000	7,000,000
	NATIVE AMERICAN GRAVES PROTECTION AND REPATRIATION....	3,931,000	3,931,000
	PROJECT CONDITION SURVEYS.....	10,709,000	10,709,000
	PROTECTION, CLEARING, AND STRAIGHTENING OF CHANNELS...	50,000	50,000
	REAL TIME WATER CONTROL RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	675,000	675,000
	RECREATION PARTNERSHIP INITIATIVES (RPI).....	400,000	400,000
	REMOVAL OF SUNKEN VESSELS.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
	REPAIR, EVALUATION, MAINTENANCE & REHAB RESEARCH.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
	RIVER CONFLUENCE ICE RESEARCH.....	650,000	650,000
	SCHEDULING RESERVOIR OPERATIONS.....	3,200,000	3,200,000
	SURVEILLANCE OF NORTHERN BOUNDARY WATERS.....	3,764,000	3,764,000
	WATERBORNE COMMERCE STATISTICS.....	4,310,000	4,310,000
	WETLANDS MITIGATION BANKING DEMONSTRATION STUDY.....	335,000	335,000
	WETLANDS RESEARCH PROGRAM.....	5,283,000	5,283,000
	REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGE.....	-25,487,000	-35,480,000
TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.....		1,657,700,000	1,688,990,000
TYPE OF PROJECT:			
(N)	NAVIGATION		
(BE)	BEACH EROSION CONTROL		
(FC)	FLOOD CONTROL		
(MP)	MULTIPURPOSE, INCLUDING POWER		



BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
<b>GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b>		
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
UPPER SAN PEDRO RIVER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	80,000	80,000
TUCSON/PHOENIX WATER CONSERVATION AND EXCHANGE STUDY..	300,000	300,000
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		
AMERICAN RIVER FOLSOM SOUTH OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	65,000	65,000
DELTA WATER MANAGEMENT.....	---	50,000
OFFSTREAM STORAGE INVESTIGATION.....	---	20,000
SACRAMENTO VALLEY RICELANDS/WETLANDS CONJUNC. USE STUD	500,000	500,000
SALTON SEA RESEARCH PROJECT.....	---	100,000
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY CONVEYANCE.....	---	10,000
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMPREHENSIVE WATER.....	200,000	200,000
PUTAH CREEK FLOW OPTIMIZATION INVESTIGATION.....	50,000	50,000
<b>COLORADO</b>		
GRAND VALLEY PROJECT WATER CONSERVATION STUDY .....	50,000	50,000
UPPER ARKANSAS RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY INVEST.....	125,000	125,000
YAMPA RIVER WATER SUPPLY STUDY .....	100,000	100,000
<b>IDAHO</b>		
IDAHO RIVER SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT.....	175,000	175,000
<b>MONTANA</b>		
FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.....	---	200,000
MUSSELSHELL RIVER WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.....	80,000	80,000
WESTERN MONTANA WATER CONSERVATION STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>		
MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ASSESSMENT/MGMT STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
PECOS RIVER BASIN FISH AND WILDLIFE.....	100,000	100,000
RIO PUERCO WATERSHED SEDIMENTATION & WATER QUALITY STU	50,000	50,000
SAN JUAN RIVER - GALLUP WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	---	500,000
<b>NEBRASKA</b>		
PICK SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM, PRAIRIE BEND UNIT..	---	75,000
<b>OREGON</b>		
CARLTON LAKE RESTORATION.....	100,000	100,000
GRANDE RONDE WATER OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	55,000	55,000
JOSEPHINE COUNTY WATER MGMT IMPROVEMENT STUDY.....	90,000	90,000
NORTHWEST OREGON REGIONAL WATER SUPPLY STUDY .....	100,000	100,000
OREGON STREAM RESTORATION PLANNING STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
OREGON SUBBASIN CONSERVATION PLANNING.....	200,000	200,000
OWYHEE PROJECT STORAGE OPTIMIZATION STUDY.....	200,000	200,000
UPPER DESCHUTES RIV BASIN WATER CONSERVATION PROJ.....	120,000	320,000
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>		
BLACK HILLS REGIONAL WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	100,000	100,000
LEWIS AND CLARK RURAL WATER SYSTEM.....	---	50,000
<b>TEXAS</b>		
EDWARDS ACQUIFER REG. WATER RESOURCES & MGMT STUDY....	175,000	175,000
LOWER RIO GRANDE BASIN STUDY.....	190,000	190,000
RINCON BAYOU—NUECES MARSH WETLANDS.....	175,000	175,000
<b>UTAH</b>		
UTAH LAKE WATER MANAGEMENT STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
WEBER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	150,000	150,000
<b>WYOMING</b>		
WIND RIVER BASIN STUDY.....	88,000	88,000
<b>VARIOUS</b>		
BEAR RIVER INTRESTATE WATER SUPPLY STUDY.....	75,000	75,000
BEAR RIVER BASIN WATER QUALITY/WATERSHED.....	150,000	150,000

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
COLORADO RIVER WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
ENVIRONMENTAL & INTERAGENCY COORDINATION ACTIVITIES...	3,234,000	3,234,000
FISH & WILDLIFE HABITAT PRESERVATION & ENHANCEMENT....	50,000	50,000
GENERAL PLANNING STUDIES.....	900,000	900,000
INVESTIGATION OF EXISTING PROJECTS.....	455,000	455,000
LOWER COLORADO RIVER REGULATORY STORAGE STUDY.....	150,000	150,000
MINOR WORK ON COMPLETED INVESTIGATIONS.....	236,000	236,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN WATER RESOURCE MGMT PLANS.....	150,000	150,000
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.....	1,346,000	1,346,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN SALMON MIGRATION WATER STUDY..	200,000	200,000
UPPER SNAKE RIVER BASIN STORAGE OPTIMIZATION.....	200,000	200,000
WEST TEXAS/SOUTHERN NEW MEXICO WATER RESOURCE INVEST..	100,000	100,000
RECLAMATION WASTE WATER STUDIES.....	---	1,000,000
REDUCTION FOR ANTICIPATED SAVINGS AND SLIPPAGES.....	---	-1,100,000
<b>TOTAL, GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS.....</b>	<b>12,714,000</b>	<b>13,819,000</b>
<b>CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM</b>		
<b>CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION</b>		
<b>AND</b>		
<b>COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS</b>		
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
INDIAN WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT PROJECTS.....	3,023,000	3,023,000
TRES RIOS WETLANDS DEMONSTRATION.....	---	500,000
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		
<b>CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT:</b>		
AUBURN-FOLSOM SOUTH UNIT.....	1,825,000	1,825,000
MISCELLANEOUS PROJECT PROGRAMS.....	16,015,000	20,190,000
SACRAMENTO RIVER DIVISION.....	4,814,000	4,814,000
SAN LUIS UNIT.....	50,000	50,000
TRINITY RIVER RESTORATION PROGRAM.....	3,535,000	3,535,000
LOS ANGELES AREA WATER RECLAMATION & REUSE PROJECTS.	---	5,250,000
SAN GABRIEL BASIN DEMONSTRATION.....	---	5,000,000
<b>COLORADO</b>		
GRAND VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	15,444,000	15,444,000
LOWER GUNNISON BASIN UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	4,193,000	4,193,000
PARADOX VALLEY UNIT, TITLE II, CRBSCP.....	3,958,000	3,958,000
<b>MONTANA</b>		
HUNGRY HORSE DAM.....	---	3,500,000
<b>NEBRASKA</b>		
NORTH LOUP DIVISION, P-SMBP.....	5,928,000	5,928,000
<b>NEVADA</b>		
NEWLANDS PROJECT.....	---	100,000
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>		
GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT, P-SMBP.....	30,000,000	32,000,000
<b>OREGON</b>		
UMATILLA BASIN PROJECT.....	6,300,000	9,900,000
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>		
BELLE FOURCHE UNIT, P-SMBP.....	7,310,000	7,310,000
MNI WICONI PROJECT.....	3,000,000	10,000,000
MID DAKOTA PROJECT.....	---	2,000,000
<b>TEXAS</b>		
LAKE MEREDITH SALINITY CONTROL PROJECT, TX & OK.....	---	1,400,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
WASHINGTON		
COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT: IRRIGATION FACILITIES.....	4,000,000	4,800,000
VARIOUS		
BOULDER CANYON PROJECT, AZ-NV.....	4,754,000	4,754,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJ., TITLE I..	8,257,000	8,257,000
SUBTOTAL, REGULAR CONSTRUCTION.....	122,406,000	157,731,000
DRAINAGE AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION:		
BOISE PROJECT, PAYETTE DIVISION, IDAHO.....	2,395,000	2,395,000
BRANTLEY PROJECT, NEW MEXICO.....	2,092,000	2,092,000
COLORADO RIVER FRONT WORK & LEVEE SYSTEM, AR, CO....	1,250,000	1,250,000
COLUMBIA & SNAKE RIVER SALMON RECOVERY PROJECT.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
CULTURAL RESOURCES ACT., ID,ND,MT,OR,SE,WA,WY.....	62,000	62,000
FRYINGAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO.....	400,000	400,000
HEADGATE ROCK HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT, AZ, CA.....	51,000	51,000
KLAMATH PROJECT, OREGON-CALIFORNIA.....	2,442,000	2,442,000
MC GEE CREEK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....	100,000	100,000
MINIDOKA PROJECT, IDAHO.....	315,000	315,000
MOUNTAIN PARK PROJECT, OKLAHOMA.....	500,000	500,000
NEULANDS PROJECT, NEVADA.....	2,379,000	2,379,000
NUECES RIVER PROJECT, TEXAS.....	700,000	700,000
PALMETTO BEND PROJECT, TEXAS.....	100,000	100,000
PICK-SLOAN MISSOURI BASIN PROGRAM:		
BOSTWICK DIVISION, NEBRASKA.....	230,000	1,230,000
EAST BENCH UNIT, MONTANA.....	50,000	50,000
FARWELL UNIT, NEBRASKA.....	560,000	560,000
OAHE UNIT, SOUTH DAKOTA.....	96,000	96,000
OWL CREEK UNIT, WYOMING.....	15,000	15,000
RECLAMATION RECREATION MANAGMENT ACT - TITLE 28.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
RECREATION FACILITIES AT EXISTING RESV, VARIOUS.....	151,000	151,000
SAN LUIS VALLEY PROJECT, CLOSED BASIN DIVISION.....	390,000	390,000
TUALATIN PROJECT, OREGON.....	---	450,000
WETLANDS DEVELOPMENT, VARIOUS.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
YAKIMA FISH PASSAGE/PROTECTIVE FACILITIES, WA.....	725,000	725,000
SUBTOTAL, DRAINAGE ADN MINOR CONSTRUCTION.....	20,803,000	22,253,000
SAFETY OF DAMS PROGRAMS:		
BITTER ROOT PROJECT, COMO DAM, MONTANA.....	500,000	500,000
BOISE PROJECT, DEER FLAT DAM, IDAHO.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, VERNAL UNIT, STEINAKER DAM, UT	1,099,000	1,099,000
DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR DAM SAFETY PROGRAM.....	650,000	650,000
HYRUM PROJECT, UTAH.....	341,000	341,000
ITITIATE SOD CORRECTION ACTION, VARIOUS.....	18,136,000	18,136,000
MODIFICATION REPORTS & PRECONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.....	2,500,000	2,500,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, BARTLETT DAM, ARIZONA.....	12,897,000	12,897,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, HORSESHOE DAM, ARIZONA.....	14,234,000	14,234,000
SALT RIVER PROJECT, STEWART MTN. DAM, ARIZONA.....	227,000	227,000
SAN CARLOS IRRIGATION - COOLIDGE DAM, ARIZONA.....	7,903,000	7,903,000
SUBTOTAL, SAFETY OF DAMS.....	62,487,000	62,487,000
REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT:		
MILK RIVER, GLASGOW DIVISION, MT.....	410,000	410,000
OGDEN RIVER PROJECT, UTAH.....	1,935,000	1,935,000
SHOSHONE PROJECT.....	1,100,000	1,300,000
WEBER BASIN PROJECT, UTAH.....	3,613,000	3,613,000
SUBTOTAL, REHABILITATION AND BETTERMENT.....	7,058,000	7,258,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY:		
DESALTING TECHNOLOGY.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE.....	1,012,000	1,012,000
GROUNDWATER RECHARGE DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.....	4,470,000	4,470,000
WATER TECHNOLOGY/ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH.....	4,335,000	4,335,000
SUBTOTAL, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.....	10,817,000	10,817,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION AND COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROJECTS	223,571,000	260,546,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

PROJECT TITLE	BUDGET ESTIMATE	CONFERENCE ALLOWANCE
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT		
UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN FUND AND PARTICIPATING PROJECTS		
COLORADO		
ANIMAS-LA PLATA PROJECT.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
DOLORES PROJECT.....	20,335,000	20,335,000
UTAH		
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, BONNEVILLE UNIT.....	18,857,000	18,857,000
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT, UINTAH UNIT.....	25,000	25,000
DRAINAGE & MINOR CONSTRUCTION:		
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS:		
DALLAS CREEK PROJECT.....	290,000	290,000
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES:		
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES.....	12,490,000	12,490,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES.....	3,751,000	3,751,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT.....	62,748,000	62,748,000
COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT		
ARIZONA		
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, WATER DEVELOPMENT (LCRBDF)...	160,470,000	160,470,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, NON-INDIAN DIST. SYSTEMS.....	120,000	120,000
CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT, SAFETY OF DAMS.....	18,178,000	18,178,000
TOTAL, COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT.....	178,768,000	178,768,000
ASSOCIATED ITEMS		
UNDISTRIBUTED REDUCTION BASED ON ANTICIPATED DELAYS...	-33,239,000	-37,639,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM.....	431,848,000	464,423,000
LOAN PROGRAM		
EASTERN MUNICIPAL CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICT NO. 3.....	3,800,000	3,800,000
FORT MCDOWELL INDIAN TRIBE.....	1,400,000	9,100,000
LOAN ADMINISTRATION.....	600,000	600,000
TOTAL, LOAN PROGRAM.....	5,800,000	13,500,000

## TITLE III

## DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

The summary tables at the end of this title set forth the conference agreement with respect to the individual appropriations, programs and activities of the Department of Energy. Additional items of conference agreement are discussed below.

## APPLICATION OF GENERAL REDUCTIONS

With regard to any general reductions contained in the Fiscal Year 1994 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, with the exception of activities specifically addressed by the Committees, the conferees recommend that the Department of Energy apply those reductions in the most prudent and practical manner. Any such reduction should be taken in a manner that is cost effective and generally least disruptive to the Department's missions and programs. The Department continues to maintain significant amounts of prior year uncanceled balances, particularly in capital equipment and construction project accounts. In applying any general reductions, the Department should seek to reduce these balances as much as possible. Furthermore, the Department shall consult with and make their plans for these reductions available to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees prior to implementing the reductions.

## GENERAL PLANT PROJECTS

In recent years, general plant projects authorized under Department of Defense authorization acts have been subject to statutory funding limits on the cost of individual projects, while similar projects for civilian programs of the Department have not. The Secretary should develop guidelines using the flexibility provided to the civilian programs and the direction provided in enacted authorization acts. The Secretary should establish coordinated management guidelines and funding limits for Departmentwide application which achieves maximum programmatic efficiency and effectiveness. These revised guidelines should be submitted to the House and Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittees prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1995 budget.

## MINORITY EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES

There are currently over 440,000 Hispanic students attending 125 Hispanic-serving institutions in 15 states and Puerto Rico. These colleges and universities include some of the premier research and development facilities in the world, as well as many other excellent two- and four-year institutions. These colleges and universities are poised to make an increasingly important contribution to Department of Energy research projects and programs, particularly as the DOE plans to increase its pre-designated research, development, and education funds for many minority institutions, including historically black colleges and universities.

The conferees applaud the Department of Energy's efforts to enhance the education opportunities for minority students in the areas of science and technology. The conferees strongly encourage the Department to include Hispanic-serving institutions to participate in any current or future plans to increase its pre-designated or targeted research, development, and education funds.

## ENERGY SUPPLY, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$3,223,910,000 for Energy Supply, Research and Development Activities instead of

\$3,167,634,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,249,286,000 as proposed by the Senate, deletes language proposed by the Senate restricting the funding for the gas turbine-modular helium reactor, and deletes language proposed by the House funding hydrogen research and development.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that makes funds available by transfer from the Geothermal Resources Development Fund.

## SOLAR AND RENEWABLE ENERGY PROGRAMS

The conferees agree that the solar program is funded at \$252,349,000 as indicated in the tables and the programs are to be funded at the highest level described in either the House or Senate reports, except for the reductions described in the Senate report.

*Biofuels Energy Systems.*—The Department is urged to pursue the planning of a biomass plant using switchgrass and rice straw and to submit a plan on the feasibility of such plant to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate prior to the submission of the fiscal year 1995 budget.

The conference agreement includes funds to continue ongoing research and development activities and also provides that a portion of the increase in this program for fiscal year 1994 be directed toward cost-shared validation of direct-combustion biomass technologies, including gasification technologies, injected turbines, whole tree energy, and other advanced combustion biomass technologies with a most industry-driven focus.

*Indian Energy Resources.*—The conferees recommend an appropriation of \$5,000,000 to fund and implement Indian energy resource programs in accordance with the provisions of sections 2603 and 2606 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to be administered by the Office of Technical and Financial Assistance in the energy efficiency and renewable energy organization. The conferees intend that, in allocating the funds appropriated, the Department should give priority to a mature project in which an Indian tribe has already made a substantial investment and with which the Department is already working cooperatively. In this regard, the conference is aware of the proposed Navajo transmission project in conjunction with the Western Area Power Administration and directs the Department to give every consideration to this project in allocating the funds appropriated. The conferees expect the Department to move expeditiously in allocating these funds.

## HYDROGEN RESEARCH

The conference recommendation establishes a new line for hydrogen research. Hydrogen, as a transportation fuel available from domestic sources, has the potential to play an important role in the energy security of the United States, as well as having important environmental benefits. The laboratories of the Department of Energy have extensive experience in the production, storage, transport, and safe utilization of hydrogen. Funding at the level of \$10,000,000 is provided for the Department to accelerate its hydrogen research program through a strategy of adopting available technologies and fossil sources in the short term to build experience and infrastructure for the longer term. Development of more advanced techniques, such as fuel cells and hydrogen generation using renewable energy, should be continued, and these techniques should be phased in as they become technically and economically competitive.

Development of the transportation or power end-use technologies such as fuel cells or engines, which are applications funded in other accounts (fossil energy research and development and energy conservation), should not be funded as part of hydrogen research.

## SUPERCONDUCTING MAGNETIC ENERGY STORAGE

The conferees recommend \$10,000,000 for a research program directed at the development of a superconducting magnetic energy storage (SMES) system. SMES, a state-of-the-art method of storing electrical energy in superconducting coils, offers the ability to discharge electricity as needed with 95 percent efficiency. Utilities using SMES could store excess nighttime production in the system and then withdraw that energy during the peak period of the day. It can also be used for spinning reserve, emergency power, transmission stability, and grid regulation. The conferees believe the SMES system is an important energy storage technology that also is environmentally beneficial.

The conferees recognize that the superconducting magnetic energy storage program has been under development by the Department of Defense, and in order to minimize costs and to expedite progress in the development of civilian applications, the Department should, to the extent practicable, utilize developed technology.

## NUCLEAR ENERGY PROGRAMS

The conferees recommend \$12,000,000 to continue the development of the passively safe Gas Turbine-Modular Helium Reactor as proposed by the House and \$30,400,000 for the Advance Liquid Metal Reactor/Integral Fast Reactor (ALMR/IFR) program as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees provide the full budget request of \$109,300,000 for facilities/termination. In lieu of the original budget proposal, the funds recommended are for an alternative program where the EBR-II reactor is operated through fiscal year 1996, with shutdown activities for the facility conducted in parallel with reactor operation. The funds for the termination of the MHTGR and the ALMR design are to be used to continue the program in fiscal year 1994.

## ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH

The conference provides the fiscal year 1993 level of \$158,070,000. The reduction from the budget request should be applied to the significant increase in studies performed under this budget category.

## BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

The conference provides \$1,000,000 to conduct research and develop the technology for commercial exploitation in the disposal of infectious hospital waste through electron beam sterilization at a medical research center with proven experience with this technology as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides \$5,800,000 for the Medical University of South Carolina's Cancer/Oncology Center. This appropriation will enhance the Center's research in the areas of human molecular genetics, biological risk assessment and innovative treatments in conjunction with the Department of Energy sponsored Environmental Hazards Assessment Program and the MUSC Molecular and Structural Biology program. These funds will support the establishment of a tumor bank to store and archive various cancers as well as further the development of radiosurgical approaches to tumors with environmental causation.

The conferees direct the Department of Energy to maintain the current location of the

national office and the co-located western regional office of the National Institute for Global Environmental Change. The conferees are concerned that the position of national director for the NIGEC Program has been vacant for over one year, and that the University of California has not completed the process of recruiting a scientist of international stature to head the program. The Secretary of Energy is requested to work with the president of the University of California to expedite the selection of a highly qualified national director.

The conferees have provided \$4,000,000 for the Environmental Biotechnology program at Florida A & M University to support research including support for principal investigators and research assistants at the graduate and undergraduate levels. This program, in addition to performing vitally needed research, will serve to increase the participation of minorities in this area of scientific endeavor.

The conferees are very supportive of the Department's Boron Neutron Capture Therapy (BNCT) Program and fully support the budget request of \$8,744,000. The conferees believe considerable progress has been made through support and funding for BNCT. The conferees are encouraged with the interest of a number of academic health centers and universities which have formed a BNCT-university consortium to advance treatment of brain tumors to patients in the United States. The conferees are aware and encourage the BNCT-university consortium interest, in conjunction with the National Cancer Institute, to involve national and international experts in the assessment of BNCT and the development of a strategic plan to further advance the treatment of brain tumors. To the extent available, the Department should use unobligated balances of up to \$2,000,000 to support this university consortium.

The conference agreement provides \$4,600,000 for the Biomedical Information Communication Center (BICC) at Oregon Health Sciences University to conduct research and develop a model for a statewide, high-speed information, education and data gathering network which will allow health care information, services and education to be delivered electronically. BICC is building a database for electronically encoding and storing elements of the medical record for the lifetime of a patient, the "lifetime clinical record". This database will be used to evaluate outcomes, and represents a way to track the efficacy and effect of medical treatments. Such databases, collected on large populations over long periods of time, hold the promise of answering questions that have never been answered about the long-term effects of low-level exposure to potential environmental hazards such as radiation or electromagnetic fields (EMF).

The conferees do not include funds for an international study of greenhouse gases to be conducted by the State of Illinois.

#### MAGNETIC FUSION

The conferees provide \$347,595,000 for the magnetic fusion energy program.

The conferees note with approval that the international thermonuclear experimental reactor (ITER) engineering design activity phase of the program has commenced. The conferees direct the Department of Energy to focus the Department's magnetic fusion energy program on national program elements that further the design, construction, and operation of the international thermonuclear experimental reactor and a future fusion demonstration reactor.

The Department is directed to set priorities for the domestic fusion program identifying those elements that contribute directly to the development of ITER or to the development of a fusion demonstration reactor. The Department will provide a plan that describes the selection process for the proposed site within the United States for ITER, the necessary steps that will lead to the final selection of a host site for ITER by the countries involved in the ITER program, and the schedule and critical path including milestones and budget that will be necessary to allow for the design, construction, and operation of ITER by 2005. Of the available funds, \$64,000,000 is included for ITER design and R&D. Within available funds, \$2,000,000 is provided to begin the evaluation and selection of a U.S. host site for ITER.

The deuterium-tritium experiments that will be conducted on the Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor (TFTR), located at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory (PPPL), are to have the highest priority within the U.S. fusion energy program during fiscal year 1994.

In support of ITER design and R&D tasks, and further development of a fusion demonstration reactor, \$20,000,000 is included for design work on the Tokamak Physics Experiment (TPX). The successful operation of both TPX and ITER is necessary for the development of an attractive fusion demonstration reactor. The TPX facility will be a national facility that takes advantage of the site credits at PPPL. The Department is directed to ensure that U.S. industry is fully involved in the design of TPX. Thus, it is the intent of the conferees for the TPX project to proceed with design activity including industrial participation in the engineering design and R&D. The Department should utilize standard, phased, industrial contracts for these design activities with options for construction that would permit continuity and would allow the project, if it should be approved in the future, to be completed in the most efficient and cost-effective manner.

The Department is directed to proceed with the upgrade of the DIII-D tokamak facility including increasing operating time to expedite the formulation of design solutions for TPX and ITER.

The conferees direct the Department to begin an aggressive low activation fusion materials program with the goal of developing and characterizing low activation materials that could be tested in ITER and utilized in a future demonstration power reactor.

The conferees agree with the House report language providing a \$500,000 increase, within available funds, for inertial fusion energy, and strongly urge the Department to maintain a viable inertial fusion energy program and move forward with a timely decision on the Inertial Linac Systems Experiment that would allow, if a favorable decision is rendered, construction to begin in fiscal year 1995.

#### SUPPORTING RESEARCH AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The conferees support the continuation of the Advanced Neutron Source and the conference agreement provides \$17,000,000 for the project. This is the amount needed for the continuation of essential research and development, reactor safety and regulatory compliance tasks. This will include work on the draft Environmental Impact Statement, completion of advanced conceptual design studies and updates to the appropriate baseline documentation, and applicable activities to position the project to proceed. The con-

ferrees expect a construction start next year upon accomplishment of this required work.

The conferees recommend \$3,000,000 for the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium as proposed by the House and the \$700,000 for a feasibility study to determine options for projects or programs to facilitate the adoption and long-term development of energy efficiency and renewable energy on Indian Reservations as proposed by the House.

The conferees are aware of the University of Nebraska's superconductivity research and urge the members of the Midwest Superconductivity Consortium to consider the inclusion of the institute.

The conferees recommend \$7,000,000 for the DOE Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (DOE-EPSCoR) as recommended by the Senate.

The conferees are supportive of the work done at Florida State University's Super Computations Research Institute. The Department of Energy is urged to fully utilize the facility and give consideration toward providing assistance in updating and expanding the Institute's capabilities. Accordingly, from within available funds, the conferees' recommendation includes \$8,300,000 to continue the Super Computations Research Institute.

The conferees do not include funds for the House provisions relating to the Dade County public schools, and the provision relating to the Queens Hall of Science Discovery Laboratory.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT (NON-DEFENSE)

The conferees have included funds to continue the Maywood site and Wayne site cleanup contained in the DOE Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP). This will continue the removal of contaminated materials in interim storage at Maywood and Wayne, New Jersey.

#### URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that appropriates \$177,092,000 instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and specifies specific funding and revenue sources for the Uranium Supply and Enrichment Activities.

#### URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which provides that the anticipated obligated balances should be estimated rather than prescribed.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that specifies the amount of funds to be expended for uranium and thorium decontamination required by the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

In lieu of the Senate report language concerning the appropriation of funds for the initial reimbursements of claims made by active uranium and thorium mill site licensees for remediation expenses under title X, subtitle A of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-486), the conferees are in agreement that the Department is to carry out the program and use the funds in a fair and equitable manner consistent with Public Law 102-486.

## GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$1,615,114,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,194,114,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34: Deletes language proposed by the House limiting the availability of funds to construct a B-Factory.

The conferees agree to provide \$36,000,000 for the construction of the asymmetric B-meson production facility (B-Factory) as proposed by the House. Since the review and selection of the site for the project have been completed, the restrictions contained in the House bill are no longer required.

Amendment No. 35: Deletes language proposed by the Senate restricting the availability of funds for the Superconducting Super Collider.

The conferees direct that none of the funds made available for the Superconducting Super Collider construction may be spent 90 days after the beginning of the fiscal year unless the Secretary delivers to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate an implementation plan for the specific recommendations of the Report of the DOE Review Committee on the Baseline Validation of the Superconducting Super Collider and the Secretary certifies that the management issues raised by the General Accounting Office in its report dated February 1993, number GAO/RCE-93-87, have been adequately addressed and will not reoccur.

The Los Alamos Meson Physics Facility (LAMPF), the Relativistic Heavy Ion Collider (RHIC), and the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility (CEBAF) are funded as proposed by the Senate.

Because of budget limitations, the conferees recommend a general reduction of \$15,000,000.

Language in the Act would prohibit the expenditure of funds for "food, beverages, receptions, parties, country club fees, plants or flowers pursuant to any cost-reimbursable contract". The managers do not intend to preclude legitimate activities such as cafeteria services. It is intended to prohibit the waste of the taxpayers' money on payment of contractors' country club fees or fancy parties and receptions.

## SUPERCONDUCTING SUPER COLLIDER

The conferees agree to \$640,000,000 for the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that construction of the SSC is the highest priority in particle physics today and is a critical necessity to permit progress in the basic understanding of matter into the 21st century. Numerous scientific reviews have affirmed and reaffirmed the fact that the SSC is the next logical and meaningful step in the ages-old quest for a deeper understanding of what things are made of and how they work.

As did the two preceding Presidents, President Clinton strongly supports this important project and has declared it a top priority of his Administration. In his letter of October 12, 1993, the President has stated:

The SSC represents not only the culmination of high energy physics research in the twentieth century, but also the cornerstone of continued American international scientific leadership in the century to follow. The SSC is expected to unlock fundamental secrets about the nature of matter and energy.

The SSC represents a vital investment in our nation's ability to maintain its preeminence in basic scientific research and to stimulate the development of new technologies in many areas critical to the health

of the U.S. economy. We cannot abandon our commitment to improving our national scientific and technological performance, which will, in turn, stimulate economic growth. The SSC is an investment in our future.

Fundamental science forms the foundation of technological progress. The SSC has the potential to strengthen the U.S. superconducting magnet industry. Materials and techniques resulting from the SSC will help to improve the performance of U.S. manufacturing and may stimulate advances in health care.

In her letter of October 13, 1993, the Secretary of Energy urged the continued support for the SSC and advised that the SSC will be an essential tool for carrying all of humanity to the next level of understanding about the origin of mass and the relations between mass and energy. Termination of the SSC would cause severe damage to the field of high energy physics and would signal that the United States is withdrawing from its position of clear world leadership in basic science.

The Secretary of Energy further advised of her intention to institute a number of management reforms and has committed to comply with the Senate provisions concerning the appropriate improvements.

The Secretary of Energy advised that she expects that the project will be completed in 2002 for less than \$11,000,000,000 in as-spent dollars. The conferees intend to hold the Secretary of Energy to a commitment of less than \$11,000,000,000 for the construction of the Superconducting Super Collider. If at any time the estimate for the project exceeds this figure, the Secretary should advise the Congress of actions to reduce the cost of the project or reduce its scope.

## NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL FUND

Amendment No. 36: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

*For the nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$260,000,000 to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund. To the extent that balances in the fund are not sufficient to cover amounts available for obligation in the account, the Secretary shall exercise her authority pursuant to section 302(e)(5) of said Act to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury: Provided, That of the amount herein appropriated, within available funds, not to exceed \$5,500,000 may be provided to the State of Nevada, for the sole purpose of conduct of its scientific oversight responsibilities pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, Public Law 97-425, as amended: Provided further, That of the amount herein appropriated, not more than \$7,000,000 may be provided to affected local governments, as defined in the Act, to conduct appropriate activities pursuant to the Act: Provided further, That within ninety days of the completion of each Federal fiscal year, each State or local entity shall provide certification to the Department of Energy, that all funds expended from such payments have been expended for activities as defined in Public Law 97-425, as amended. Failure to provide such certification shall cause such entity to be prohibited from any further funding provided for similar activities: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used directly or indirectly to influence legislative action on any matter pending before Congress or a State legis-*

*lature or for any lobbying activity as provided in 18 U.S.C. 1913: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used for litigation expenses: Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated may be used to support multistate efforts or other coalition building activities inconsistent with the restrictions contained in this Act: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this Act shall be made available for Phase II-B grants to study the feasibility of siting a Monitored Retrievable Storage Facility.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees agree to the distribution of the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund as proposed by the Senate which makes specific allocations and restrictions as to the use of the funds. The provision proposed by the Senate considering the siting of a Monitored Retrievable Storage facility has been revised to prohibit Phase II-B grants.

The conferees agree with the House provisions concerning the development of a multipurpose canister (MPC).

## ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

## WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$3,595,198,000 instead of \$3,572,198,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,597,482,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree to provide \$17,000,000 to continue funding the dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility at the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). However, no funds are provided for the high-explosives material test facility at LANL.

For the technology transfer program in fiscal year 1994, an amount of \$223,000,000 is recommended. Within this funding, the conferees support making available not to exceed \$3,000,000 for evaluating and assisting in the transfer of technologies developed at the Nevada Test Site.

The conference agreement includes \$10,000,000 for the high-performance computing and communications program.

The conferees are aware that the authorizing committees may include in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 a change to the testing program budget structure. There is no objection to the Department implementing this new structure in fiscal year 1994.

The conferees have not included \$4,000,000 proposed by the Senate to establish, in conjunction with the Department of Defense, a program for destruction of highly energetic explosives. There is no objection to the Department of Energy's participation in this program if funded on a reimbursable basis by another agency.

The conference agreement provides \$30,000,000 for the research and evaluation activities related to the production of tritium and to initiate a systematic review of all available options for disposal of plutonium from dismantled warheads. These funds have been provided as part of the weapons complex reconfiguration program which is currently managing this activity.

During deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, both the House and Senate Armed Services Committees are addressing the issues of tritium production and plutonium disposal.

The conferees recognize the need to provide for new tritium production capacity to meet future anticipated demands for tritium in the downsized nuclear weapons stockpile as well as the need to provide a practical solution to the safeguarding and disposal of plutonium from dismantled nuclear weapons.

Thus, the conference agreement supports the continuation of activities begun last year by the Department of Energy to evaluate the feasibility of tritium production along with disposition of plutonium and generation of electricity. In addition, the Department should consider developing a cooperative program with Russia to explore methods of plutonium disposal and power production.

The conferees believe that the Nation must immediately begin development of a plan for ultimate disposal of plutonium from dismantled warheads. The technical, institutional and economic issues of each alternative must be evaluated. The Department is directed to begin an analysis of the costs and benefits of each option for plutonium disposal including, but not limited to, indefinite storage, direct disposal in a repository, immobilization in a waste form, reactor or accelerator conversion of plutonium, and subsequent spent fuel handling and waste management costs for each option. The development times for each technology as well as health, safety, and environmental problems are to be addressed also.

#### DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$5,181,855,000 for Defense Environmental Restoration and Waste Management instead of \$5,185,877,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,106,855,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees wish to reiterate concerns raised by both the House and Senate with respect to the overall cost of environmental cleanup actions that the Department has committed to perform under existing compliance agreements. While committed to providing adequate funding for necessary cleanup activities around the country, the conferees emphasize that there will not be an endless source of funding for this program with significant increases in the outyears.

The Department should begin to develop a program related to the management of hazardous materials and of hazardous materials emergency response, and up to \$10,000,000 from within available funds is provided for program planning and redesign activities in fiscal year 1994. The Department is expected to include funding for this activity in the fiscal year 1995 budget submission.

The conferees agree that the Department needs to develop a mechanism for establishing priorities among competing cleanup requirements. Toward this end, the Department is directed to review compliance agreements and to submit by June 30, 1995, a report to the Committees on Appropriations evaluating the risks to the public health and safety posed by the conditions at weapons complex facilities that are addressed by compliance agreement requirements.

The report should estimate, with as much specificity as practicable, the risk to the health and safety of individual members of the public intended to be addressed by cleanup activities required by the compliance agreements, the health and safety effect of implementing the requirements, and the cost associated with implementing the requirement. The Department should work with State and Federal regulators and affected parties to develop programs which reduce risk to public and worker health and safety.

The conferees emphasize that they do not intend the Department to perform an exhaustive, formal risk assessment, as that term is frequently used, of the thousands of cleanup activities required by the compliance agreement. Instead, the Department is directed to estimate the risk addressed by cleanup requirements on the basis of the best scientific evidence available.

The conference agreement includes \$2,114,000 for the liquid waste treatment system at the Nevada Test Site consistent with the Department's amended budget request.

The conferees have provided \$40,000,000 for closeout activities for the Hanford Waste Vitrification Plant construction project at Richland, Washington, in accordance with the revised Hanford site cleanup agreement. An additional \$35,000,000 has been provided in waste management operating expenses to support the closeout activities and to begin implementation of new activities required by the revised Hanford site cleanup agreement. Also, in support of the revised agreement, \$45,660,000 has been provided for the multi-function waste remediation facility at the Hanford site to accelerate construction of new tanks and development of waste pretreatment capability.

The conferees have restored the \$10,000,000 reduction proposed by the Senate to the technology development program. However, the conferees support the Senate position that these funds should not be used for educational activities. These funds are to be used for development of innovative technologies related to the remediation of high-level waste tanks and the characterization, treatment, and disposal of mixed waste. The technology development program has increasingly included funds for educational activities, community agreements, and other activities not related to technology development. The Department should ensure that the technology development program is clearly defined and justified.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate that provides for the transfer of \$8,000,000 to the Environmental Protection Agency for imple-

mentation of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Land Withdrawal Act of 1992 and development of cleanup standards to guide the Department of Energy's environmental restoration efforts.

#### MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$1,963,755,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,046,592,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees understand the Secretary of Energy has developed a plan to revise significantly the Department's classification procedures. This plan will include a comprehensive review of the classification rules and procedures, research and development of new technology to expedite declassification of documents, expanded training of employees to declassify documents, and public participation. The conferees support the objectives of this plan and expect them to be accomplished within the funds provided including issuance of revised classification guidelines by September 30, 1994. The Department is directed to report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations by June 15, 1994, on the progress to date.

The conferees support the Department's ongoing program in Verification and Control Technology to establish a data base and tracking system for weapons grade plutonium, uranium, and tritium in the states of the former Soviet Union, and urge the Department to accelerate the program as much as possible within available funds.

The conference agreement does not include establishment of a new program for tritium production and plutonium disposition. Tritium production activities which were initiated last year and development of plutonium disposition alternatives are included in the weapons complex reconfiguration program.

#### OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$30,362,000 for the Office of the Inspector General as proposed by the Senate instead of \$31,757,000 as proposed by the House.

#### POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

##### WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$272,956,000 for the Western Area Power Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$287,956,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$260,400,000 to be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$275,400,000 as proposed by the House.

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT</b>		
<b>I. Solar applications</b>		
A. Solar building technology research		
Operating expenses.....	4,807,000	4,807,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
Total, Solar building technology research.....	5,007,000	5,007,000
B. Photovoltaic energy systems		
Operating expenses.....	71,345,000	74,345,000
Capital equipment.....	6,700,000	3,700,000
Total, Photovoltaic energy systems.....	78,045,000	78,045,000
C. Solar thermal energy systems		
Operating expenses.....	32,191,000	32,191,000
Capital equipment.....	509,000	509,000
Total, Solar thermal energy systems.....	32,700,000	32,700,000
D. Biofuels energy systems		
Operating expenses.....	55,057,000	55,057,000
Capital equipment.....	3,100,000	3,100,000
Total, Biofuels energy systems.....	58,157,000	58,157,000
E. Wind energy systems		
Operating expenses.....	26,453,000	26,453,000
Capital equipment.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
Total, Wind energy systems.....	30,353,000	30,353,000
F. Ocean energy systems - OE.....	---	1,000,000
Total, Solar applications.....	204,262,000	205,262,000
<b>II. Other solar energy</b>		
A. International solar energy program - OE.....	5,754,000	5,250,000
B. Solar technology transfer - OE.....	16,404,000	21,404,000
C. National Renewable Energy Laboratory		
Capital equipment.....	1,025,000	1,025,000
Construction:		
General plant projects.....	1,728,000	1,728,000
94-E-102 National wind technology center expansion, Golden, CO.....	3,180,000	3,180,000
Total, Construction.....	4,908,000	4,908,000
Total, National Renewable Energy Laboratory.....	5,933,000	5,933,000
D. Resource assessment		
Operating expenses.....	2,203,000	2,100,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
Total, Resource assessment.....	2,403,000	2,300,000
E. Solar program support - OE.....	5,400,000	5,000,000
F. Program direction - OE.....	8,200,000	7,200,000
Total, Other solar energy.....	44,094,000	47,087,000
TOTAL, SOLAR ENERGY.....	248,356,000	252,349,000
(Operating expenses).....	(227,814,000)	(234,807,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(15,634,000)	(12,634,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(4,908,000)	(4,908,000)

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>GEOHERMAL</b>		
II. Geothermal technology development - OE.....	22,072,000	22,072,000
III. Program direction - OE.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
IV. Capital equipment.....	900,000	900,000
<b>TOTAL, GEOHERMAL.....</b>	<b>23,972,000</b>	<b>23,972,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(23,072,000)	(23,072,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(900,000)	(900,000)
<b>HYDROGEN RESEARCH</b>		
I. Operating expenses.....	4,900,000	10,000,000
<b>HYDROPOWER</b>		
I. Small scale hydropower development - OE.....	946,000	946,000
II. Program direction - OE.....	135,000	135,000
<b>TOTAL, HYDROPOWER.....</b>	<b>1,081,000</b>	<b>1,081,000</b>
<b>ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE</b>		
I. Electric energy systems		
A. Electric field effects research - OE.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
B. Reliability research - OE.....	6,100,000	6,100,000
C. System and materials research - OE.....	20,730,000	20,730,000
D. Program direction - OE.....	850,000	850,000
E. Capital equipment.....	900,000	900,000
<b>Total, Electric energy systems.....</b>	<b>38,580,000</b>	<b>38,580,000</b>
II. Energy storage systems		
A. Battery storage - OE.....	5,774,000	5,774,000
B. Thermal storage. - OE.....	---	1,100,000
C. Superconducting magnetic energy storage.....	---	10,000,000
D. Program direction - OE.....	350,000	350,000
E. Capital equipment.....	300,000	300,000
<b>Total, Energy storage systems.....</b>	<b>6,424,000</b>	<b>17,524,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ELECTRIC ENERGY SYSTEMS AND STORAGE.....</b>	<b>45,004,000</b>	<b>56,104,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(43,804,000)	(44,904,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(1,200,000)	(11,200,000)
<b>POLICY AND MANAGEMENT</b>		
Policy and management - CE.....	3,878,000	3,878,000
<b>NUCLEAR ENERGY</b>		
I. Nuclear energy R & D		
A. Light water reactor - OE.....	57,789,000	57,789,000
B. Advanced reactor R & D Operating expenses.....	16,000,000	42,400,000
C. Space reactor power systems Operating expenses.....	27,500,000	27,500,000
D. Advanced radioisotope power system Operating expenses.....	46,100,000	46,100,000
Capital equipment.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
<b>Total, Advanced radioisotope power system.....</b>	<b>48,100,000</b>	<b>48,100,000</b>
F. Facilities Operating expenses.....	6,900,000	6,900,000
G. Program direction.....	10,463,000	10,463,000
H. Policy and management Operating expenses.....	12,612,000	12,612,000
I. Test reactor area hot cells.....	1,400,000	1,400,000

Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
J. Oak Ridge landlord		
Operating expenses.....	16,080,000	16,080,000
Capital equipment.....	670,000	670,000
Construction:		
GPN-103 General plant projects.....	1,450,000	1,450,000
94-E-201 Communications network, OR.....	6,700,000	6,700,000
Total, construction.....	8,150,000	8,150,000
Total, Oak Ridge landlord.....	24,900,000	24,900,000
Total, Nuclear energy R & D.....	205,664,000	232,064,000
(Operating expenses).....	(194,844,000)	(221,244,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,670,000)	(2,670,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(8,150,000)	(8,150,000)
II. Termination costs		
Operating expenses.....	102,300,000	102,300,000
Capital equipment.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Construction:		
GPN-102 General plant projects.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Termination costs.....	109,300,000	109,300,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY.....	314,964,000	341,364,000
(Operating expenses).....	(297,144,000)	(323,544,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(7,670,000)	(7,670,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(10,150,000)	(10,150,000)
CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT		
I. Spent fuel storage R&D - OE.....	577,000	577,000
II. Program direction - OE.....	110,000	110,000
TOTAL, CIVILIAN WASTE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....	687,000	687,000
ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH		
Operating expenses.....	173,246,000	158,070,000
Capital equipment.....	1,600,000	1,600,000
TOTAL, ENVIRONMENT, SAFETY AND HEALTH.....	174,846,000	159,670,000
NUCLEAR SAFETY POLICY - OE.....	15,000,000	15,000,000
LIQUIFIED GASEOUS SPILL TEST FACILITY - ESRD.....	979,000	1,300,000
ENERGY RESEARCH		
I. Biological and environmental research		
A. Biological and environmental research R&D		
Operating expenses.....	338,060,000	338,060,000
Capital equipment.....	21,600,000	21,600,000
Construction:		
GP-E-120.General plant projects.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
94-E-335 Brookhaven linac isotope producer facility upgrade, BNL.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
94-E-337 Advanced light source structural biology support facility, LBL.....	600,000	600,000
94-E-338.Structural biology center, ANL.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
94-E-339.Human genome lab, LBL.....	2,200,000	2,200,000
91-EM-100 Environmental & molecular sciences laboratory, PNL, Richland, WA.....	33,000,000	33,000,000
Total, Construction.....	49,300,000	49,300,000
Total, Biological and environmental research R&D..	408,960,000	408,960,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
B. BER program direction - OE.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
Total, Biological and environmental research.....	416,060,000	416,060,000
(Operating expenses).....	(345,160,000)	(345,160,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(21,600,000)	(21,600,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(49,300,000)	(49,300,000)
II. Fusion energy		
A. Confinement systems.....	157,400,000	170,400,000
B. Development and technology.....	81,300,000	81,300,000
C. Applied plasma physics.....	59,805,000	59,805,000
D. Planning and projects.....	4,895,000	4,895,000
E. Inertial fusion energy.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
F. Program direction - OE.....	9,200,000	9,200,000
G. Capital equipment.....	15,995,000	15,995,000
H. Construction:		
GPE-900 General plant projects, var. locations.....	2,000,000	2,000,000
94-E-200 Tokamak physics experiment, Princeton plasma physics laboratory.....	13,000,000	---
Total, Construction.....	15,000,000	2,000,000
Total, Fusion energy.....	347,595,000	347,595,000
(Operating expenses).....	(316,600,000)	(329,600,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(15,995,000)	(15,995,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(15,000,000)	(2,000,000)
III. Supporting research and technical analysis		
A. Basic energy sciences		
1. Materials sciences.....	276,985,000	276,985,000
2. Chemical sciences.....	169,000,000	169,000,000
3. Applied mathematical sciences.....	106,200,000	106,200,000
4. Engineering and geosciences.....	37,900,000	37,900,000
5. Advanced energy projects.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
6. Energy biosciences.....	26,700,000	26,700,000
7. Program direction - OE.....	9,400,000	9,400,000
8. Capital equipment.....	44,880,000	44,880,000
9. Construction:		
GPE-400 General plant projects.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
94-E-305 Accelerator & reactor improvements.....	7,500,000	7,500,000
89-R-402 6-7 GeV syn. radiation source, ANL.....	107,000,000	107,000,000
Total, Construction.....	119,500,000	119,500,000
Total, Basic energy sciences.....	801,965,000	801,965,000
(Operating expenses).....	(637,585,000)	(637,585,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(44,880,000)	(44,880,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(119,500,000)	(119,500,000)
B. Advanced neutron source		
Operating expenses.....	12,000,000	17,000,000
Capital equipment.....	1,000,000	---
Construction:		
94-E-308 Advanced neutron source.....	26,000,000	---
Total, Advanced neutron source.....	39,000,000	17,000,000
C. Energy oversight, res. analysis & univ. support		
1. Energy research analyses - OE.....	4,020,000	4,020,000
2. University & science education programs		
a. Laboratory cooperative science centers...	35,823,000	35,823,000
b. University programs.....	12,800,000	12,800,000
c. University reactor fuel assistance.....	3,730,000	3,730,000
d. University research instrumentation.....	5,647,000	5,647,000
Total, University & science education programs.....	58,000,000	58,000,000
3. ER laboratory technology transfer.....	39,353,000	39,353,000
4. Advisory and oversight - OE.....	13,800,000	13,800,000
Total, Energy oversight, res. anal. & univ. supt..	115,173,000	115,173,000

Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>D. Multiprogram energy labs - facility support</b>		
<b>1. Multiprogram general purpose facilities</b>		
Operating expenses.....	700,000	700,000
Capital equipment.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
Construction:		
GPE-801 General plant projects.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
94-E-351 Fuel storage and transfer facility (BNL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-E-363 Replace roofing, (ORNL).....	3,300,000	3,300,000
93-E-313 Electrical system upgrade, phase.II (ANL).....	2,150,000	2,150,000
93-E-325 Potable water system upgrade, phase.I (BNL).....	2,017,000	2,017,000
92-E-322 East canyon electrical safety project (LBL).....	1,568,000	1,568,000
92-E-323 Upgrade steam distribution system, West End (ORNL).....	2,693,000	2,693,000
92-E-324 Safety compliance modifications, 326 building (PNL).....	2,000,000	2,000,000
92-E-329 Electrical substation upgrade (ANL).....	2,070,000	2,070,000
88-R-806 Environmental health & safety project (LBL).....	1,691,000	1,691,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>27,489,000</b>	<b>27,489,000</b>
<b>Total, Multiprogram general purpose facilities.....</b>	<b>34,189,000</b>	<b>34,189,000</b>
<b>2. Multiprogram energy labs - tiger team report</b>		
Operating expenses.....	623,000	623,000
Capital equipment.....	500,000	500,000
Construction:		
93-E-315 Roof replacement, phase I (BNL)..	1,926,000	1,926,000
93-E-317 Life safety code compliance (PNL)	1,000,000	1,000,000
93-E-320 Fire and safety improvements, phase.II (ANL).....	850,000	850,000
93-E-323 Fire and safety systems upgrade, phase.I (LBL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
93-E-324 Hazardous materials safeguards, phase.I (LBL).....	1,000,000	1,000,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>5,776,000</b>	<b>5,776,000</b>
<b>Total, Tiger team report.....</b>	<b>6,899,000</b>	<b>6,899,000</b>
Inactive and surplus facilities - OE.....	500,000	500,000
<b>Total, Multiprogram energy laboratories - fac sup. (Operating expenses).....</b>	<b>41,588,000</b>	<b>41,588,000</b>
<b>(Capital equipment).....</b>	<b>(1,823,000)</b>	<b>(1,823,000)</b>
<b>(Construction. ).....</b>	<b>(6,500,000)</b>	<b>(6,500,000)</b>
	<b>(33,265,000)</b>	<b>(33,265,000)</b>
<b>Total, Supporting.research and technical analysis.....</b>	<b>997,726,000</b>	<b>975,726,000</b>
<b>(Operating expenses).....</b>	<b>(766,581,000)</b>	<b>(771,581,000)</b>
<b>(Capital equipment ).....</b>	<b>(52,380,000)</b>	<b>(51,380,000)</b>
<b>(Construction..... ).....</b>	<b>(178,765,000)</b>	<b>(152,765,000)</b>
<b>IV. Policy and management.....</b>	<b>3,233,000</b>	<b>3,233,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ENERGY RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>1,764,614,000</b>	<b>1,742,614,000</b>

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>ENERGY APPLICATIONS</b>		
<b>I. Technical information management program</b>		
Operating expenses.....	14,338,000	14,338,000
Capital equipment.....	600,000	600,000
<b>Total, Technical information management program.....</b>	<b>14,938,000</b>	<b>14,938,000</b>
<b>II. In-house energy management</b>		
Operating expenses.....	6,590,000	6,590,000
Construction:		
IHE - 500 Modifications for energy mgmt.....	19,555,000	19,555,000
<b>Total, In-house energy management.....</b>	<b>26,145,000</b>	<b>26,145,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ENERGY APPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>41,083,000</b>	<b>41,083,000</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT (NON-DEFENSE)</b>		
<b>I. Corrective activities</b>		
Operating expenses		
Undistributed.....	1,120,000	1,120,000
Construction:		
92-E-601 Melton Valley LLLW collection and transfer system upgrade (ORNL).....	11,500,000	11,500,000
90-R-119 Laboratory wastewater treatment plant improvements (ANL).....	680,000	680,000
88-R-830 Liquid low level waste collection and transfer sys upgrade (ORNL).....	6,500,000	6,500,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>18,680,000</b>	<b>18,680,000</b>
<b>Total, Corrective activities.....</b>	<b>19,800,000</b>	<b>19,800,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(1,120,000)	(1,120,000)
(Construction.....)	(18,680,000)	(18,680,000)
<b>II. Environmental restoration</b>		
Operating expenses:		
1. Facilities and sites.....	230,858,000	230,858,000
2. Formerly utilized sites, remedial action projects.....	42,745,000	42,745,000
3. Uranium program mill tailings, remedial action projects.....	97,103,000	97,103,000
4. Uranium mill tailings, groundwater restoration project.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
<b>Total, Environmental restoration.....</b>	<b>377,706,000</b>	<b>377,706,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(377,706,000)	(377,706,000)
<b>III. Waste management</b>		
Operating expenses:		
1. Waste operations.....	73,336,000	73,336,000
2. West valley.....	124,000,000	124,000,000
3. Low level waste.....	11,400,000	11,400,000
<b>Total, Operating expenses.....</b>	<b>208,736,000</b>	<b>208,736,000</b>
Capital equipment.....	2,706,000	2,706,000
Construction:		
GP-E-600 General plant projects.....	1,992,000	1,992,000
94-E-601 Waste handling building, Fermilab.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-E-602 Bethel Valley federal facility agreement upgrades, ORNL.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
93-E-632 Laboratory floor drain collection system upgrades, BNL.....	1,083,000	1,083,000
93-E-633 Upgrade sanitary sewer system (ORNL)..	7,000,000	7,000,000
93-E-900 Long-term storage of TMI-2 fuel, INEL.	7,320,000	7,320,000
91-E-305 Waste management fac. project (BNL)...	6,150,000	6,150,000

	Budget Estimate	Conference
91-E-322 329 Building compliance (PNL).....	1,800,000	1,800,000
91-E-600 Rehab of waste management bld 306, ANL	200,000	200,000
91-E-602 Hazardous, radioactive and mixed waste storage facility.(ANL).....	1,295,000	1,295,000
88-R-112 Hazardous waste handling, fac. (LBL)..	5,787,000	5,787,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>37,227,000</b>	<b>37,227,000</b>
<b>Total, Waste management.....</b>	<b>248,669,000</b>	<b>248,669,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(208,736,000)	(208,736,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,706,000)	(2,706,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(37,227,000)	(37,227,000)
<b>IV. Facility transition and managment</b>		
Operating expenses.....	71,103,000	71,103,000
Capital equipment.....	200,000	200,000
<b>Total, Facility transition and managment.....</b>	<b>71,303,000</b>	<b>71,303,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MANAGEMENT.</b>	<b>717,478,000</b>	<b>717,478,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(658,665,000)	(658,665,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(2,906,000)	(2,906,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(55,907,000)	(55,907,000)
<b>Subtotal, Energy supply research and development.....</b>	<b>3,356,842,000</b>	<b>3,366,580,000</b>
Use of prior year balances.....	-113,300,000	-113,300,000
Education programs (ESR&D).....	-58,000,000	---
Salary reduction.....	-29,370,000	-29,370,000
<b>TOTAL, ENERGY SUPPLY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.....</b>	<b>3,156,172,000</b>	<b>3,223,910,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(2,702,102,000)	(2,802,840,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(120,485,000)	(126,485,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(333,585,000)	(294,585,000)
<b>URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>I. Uranium enrichment residual activities</b>		
Operating expenses.....	246,992,000	246,992,000
Capital equipment.....	100,000	100,000
<b>Subtotal, Uranium supply and enrichment activities....</b>	<b>247,092,000</b>	<b>247,092,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(246,992,000)	(246,992,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(100,000)	(100,000)
Revenues.....	-70,000,000	-70,000,000
<b>TOTAL, URANIUM SUPPLY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>177,092,000</b>	<b>177,092,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(176,992,000)	(176,992,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(100,000)	(100,000)
<b>URANIUM ENRICHMENT DECONTAMINATION AND DECOMMISSIONING FUND</b>		
UE Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund.....	286,320,000	286,320,000
<b>GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH</b>		
<b>I. High energy physics</b>		
<b>A. Physics research - OE.....</b>	<b>148,560,000</b>	<b>148,560,000</b>
<b>B. Facility operations</b>		
Operating expenses.....	268,455,000	268,455,000
Capital equipment.....	61,160,000	61,160,000
Construction:		
GP-E-103 General plant projects, various locations.....	12,149,000	12,149,000
94-G-301 Accelerator improvements & modifications, VL.....	13,105,000	13,105,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
94-G-304.B-Factory.....	36,000,000	36,000,000
92-G-302.Fermilab main injector, Fermilab....	25,000,000	25,000,000
Total, Construction.....	86,254,000	86,254,000
Total, Facility operations.....	415,869,000	415,869,000
C. High energy technology - OE.....	59,415,000	59,415,000
E. Other capital equipment.....	3,925,000	3,925,000
Total, High energy physics.....	627,769,000	627,769,000
(Operating expenses).....	(476,430,000)	(476,430,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(65,085,000)	(65,085,000)
(Construction.....)	(86,254,000)	(86,254,000)
II. Nuclear physics		
A. Medium energy physics - OE.....	91,555,000	111,555,000
B. Heavy ion physics - OE.....	67,400,000	67,400,000
C. Low energy physics - OE.....	25,600,000	25,600,000
D. Nuclear theory - OE.....	14,800,000	14,800,000
E. Capital equipment.....	27,130,000	30,130,000
F. Construction:		
GP-E-300 General plant projects, various locations.....	3,600,000	3,600,000
94-G-302 Accelerator improvements & mods., VL..	3,800,000	3,800,000
91-G-300 Relativistic heavy ion collider, BNL..	70,000,000	78,000,000
87-R-203 Continuous electron beam accelerator facility, Newport News, VA.....	16,590,000	16,590,000
Total, Construction.....	93,990,000	101,990,000
G. Other capital equipment.....	1,870,000	1,870,000
Total, Nuclear physics.....	322,345,000	353,345,000
(Operating expenses).....	(199,355,000)	(219,355,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(29,000,000)	(32,000,000)
(Construction.....)	(93,990,000)	(101,990,000)
III.General science program direction - OE.....	9,000,000	9,000,000
IV. Superconducting super collider		
A. SSC project		
Operating expenses.....	104,402,000	104,402,000
Capital equipment.....	50,000,000	50,000,000
Construction:		
90-R-106.Superconducting super collider.....	480,598,000	480,598,000
Total, SSC project.....	635,000,000	635,000,000
B. SSC laboratory research and operations		
Operating expenses.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total, Superconducting super collider.....	640,000,000	640,000,000
General reduction.....	-12,923,000	-15,000,000
TOTAL, GENERAL SCIENCE AND RESEARCH.....	1,586,191,000	1,615,114,000
(Operating expenses).....	(781,264,000)	(799,187,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(144,085,000)	(147,085,000)
(Construction.....)	(660,842,000)	(668,842,000)
ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND		
I. Isotope production.....	3,910,000	3,910,000
General reduction.....	-44,000	---
TOTAL, ISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION FUND	3,866,000	3,910,000

Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES:</b>		
<b>WEAPONS ACTIVITIES</b>		
<b>I. Research and development</b>		
<b>A. Research and development - core</b>		
Operating expenses.....	986,772,000	956,772,000
Capital equipment.....	67,019,000	67,019,000
Construction:		
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	11,500,000	11,500,000
94-D-102, Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, Phase V, various locations....	11,110,000	4,000,000
92-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development and testing facilities revitalization, phase IV, various locations...	27,479,000	27,479,000
90-D-102 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, phase III, various locations.....	30,805,000	30,805,000
88-D-106 Nuclear weapons research, development, and testing facilities revitalization, phase II, various locations.....	39,624,000	39,624,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>120,518,000</b>	<b>113,408,000</b>
<b>Total, Research and development - core.....</b>	<b>1,174,309,000</b>	<b>1,137,199,000</b>
<b>B. Inertial fusion</b>		
Operating expenses.....	172,553,000	172,553,000
Capital equipment.....	15,860,000	15,860,000
<b>Total, Inertial fusion.....</b>	<b>188,413,000</b>	<b>188,413,000</b>
<b>Total, Research and development.....</b>	<b>1,362,722,000</b>	<b>1,325,612,000</b>
<b>II. Testing</b>		
<b>A. Weapons program</b>		
Operating expenses.....	375,000,000	374,726,000
Capital equipment.....	24,400,000	19,400,000
Construction:		
GPD-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
93-D-102 Nevada support facility, North Las Vegas, NV.....	4,000,000	4,000,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>9,000,000</b>	<b>9,000,000</b>
<b>Total, Testing.....</b>	<b>408,400,000</b>	<b>403,126,000</b>
<b>Total, Research, development and testing.....</b>	<b>1,771,122,000</b>	<b>1,728,738,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(1,534,325,000)	(1,504,051,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(107,279,000)	(102,279,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(129,518,000)	(122,408,000)
<b>III. Stockpile support</b>		
Operating expenses.....	1,802,280,000	1,792,280,000
Capital equipment.....	12,136,000	12,136,000
Construction:		
Production base:		
Facilities capability assurance program:		
88-D-122 Facilities capabilities assurance program (FCAP), various locations.....	27,100,000	27,100,000
Production support facilities:		
GPD-121 General plant projects, various locations.....	7,700,000	7,700,000
<b>Total, Production base.....</b>	<b>34,800,000</b>	<b>34,800,000</b>

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
Environment, safety and health:		
94-D-124 Hydrogen fluoride supply system, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
94-D-125 Upgrade life safety, Kansas City Plant, Kansas City, MO.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-127 Emergency notification system, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-128 Environmental, Safety and Health analytical lab, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX...	800,000	800,000
93-D-122 Life safety upgrades, Y-12 Plant, Oak Ridge, TN.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
92-D-126 Replace emergency notification systems, various locations.....	10,500,000	10,500,000
85-D-121 Air and water pollution control Y-12 plant.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
<b>Total, Environment, safety and health.....</b>	<b>26,300,000</b>	<b>26,300,000</b>
Safeguards and security:		
88-D-123 Security enhancement, Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>81,100,000</b>	<b>81,100,000</b>
Use of prior year balances - OE (WA/SS).....	---	-3,000,000
<b>Total, Stockpile support.....</b>	<b>1,895,516,000</b>	<b>1,882,516,000</b>
IV. Program direction		
Weapons program direction.....	280,466,000	177,466,000
Contractor employment transition.....	---	100,000,000
Capital equipment.....	3,619,000	3,619,000
<b>Total, Program direction.....</b>	<b>284,085,000</b>	<b>281,085,000</b>
V. Complex reconfiguration		
Operating expenses.....	138,500,000	168,500,000
Construction:		
93-D-123 Complex - 21, various locations.....	25,000,000	25,000,000
<b>Total, Complex reconfiguration.....</b>	<b>163,500,000</b>	<b>193,500,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Weapons activities.....</b>	<b>4,114,223,000</b>	<b>4,085,839,000</b>
Use of prior year balances.....	-356,641,000	-440,641,000
Salary reduction.....	-48,282,000	-50,000,000
<b>TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>3,709,300,000</b>	<b>3,595,198,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(3,350,648,000)	(3,248,656,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(123,034,000)	(118,034,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(235,618,000)	(228,508,000)
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION AND WASTE MGMT		
I. Corrective activities		
Operating expenses		
Undesignated.....	2,170,000	2,170,000
Capital equipment		
Undesignated.....	600,000	600,000
Construction:		
92-D-403 Tank upgrades project, LLNL.....	3,888,000	3,888,000
<b>Total, Corrective activities.....</b>	<b>6,658,000</b>	<b>6,658,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(2,170,000)	(2,170,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(600,000)	(600,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(3,888,000)	(3,888,000)

Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>II. Environmental restoration</b>		
Operating expenses.....	1,536,027,000	1,536,027,000
<b>III. Waste management</b>		
Operating expenses.....	2,327,106,000	2,362,106,000
Capital equipment.....	132,113,000	138,781,000
Construction:		
GP-D-171 General plant projects.....	28,959,000	28,959,000
94-D-400 High explosive wastewater treatment system, LANL.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
94-D-402 Liquid waste treatment system, NTS.....	2,114,000	2,114,000
94-D-404 Melton Valley storage tank capacity increase, ORNL.....	9,400,000	9,400,000
94-D-405 Central neutralization facility pipeline extension project, K-25.....	1,714,000	1,714,000
94-D-406 Low-level waste disposal facilities, K-25.....	6,000,000	6,000,000
94-D-407 Initial tank retrieval systems, RL.....	7,000,000	7,000,000
94-D-408 Office facilities - 200 East, RL.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
94-D-411 Solid waste operation complex, RL.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
94-D-414 Site 300 explosive waste storage facility, LLNL.....	370,000	370,000
94-D-416 Solvent storage tanks installation, SR.	1,500,000	1,500,000
93-D-174 Plant drain waste water treatment upgrades, Y-12.....	3,500,000	3,500,000
93-D-175 Industrial waste compact fac., Y-12....	1,800,000	1,800,000
93-D-176 Oak Ridge reservation storage facility, Oak Ridge, TN.....	6,039,000	6,039,000
93-D-177 Disposal of K-1515 sanitary water treatment plant waste, K-25.....	7,100,000	7,100,000
93-D-178 Building 374 liquid waste treatment facility, RF.....	1,000,000	1,000,000
93-D-181 Radioactive liquid waste line repl, RL.	6,700,000	6,000,000
93-D-182 Replace of cross-site trans system, RL.	6,500,000	6,500,000
93-D-183 Multi-function waste remediation, RL...	35,660,000	45,660,000
93-D-187 High level waste removal from filled waste tanks, SR.....	3,000,000	3,000,000
93-D-188 New sanitary landfill, SR.....	1,020,000	1,020,000
92-D-172 Hazardous waste treatment and processing facility, Pantex Plant.....	300,000	300,000
92-D-173 NOx abatement facility, ID.....	10,000,000	10,000,000
92-D-177 Tank 101-AZ waste retrieval system, RL.	7,000,000	7,000,000
92-D-188 Waste management ES&H, and compliance activities, various locations.....	8,568,000	8,568,000
91-D-171 Waste receiving and processing facility, module 1, Richland, WA.....	17,700,000	17,700,000
90-D-172 Aging waste transfer line, Richland, WA.....	5,600,000	5,000,000
90-D-177 RWMC transuranic (TRU) waste characterization and storage facility, ID.....	21,700,000	21,700,000
89-D-172 Hanford environmental compliance, Richland, WA.....	11,700,000	11,700,000

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
89-D-173 Tank farm ventilation upgrade, Richland, WA.....	1,800,000	1,000,000
89-D-174 Replacement high level waste evaporator, Savannah River, SC.....	12,974,000	12,974,000
88-D-173 Hanford waste vitrification plant (HWVP), Richland, WA.....	85,000,000	40,000,000
87-D-181 Diversion box and pump pit containment buildings, Savannah River, SC.....	2,137,000	2,137,000
86-D-103 Decontamination and waste treatment facility, LLNL, Livermore, CA.....	10,260,000	10,260,000
83-D-148 Non-radioactive hazardous waste management, Savannah River, SC.....	2,169,000	2,169,000
81-T-105 Defense waste processing fac., SR, SC..	43,873,000	43,873,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>379,457,000</b>	<b>342,357,000</b>
<b>Total, Waste management.....</b>	<b>2,838,676,000</b>	<b>2,843,244,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(2,327,106,000)	(2,362,106,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(132,113,000)	(138,781,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(379,457,000)	(342,357,000)
<b>IV. Technology development</b>		
Operating expenses.....	371,150,000	371,150,000
Capital equipment.....	29,850,000	29,850,000
<b>Total, Technology development.....</b>	<b>401,000,000</b>	<b>401,000,000</b>
<b>V. Transportation Management</b>		
Operating expenses.....	19,730,000	19,730,000
Capital equipment.....	400,000	400,000
<b>Total, Transportation Management.....</b>	<b>20,130,000</b>	<b>20,130,000</b>
<b>VI. Program direction</b>		
Operating expenses.....	82,427,000	82,427,000
Capital equipment.....	9,469,000	9,469,000
<b>Total, Program direction.....</b>	<b>91,896,000</b>	<b>91,896,000</b>
<b>VII. Facility transition &amp; management</b>		
Operating expenses.....	545,268,000	545,268,000
Capital equipment.....	24,726,000	24,726,000
<b>Construction:</b>		
GP-D-171 General plant projects, var. locations	19,221,000	19,221,000
94-D-122 Underground storage tanks, RF.....	700,000	700,000
94-D-401 Emergency response facility, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,190,000	600,000
94-D-412 300 area process sewer piping system upgrade, Richland, Washington.....	1,100,000	1,100,000
94-D-415 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory medical facilities, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,110,000	1,110,000
94-D-451 Infrastructure replacement, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.....	6,600,000	6,600,000
93-D-172 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory electrical upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	9,600,000	9,600,000
93-D-184 325 facility compliance/renovation, Pacific Northwest Laboratory, Richland, Washington.....	3,500,000	3,500,000

	Budget Estimate	Conference
93-D-185 Landlord program safety compliance, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	1,351,000	1,351,000
92-D-125 Master safeguards and security agreement/materials surveillance task force security upgrades, Rocky Flats Plant, Golden, Colorado.....	3,900,000	3,900,000
92-D-181 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory fire and life safety improvements, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
92-D-182 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory sewer systems upgrade, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	1,450,000	1,450,000
92-D-183 Idaho National Engineering Laboratory transportation complex, Idaho National Engineering Laboratory, Idaho.....	7,198,000	7,198,000
92-D-184 Hanford infrastructure underground storage tanks, Richland, Washington.....	300,000	300,000
92-D-186 Steam system rehabilitation, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	4,300,000	4,300,000
92-D-187 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase II, Richland, Washington.....	10,276,000	10,276,000
91-D-175 300 area electrical distribution conversion and safety improvements, phase I, Richland, Washington.....	1,500,000	1,500,000
90-D-175 Landlord program safety compliance, phase I, Richland, Washington.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>80,096,000</b>	<b>79,506,000</b>
<b>Total, Facility transition &amp; management.....</b>	<b>650,090,000</b>	<b>649,500,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(545,268,000)	(545,268,000)
(Capital expenses).....	(24,726,000)	(24,726,000)
(Construction).....	(80,096,000)	(79,506,000)
<b>Subtotal, Defense environment restoration &amp; waste mgmt</b>	<b>5,544,477,000</b>	<b>5,548,455,000</b>
Use of prior year balances.....	-86,600,000	-86,600,000
General reduction and other adjustments.....	-37,765,000	-280,000,000
Transfer to EPA.....	8,000,000	---
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION &amp; WASTE MGMT.</b>	<b>5,428,112,000</b>	<b>5,181,855,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(4,767,513,000)	(4,552,278,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(197,158,000)	(203,826,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(463,441,000)	(425,751,000)
<b>MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS</b>		
<b>MATERIALS SUPPORT</b>		
I. Reactor operations.....	168,495,000	168,495,000
II. Processing of nuclear materials.....	387,628,000	387,628,000
III. Supporting services.....	282,073,000	260,000,000
IV. Capital equipment.....	75,209,000	65,000,000
V. Construction:		
A. Environment, safety and health:		
93-D-147 Domestic water system upgrade Phase I & II, Savannah River, SC.....	7,720,000	7,720,000
93-D-148 Replace high-level drain lines, Savannah River, SC.....	1,800,000	1,800,000
93-D-152 Environmental modification for production facilities, Savannah River, SC.....	20,000,000	20,000,000
92-D-140 F&H canyon exhaust upgrades, Savannah River, SC.....	15,000,000	15,000,000

	Budget Estimate	Conference
92-D-142 Nuclear material processing training center, Savannah River, SC.....	8,900,000	8,900,000
92-D-143 Health protection instrument calibration facility, Savannah River, SC.....	9,600,000	9,600,000
90-D-149 Plantwide fire protection, Phases I and II, Savannah River, SC.....	25,950,000	25,950,000
Total, Environment, safety and health.....	88,970,000	88,970,000
<b>B. Programmatic projects:</b>		
GPD-146 General plant projects, various locations.....	31,760,000	23,000,000
92-D-150 Operations support facilities, Savannah River, SC.....	26,900,000	26,900,000
92-D-153 Engineering support facility, Savannah River Site, SC.....	9,500,000	9,500,000
86-D-149 Productivity retention program, Phases I, II, III, IV, V, and VI, various locations.....	3,700,000	3,700,000
Total, Programmatic projects.....	71,860,000	63,100,000
Total, Construction.....	160,830,000	152,070,000
VI. Program direction.....	62,970,000	57,000,000
Subtotal, Materials Support.....	1,137,205,000	1,090,193,000
TOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT.....	1,137,205,000	1,090,193,000
(Operating expenses).....	(901,166,000)	(873,123,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(75,209,000)	(65,000,000)
(Construction.....)	(160,830,000)	(152,070,000)
<b>OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS</b>		
<b>I. Verification and control technology</b>		
Operating expenses.....	344,741,000	341,941,000
Capital equipment.....	15,573,000	15,573,000
Construction:		
90-D-186 Center for national security and arms control, Sandia National Laboratories Albuquerque, NM.....	8,515,000	8,515,000
Total, Verification and control technology.....	368,829,000	366,029,000
<b>II. Nuclear safeguards and security</b>		
Operating expenses.....	86,246,000	82,700,000
Capital equipment.....	4,101,000	4,101,000
Total, Nuclear safeguards and security.....	90,347,000	86,801,000
<b>III. Security investigations - OE.....</b>	53,335,000	49,000,000
<b>IV. Security evaluations</b>		
Operating expenses.....	14,961,000	14,961,000
<b>V. Office of nuclear safety</b>		
Operating expenses.....	24,859,000	24,859,000
Capital equipment.....	50,000	50,000
Total, Office of nuclear safety.....	24,909,000	24,909,000
<b>VI. Worker training and adjustment.....</b>	100,000,000	100,000,000
TOTAL, OTHER NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.....	652,381,000	641,700,000
(Operating expenses).....	(624,142,000)	(613,461,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(19,724,000)	(19,724,000)
(Construction.....)	(8,515,000)	(8,515,000)

Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
<b>NAVAL REACTORS</b>		
<b>I. Naval reactors development</b>		
A. Plant development - OE.....	124,900,000	124,900,000
B. Reactor development - OE.....	316,531,000	316,531,000
C. Reactor operation and evaluation - OE.....	166,000,000	166,000,000
D. Capital equipment.....	46,900,000	46,900,000
E. Construction:		
GPN-101 General plant projects, various locations.....	7,500,000	7,500,000
93-D-200 Engineering services facilities Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory, Niskayuna, NY...	7,000,000	7,000,000
92-D-200 Laboratories facilities upgrades, various locations.....	2,800,000	2,800,000
90-N-102 Expended core facility dry cell project, Naval Reactors Facility, ID.....	7,800,000	---
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>25,100,000</b>	<b>17,300,000</b>
F. Program direction.....	18,300,000	18,300,000
<b>Total, Naval reactors development.....</b>	<b>697,731,000</b>	<b>689,931,000</b>
<b>II. Enrichment materials - OE.....</b>	<b>70,000,000</b>	<b>70,000,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS.....</b>	<b>767,731,000</b>	<b>759,931,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(695,731,000)	(695,731,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(46,900,000)	(46,900,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(25,100,000)	(17,300,000)
<b>SUBTOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEF. PROGRAMS...</b>	<b>2,557,317,000</b>	<b>2,491,824,000</b>
Savannah river pension refund.....	-100,000,000	-100,000,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-351,132,000	-409,132,000
Salary reduction.....	-18,937,000	-18,937,000
Education programs (MS).....	58,000,000	---
<b>TOTAL, MATERIALS SUPPORT AND OTHER DEFENSE PROGRAMS...</b>	<b>2,145,248,000</b>	<b>1,963,755,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(1,808,970,000)	(1,654,246,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(141,833,000)	(131,624,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(194,445,000)	(177,885,000)
<b>DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL</b>		
Defense nuclear waste disposal.....	120,000,000	120,000,000
General reduction.....	-258,000	---
<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL.....</b>	<b>119,742,000</b>	<b>120,000,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES.....</b>	<b>11,402,402,000</b>	<b>10,860,808,000</b>
(Operating expenses).....	(10,046,873,000)	(9,575,180,000)
(Capital equipment ).....	(462,025,000)	(453,484,000)
(Construction..... ).....	(893,504,000)	(832,144,000)
<b>DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION</b>		
<b>I. Administrative operations</b>		
A. Office of the Secretary - salaries and expenses.	2,856,000	2,856,000
B. General management - personnel compensation and benefits.....	191,269,000	191,269,000
C. General management - other expenses		
1. Travel.....	5,317,000	5,317,000
2. Services.....	183,678,000	177,000,000
3. Capital equipment.....	8,561,000	7,780,000
<b>Total, Other expenses.....</b>	<b>197,556,000</b>	<b>190,097,000</b>

## Department of Energy

	Budget Estimate	Conference
-----		
D. Program support		
1. Office of minority economic impact.....	3,626,000	3,626,000
2. Policy analysis and system studies.....	4,334,000	4,334,000
3. Consumer affairs.....	47,000	47,000
4. Public affairs.....	55,000	55,000
5. International policy studies.....	1,255,000	1,255,000
Total, Program support.....	9,317,000	9,317,000
-----		
Total, Administrative operations.....	400,998,000	393,539,000
II. Cost of work for others.....	61,626,000	61,626,000
-----		
Subtotal, Departmental administration (gross).....	462,624,000	455,165,000
Use of unobligated balances and other adjustments....	-47,927,000	-53,927,000
General reduction.....	-214,000	---
-----		
Total, Departmental administration (gross).....	414,483,000	401,238,000
Miscellaneous revenues.....	-239,209,000	-239,209,000
-----		
TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION (net).....	175,274,000	162,029,000
(Operating expenses).....	(166,713,000)	(154,249,000)
(Capital equipment).....	(8,561,000)	(7,780,000)
=====		
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL		
Office of Inspector General.....	31,757,000	30,362,000
=====		
POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS:		
ALASKA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
Operating expenses.....	4,010,000	4,010,000
=====		
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Operating expenses.....	3,217,000	3,217,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling.....	31,488,000	31,488,000
-----		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	34,705,000	34,705,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-4,963,000	-4,963,000
-----		
TOTAL, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	29,742,000	29,742,000
=====		
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Operating expenses.....	21,563,000	21,563,000
B. Purchase power and wheeling.....	1,650,000	1,650,000
C. Construction.....	11,138,000	11,138,000
-----		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	34,351,000	34,351,000
Use of prior year balances.....	-764,000	-764,000
-----		
TOTAL, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	33,587,000	33,587,000
=====		
WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION		
I. Operation and maintenance		
A. Construction and rehabilitation.....	121,695,000	121,695,000
B. System operation and maintenance.....	125,554,000	125,554,000
C. Purchase power and wheeling.....	100,707,000	100,707,000
D. Utah mitigation and conservation.....	5,000,000	5,000,000
-----		
Subtotal, Operation and maintenance.....	352,956,000	352,956,000
Use of prior year balances.....	---	-75,000,000
Transfer of permanent authority from DOI.....	(7,168,000)	(7,168,000)
-----		
TOTAL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION.....	352,956,000	277,956,000
=====		



TITLE IV

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$249,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$189,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree that a total of \$50,000,000 is provided for Corridor L in West Virginia; a total of \$4,600,000 is provided for corridor construction in Mississippi; a total of \$13,500,000 is provided for Corridors G, B, Q, and F in Kentucky; and a total of \$38,700,000 is provided for corridor construction in Alabama.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$16,560,000 for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board instead of \$15,060,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,060,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$140,473,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$138,973,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 47: Deletes language proposed by the Senate urging the Secretary of Energy to prepare a proposal to satisfy the Bonneville Power Administration's entire repayment obligation to the United States Treasury.

The conferees agree that, utilizing funds made available in this Act, the Secretary of Energy is requested to submit to the Congress by February 1, 1994, a legislative proposal to satisfy the Bonneville Power Administration's entire repayment obligation to the United States Treasury for appropriated investment in the Federal Columbia River Power System. The proposal should result in maximum deficit reduction for the Federal Government in fiscal year 1995 through fiscal year 1999, and should not increase Bonneville Power Administration rates beyond those rates which would result under existing debt repayment policy and practices.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follow:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	\$22,240,643,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,346,046,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	21,730,444,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,192,617,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994 .....	22,215,382,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	-25,261,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	0,664,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+484,938,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+22,765,000

TOM BEVILL,  
VIC FAZIO,  
JIM CHAPMAN,  
DOUGLAS "PETE"

PETERSON,  
ED PASTOR,  
CARRIE MEEK,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
DEAN A. GALLO,  
HAROLD ROGERS,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
HARRY REID,  
J. ROBERT KERREY,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
DON NICKLES,  
SLADE GORTON,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2519

Mr. SMITH of Iowa submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 103-293)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2519) "making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 19, 20, 25, 35, 38, 39, 43, 47, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 60, 65, 66, 70, 85, 88, 91, 102, 104, 112, 118, 119, 134, 154, 156, 158, 160, 165, 167, 172, 173, 176, 177, and 178.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 14, 24, 28, 29, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49, 51, 59, 61, 74, 83, 87, 100, 117, 121, 123, 124, 125, 136, 144, 146, 163, and 168, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$90,105,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$358,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: \$12,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$107,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$85,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$4,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$13,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$8,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$500,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 213 of said Act for regional children's advocacy centers; (b) \$1,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 214 of said Act for local children's advocacy centers; (c) \$1,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$9,123,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$813,797,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$99,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$99,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:  
That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$722,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$269,543,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$7,776,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$26,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$18,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: 1992 (Public Law 102-572 (106 Stat. 4515-4516)), \$13,550,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$226,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: \$109,703,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$2,000,000 is for the construction of the National Marine Fisheries Service Estuarine and Habitat Research Laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana; of which \$1,000,000 is for a grant for the purchase of equipment for the Ruth Patrick Science Education Center in Aiken, South Carolina; and of which the following amounts shall be available to carry out continuing construction activities: \$1,000,000 for construction and related expenses for a Multi-Species Aquaculture Facility to be located in the State of New Jersey; \$1,000,000 for a grant to the Mystic Seaport, Mystic, Connecticut, for a maritime education center; \$1,395,000 for a grant to the Indiana State University Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education; and \$1,000,000 for a grant for the Boston Biotechnology Innovation Center: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, any land located on Woodley Island in the City of Eureka, California, that is acquired by the United States of America from Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation and Conservation District, California, for use as a weather forecasting office, shall be used only

as a weather forecasting office and for related purposes: Provided further, That in the event the aforementioned property is no longer required for such use, the Secretary of Commerce shall determine that the property is no longer needed for such use and title of the property shall revert to Humboldt Bay Harbor, Recreation, and Conservation District; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$16,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: , including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms in the areas of textiles, biotechnology, and manufacturing, to include: a grant of \$9,000,000 for the National Textile Center University Consortium; a grant of \$3,400,000 for the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation; a grant of \$800,000 for the Center for Global Competitiveness at Saint Francis College in Loretto, Pennsylvania; a grant of \$465,000 for the Center for Manufacturing Productivity at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst; a grant of \$1,395,000 for the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute; and a grant of \$930,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute, ; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: \$248,590,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$42,100,000, of which \$30,300,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That \$800,000 shall be available only for a grant to the City of Williamsport, Pennsylvania for revitalization and development of minority firms, and \$500,000 shall be available only for a grant to the Catawba Indian Tribe in South Carolina for business planning and technical assistance; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$5,700,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$19,927,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$24,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$26,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$28,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$23,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$2,850,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$12,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$11,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$2,156,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$18,450,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$20,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 127:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 127, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$258,900,000. Of this total amount: \$71,266,000 shall be available for grants for performance in fiscal year 1994 or fiscal year 1995

for Small Business Development Centers as authorized by section 21 of the Small Business Act, as amended; \$3,500,000 shall be available for the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE); \$18,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 24 of the Small Business Act, as amended; \$3,000,000 shall be available for the Small Business Institute program (SBI); \$9,000,000 shall be available until expended for Microloan technical assistance; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 128:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: ; \$175,000 shall be available for a grant to the Ben Franklin Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to assist small businesses to qualify for and participate in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program; \$750,000 shall be available for a grant to the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center for the North Carolina Small Business Capital Access Program to provide financial development assistance to small businesses; \$500,000 shall be available for a grant to the Van Emmons Population, Marketing Analysis Center, Towanda, Pennsylvania, for an integrated small business data base to assist Appalachian Region small businesses; \$1,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky, for small business development assistance; \$680,000 shall be available for a grant to the State of Nebraska for a statewide small business data base to facilitate the development of small businesses in rural communities; \$100,000 shall be available for a grant to the State of Nebraska for a statewide small business data base to facilitate the development of small businesses in rural communities; \$100,000 shall be available for a grant to the Institute for Economic Development, Western Kentucky University to provide small business consulting services for senior citizens; \$5,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the National Center for Genome Resources in New Mexico, to provide consulting assistance, information and related services to small businesses and for related purposes; \$1,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, for the Genesis small business incubator facility; \$300,000 shall be available for a grant to the Economic Development Council of Paducah, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business incubator facility; \$1,000,000 shall be available for a grant to the WVHTC Foundation in West Virginia for build out, equipment, and operations costs for a small business incubator facility; \$250,000 shall be available for a grant to Grant County, West Virginia, to establish a small business development and financial assistance fund; and in addition, the following continuing activities shall be funded from the total amount provided in this paragraph at the level designated for these activities under this heading in Public Law 102-395: Hazard Community College in Hazard, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business consulting, information and assistance facility; Seton Hill

College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, to provide for a small business consulting and assistance center for entrepreneurial opportunity; the University of Central Arkansas to assist the Small Business Institute Program of the Small Business Administration to establish and operate a National Data Center; and the Iowa Waste Reduction Center, University of Northern Iowa for a demonstration program to assist small businesses in complying with certain Federal regulatory requirements; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 131:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$196,041,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 143:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 151:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 151, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$6,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 152:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$11,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 153:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 153, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$14,400,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 155:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 155, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$16,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 157:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$16,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

**Amendment numbered 164:**

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate num-

bered 164, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$43,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30, 31, 34, 37, 44, 52, 62, 63, 64, 67, 71, 73, 75, 78, 79, 80, 81, 84, 93, 97, 99, 101, 110, 111, 113, 114, 115, 120, 122, 129, 130, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 159, 161, 162, 166, 169, 170, 171, 174, and 175.

NEAL SMITH,  
BOB CARR,  
ALAN MOLLOHAN,  
JAMES MORAN,  
DAVID E. SKAGGS,  
DAVID E. PRICE,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
HAL ROGERS,  
JIM KOLBE,  
JOSEPH MCDADE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
DALE BUMPERS,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
JIM SASSER,  
BOB KERREY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
TED STEVENS,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
PHIL GRAMM,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

**JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE**

The managers on the part of the House and Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement by the House and Senate in explanation of the effect of the action by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

**TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND RELATED AGENCIES**

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS**

The conference agreement provides a total of \$679,605,000 for the various Justice Assistance programs of the Office of Justice Programs instead of \$650,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$683,314,000 as proposed by the Senate. The disposition of each amendment under this heading and a detailed description of the agreement for each program follows—

**Amendment No. 1:** Appropriates \$90,105,000 instead of \$91,300,000 as proposed by the House and \$89,564,000 as proposed by the Senate for the following programs:

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—				
	1993 En-acted	1994 Re-quest	1994 House	1994 Sen-ate	1994 Con-ference
National Institute of Justice	22,995	22,995	22,995	22,500	22,500
Bureau of Justice Statistics	21,373	21,373	21,373	20,943	20,943
Emergency Assistance	(2,000)				
Missing Children	8,471	5,971	6,621	6,621	6,621
Regional Information Sharing System	14,491	14,491	14,491	14,200	14,491
Management and Administration	21,669	25,822	25,820	25,300	25,550
<b>Total</b>	<b>88,999</b>	<b>90,652</b>	<b>91,300</b>	<b>89,564</b>	<b>90,105</b>

(In thousands of dollars)

The conferees are concerned about duplication of effort within the Department, specifically within the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). As discussed under the National Institute of Justice, the bureaus within OJP are funding similar, or in some cases, the same projects. The conferees expect the Attorney General to ensure that funds appropriated to the Department of Justice for the various Bureaus of OJP be obligated in a way to avoid such duplication of effort.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

The conferees understand that the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has initiated plans to embark on a major study on the origins of criminal behavior. This study would entail the gathering of significant amounts of data on individuals by tracking them from childhood through adulthood. The conferees understand that the NIJ plan to start from scratch on this project, in spite of the fact that there are a number of ongoing studies that could provide most of the data needed for the study. The conferees are aware of the three projects of the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency—

the Denver Youth Survey, Pittsburgh Youth Study, and Rochester Youth Development Study. Since 1986, these studies have gathered extensive and valuable data about youth violence. The conferees agree that scarce budgetary resources should not be wasted by duplicating the information already gathered by these three studies. The conferees further agree that the NIJ, from within the amounts set aside for this project, should provide grants to these three ongoing studies in order to allow them to continue to interview and collect data on the subjects of their study who are now entering the peak ages of involvement in violence. In past years these projects have each received grants of \$500,000, and the conferees believe similar amounts are needed in fiscal year 1994 to continue their efforts. Fifteen days prior to the award of any grants for the study on the origins of criminal behavior, the conferees expect the Department to notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate of their plans for this project.

Amendment No. 2: Renames the "Missing Alzheimer Patient Alert" program designated in the House bill, to the "Safe Return" program, as proposed by the Senate amendment.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE GRANTS

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, \$474,500,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill provided a total of \$427,000,000 for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grants, while the Senate amendment proposed \$493,750,000 for these grants. The conference agreement provides a total of \$474,500,000, as summarized in the following table:

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE GRANTS

[In thousands of dollars]

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—				
	1993 En-acted	1994 Re-quest	1994 House	1994 Sen-ate	1994 Con-ference
Part D—Management and Administration	2,000				
Part E—Edward Byrne Memorial Grants:					
Formula Grants	423,000	431,000	306,000	371,750	358,000
Discretionary Grants	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Correctional Options Grants	(9,000)	(8,000)	15,000	9,000	12,000
NCIC 2000	21,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
DC/Metro Task Force	(2,000)	2,000	2,000		(2,000)
State/local overtime assistance payments	(16,000)	(16,000)	16,000	(16,000)	16,000
Community Policing			25,000	25,000	25,000
Upgrade Criminal Records				25,000	(25,000)
Anti car theft grants					500
<b>Total, State and Local Law Enforcement Grants</b>	<b>496,000</b>	<b>496,000</b>	<b>427,000</b>	<b>493,750</b>	<b>474,500</b>

The conference agreement also adds new language, not in either bill, waiving the \$50,000,000 limitation of Byrne discretionary grants contained in section 511 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act. This waiver is necessary in order to provide the \$25,000,000 requested by the Administration for Community Policy projects.

The conferees note that a supplemental appropriation of \$150,000,000 for grants to local communities to hire additional law enforcement personnel was enacted on July 2, 1993. These grants, however, will be awarded during the 1994 fiscal year. The conference agreement was made with this additional source of funding available to States and localities in mind.

Amendment No. 4: Designates \$358,000,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grant program, instead of \$371,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$356,000,000 for the entire Byrne Program as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *of part E of title 1 of said Act and \$50,000,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language which: (1) provides that the \$358,000,000 agreed to in amendment number 4 be available for the Byrne formula grant program,

and (2) designates \$50,000,000 for the Byrne discretionary grant program. The House and Senate bills included similar language making the amounts provided in amendment number 4 available for both the Byrne formula and discretionary grant programs.

Amendment No. 6: Designates \$12,000,000 for Correctional Options Grants, instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House, and "an additional \$9,000,000" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds the words "an additional", which were not in the House bill. This language clarifies the intent of the conferees that the \$25,000,000 in discretionary grants designated for Community Policing is in addition to the \$50,000,000 provided for the Byrne discretionary program.

Amendment No. 8: Deletes a designation of \$1,000,000 for a community policing grant for Wichita, Kansas as proposed in the Senate amendment. This matter is further addressed under the Byrne discretionary grant program.

Amendment No. 9: Deletes the words "an additional" as proposed in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

*(e) \$16,000,000 shall be available to reimburse any appropriation account, as designated by the Attorney General, for selected costs incurred by*

*State and local law enforcement agencies which enter into cooperative agreements to conduct joint law enforcement operations with Federal agencies; (f) \$500,000 shall be available to carry out the provisions of subtitle B of title 1 of the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-519), notwithstanding the provisions of section 131(b)(2) of said Act, for grants to be used in combating motor vehicle theft: Provided further, That not to exceed \$12,500,000 of the funds made available in fiscal year 1994 under chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title 1 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, shall be available as follows: (a) \$2,000,000 shall be available for the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; (b) not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for start-up costs associated with coordinating the national background check system; and (c) \$500,000 shall be transferred to the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement for the necessary expenses of the Commission as authorized by section 211(B) of Public Law 101-515.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill designated \$2,000,000 for the D.C. Metro Area Drug Task Force and \$16,000,000 for overtime payments for State and local law enforcement personnel. The Senate amendment deleted the House designations and added a new designation of \$25,000,000 for grants to upgrade criminal history records.

The conference agreement restores the House designation of \$16,000,000 for overtime payments for State and local law enforcement personnel, and adds a new designation

not in either bill of \$500,000 grants authorized by the Anti Car Theft Act of 1992. The agreement waives the provision in the Anti Car Theft Act that requires States to charge a \$1 motor vehicle fee to apply for these grants, because most States have no such fee enacted into law.

The conference agreement also includes language designating up to \$12,500,000 within the Byrne discretionary grant program for the following programs: (a) \$2,000,000 for the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force; (b) up to \$10,000,000 for the FBI's start-up costs associated with coordinating the national background check system; and (c) \$500,000 to initiate the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement. The conferees agreed to designate \$500,000 from the Byrne program for the National Commission to Support Law Enforcement because of its importance to State and local law enforcement.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which adds language, not in the House bill, to allow the States in fiscal year 1994 to utilize their Byrne formula grant funding for programs for the prosecution of driving under the influence charges.

*Edward Byrne Memorial Formula Grants.*—The agreement provides \$358,000,000 for the formula grant program, almost a 20 percent increase over the amount provided in the House bill.

The conferees understand that 42 U.S.C. 3759 mandates that the States allocate no less than 5 percent of their formula grant funding for the improvement of criminal justice records. Five percent of the amount appropriated for formula grants would equal \$18,000,000, or \$3,000,000 more than the amount requested by the Administration to upgrade State criminal records. The conferees agree that the Bureau of Justice Assistance, in its guidance to the States on these fiscal year 1994 grants, should make the upgrade of criminal history records, in conjunction with the FBI, a high priority.

*Edward Byrne Memorial Discretionary Grants.*—The agreement provides the full \$50,000,000 authorized for this discretionary grant program, to include:

(A) \$2,800,000 for the National Crime Prevention Council to continue and expand the National Citizens Crime Prevention Campaign (McGruff).

(B) \$1,200,000 for a grant to DARE America to continue and expand the Drug Abuse Resistance Education program.

(C) \$2,500,000 for a continuation grant to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

(D) \$2,800,000 for a continuation grant for the Organized Crime Narcotics (OCN) program.

(E) \$2,800,000 for a continuation grant for the Financial Investigations (FINVEST) program.

(F) \$700,000 for Criminal Information Systems for a continuation grant to the SEARCH Group, Inc.

(G) Not less than \$500,000 to continue the criminal drug organization project of the South Carolina State Grand Jury.

(H) \$2,000,000 for a grant to continue the activities of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Area Drug Enforcement Task Force.

(I) Up to \$10,000,000 for a grant to the FBI to coordinate the national background check system as part of the upgrade of State criminal history records.

The conferees are aware of a number of other projects which will enhance State and

local law enforcement. Within the overall amounts provided in the conference agreement for Byrne discretionary grants, the conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine the following proposals, provide grants if warranted, and report its intentions to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

The projects described on page 16 of House Report 103-157, and the following additional projects—

San Miguel County, New Mexico seeks a grant for planning and design work to establish a multi-jurisdictional detention center.

The State of Florida seeks a grant to expand the Miami Violent Street Crime Task Force concept to other communities in Florida. This program has had some preliminary success in preventing and reducing such crimes as car-jackings and highway and street robberies which have endangered residents and visitors alike.

Lamar University in Beaumont, Texas, working in close cooperation with State and County officials, seeks a grant for a state-of-the-art instructional program to provide criminal justice, drug treatment and correctional education services for five current and proposed Federal, State and County prisons in Southeast Texas.

Williamsport, Pennsylvania seeks a grant to implement a drug interdiction and community neighborhood watch program.

The American Correctional Association seeks a grant to demonstrate and evaluate model training programs for staff and inmates at selected prison facilities.

*Correctional Options Grants.*—The agreement provides a total of \$12,000,000 for Correctional Options Grants, as follows:

(A) \$9,600,000 for grants to public agencies for correctional options that provide alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration.

(B) \$1,200,000 for grants to private agencies for correctional options that provide alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration.

(C) \$1,200,000 for grants to public agencies to establish, operate and support boot camp prisons.

The conferees are aware of a number of Correctional Options projects which will provide innovative alternatives to incarceration. Within the overall amounts provided in the conference agreements for these grants, the conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine the following proposals, provide grants if warranted, and report its intentions to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate:

The South Carolina Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services seeks a continuation grant for the Coastal Addictions Treatment Program, which diverts to treatment youthful offenders with alcohol/drug abuse problems;

San Juan County, New Mexico as described in House Report 103-157; and

Los Angeles County, California as described in Senate Report 103-105.

The conference agreement also provides for the following discretionary grants in addition to the amounts provided for the Edward Byrne Memorial Discretionary Grant Program:

*National Crime Information Center (NCIC).*—\$13,000,000 to continue the modernization of the NCIC.

*Overtime Payments.*—\$16,000,000 for overtime payments to State and local law enforcement agencies which are participating in Federal task forces. The conference agreement assumes that these funds will be dis-

tributed as follows: \$10,700,000 for DEA and \$5,300,000 for OCDE.

*Anti Car Theft Grants.*—\$500,000 for a newly authorized grant program to be used to combat motor vehicle theft.

The conferees are aware of two projects which will provide innovative approaches to combating motor vehicle theft. Within the overall amounts provided in the conference agreement for these discretionary grants, the conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine the following proposals, provide grants if warranted, and report its intentions to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

The District Attorneys Office for Kings County, NY seeks a grant for a project utilizing its innovative Autocrimes Prosecution Unit of Assistant District Attorneys and criminal investigators, working with the NYPD's Auto Crimes Division, to prosecute car thieves and dismantle chop shops and illegal parts distribution operations.

Essex and Union Counties, New Jersey seek a grant to expand an auto theft task force, which has had some preliminary success in reducing auto theft.

*Community Policing.*—\$25,000,000 for Community Policing grants to State and local governments to improve cooperative efforts between law enforcement agencies and the community by placing more officers on the street and employing new, innovative techniques to prevent crime.

The conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to continue to utilize the expertise developed by national organizations, such as the Eisenhower Foundation, the National Crime Prevention Council, the National Training and Information Center, and the National Association of Town Watch in expanding Community Policing into new communities.

The conferees agree with the decision by the Justice Department to equally distribute, between large and small communities, the grants for additional police funded in the fiscal year 1993 supplemental appropriation. The conferees encourage the Attorney General to distribute these Community Policing grants in a like manner.

The conferees are aware of a number of projects which will provide innovative approaches to community policing. Within the overall amounts provided in the conference agreement for these discretionary grants, the conferees expect the Bureau of Justice Assistance to examine the following proposals, provide grants if warranted, and report its intentions to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate.

The Santee-Lynches Regional Council of Governments in South Carolina, as described in Senate Report 103-105.

The City of Johnstown and Cambria County, Pennsylvania seeks a grant for a multi-jurisdictional community policing proposal involving Federal, State and local law enforcement, community leaders, and social services agencies.

The City of Charleston, WV seeks a grant to combine efforts of community volunteer organizations, local law enforcement and public housing agencies to address high crime activity.

The City of Wichita, KS seeks a grant for a community policing demonstration project as a model for moderate-sized cities, which will concentrate the efforts of police and community volunteers in high crime activity areas.

The conferees are also aware of the need to provide communities interested in utilizing community policing techniques with training and technical assistance. The conferees

understand that the Bureau of Justice Assistance's (BJA) State and Local Training and Technical Assistance program, particularly the Community Oriented Policing (COP) training component, has already trained over 10,000 officers and local officials in this philosophy of crime prevention. The conferees believe the availability of this assistance is critical to the success of the community policing discretionary grant program and expect BJA to provide additional re-

sources from this appropriation to the COP training project. These training funds shall be in addition to other funds required to provide technical assistance to the States in their implementation of the Edward Byrne Formula Grant program.

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates \$107,000,000, instead of \$123,000,000 as proposed

JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—				
	1993 En-acted	1994 Re-quest	1994 House	1994 Sen-ate	1994 Con-ference
Title II:					
Part A—Management & Administration	3,650	3,650	4,200	3,700	4,250
Part B—Formula Grants	51,100	51,100	65,550	53,300	59,500
Part C—Discretionary Grants	18,250	18,250	23,250	19,000	21,250
Part D—Youth Gangs	4,000	4,000	6,000	5,000	5,000
Part G—Juvenile Mentoring			2,000	7,000	4,000
Title V—Delinquency Prevention Grants			22,000	7,000	13,000
Total—JJDP programs	77,000	77,000	123,000	95,000	107,000

Amendment No. 13: Designates \$85,000,000 for funding of Part A (Management & Admin), Part B (Formula Grants), and Part C (Discretionary Grants) of the JJJPA, instead of \$93,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$76,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Designates \$5,000,000 for funding of Part D of the JJJPA (Youth Gangs) as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15: Designates \$4,000,000 for funding of Part G (Juvenile Mentoring) of the JJJPA, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Designates \$13,000,000 for funding of Title V (Delinquency Prevention Grants) of the JJJPA, instead of \$22,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Part C—Discretionary Grants.—The conference agreement provides a total of \$21,250,000 for Part C discretionary grants, of which:

(A) \$550,000 is for a grant to provide financial and technical assistance to an organization representing the State Advisory Groups (SAGs).

(B) \$100,000 is for a grant to an organization representing the SAGs for an information center to gather and publicize information on JJDP programs.

(C) \$3,500,000 is for a grant to the five organizations which comprise the National Coordinated Law-Related Education (LRE) program.

The conferees agree that section 299(e) of the JJJPA does not preclude the National Coordinated Program from competing for LRE funding for programs/projects developed after enactment of P.L. 102-586.

Within the amounts provided for the National Coordinated LRE Program, the conferees agree that \$100,000 should be made available as a one-time grant to the National Student/Parent Mock Election program. The conferees understand that this program, while providing a useful tool for educators to instruct students on the democratic process, is not targeted towards at-risk youth. Limited funding provided under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act should be targeted against at-risk youth and not the juvenile population in general. The conferees agree that any future Federal grant proposals for the Mock Student Election should be considered under programs administered by the Department of Education.

(D) \$2,300,000 is for a grant to the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges to provide continuing legal education in family and juvenile law.

(E) \$1,000,000 is for a grant to expand the Teens, Crime, and the Community Program as described in the Senate Report.

(F) \$1,300,000 is for grants for the 7 studies of youth violence mandated by section 248(b)(6) of the JJJPA. Within this amount, \$300,000 is provided for the three existing sites, and \$1,000,000 is provided to initiate the studies at the four new sites described in section 248. As discussed previously in the report under the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the conferees believe continuation of the Program of Research on the Causes and Correlates of Delinquency at the three existing sites should be funded at an estimated \$500,000 for each site by NIJ as part of its study on the origins of criminal behavior. Should the three Causes and Correlates sites be funded by NIJ, then the conferees believe the \$300,000 designated here for that purpose should instead be used for grants to States

by the House and \$95,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$107,000,000 for FY 1994 for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA) programs, as summarized in the following table:

for assistance to programs at the State and local level.

(G) \$500,000 is for a continuation grant to the National Network of Children's Advocacy Centers for technical assistance and training.

Within the amounts provided for discretionary grants under Parts C, D and G of title II and title V of the JJJPA Act, the conferees expect the Office of Juvenile Justice Programs to examine each of the following proposals and to provide grants if warranted, and to submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations on its intentions for each proposal:

The projects described on page 18 of House Report 103-157 and page 14 of Senate Report 103-105, and the following additional projects—

A grant to "Just Say No" International to expand its Youth Power program to public housing projects in Oakland, California and Baltimore, Maryland.

A grant to the State of North Carolina to initiate two pilot violence reduction programs based on a successful model program implemented by the Governor's Crime Commission in Robeson County, N.C.

A grant to Lackawanna County, PA to initiate a Juvenile Crime Prevention Program with the local District Attorney, community representatives and counseling practitioners.

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE ACT

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$8,000,000, instead of \$8,700,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$8,000,000 for Victims of Child Abuse programs for FY 1994, as summarized in the following table:

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—				
	1993 en-acted	1994 re-quest	1994 House	1994 Sen-ate	1994 con-ference
Subtitle A—Improve Investigations/Prosecution:					
Regional Advocacy Centers			500		500
Local Advocacy Centers			1,500		1,000
Technical Assistance and Training	1,500	1,500	1,600	1,500	1,500
Subtotal	1,500	1,500	3,600	1,500	3,000
Subtitle B—Court Appointed Special Advocates:					
Training and Technical Assistance	(1,000)		1,000	1,000	1,000

VICTIMS OF CHILD ABUSE PROGRAMS—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

Program/Activity	Fiscal year—			
	1993 enacted	1994 request	1994 House	1994 Senate 1994 conference
Expand Local CASA Programs .....	(1,000)		3,500	2,000 3,500
Subtotal .....	(2,000)	0	4,500	3,000 4,500
Subtotal C—Child Abuse Training .....	500	500	600	500 500
Total—Victims of Child Abuse Act .....	2,000	2,000	8,700	5,000 8,000

Amendment No. 18: Designates \$500,000 for Regional Children's Advocacy Centers, \$1,000,000 for Local Children's Advocacy Centers, and \$1,500,000 for technical assistance and training. The House bill designated \$500,000 for Regional Children's Advocacy Centers, \$1,500,000 for Local Children's Advocacy Centers, and \$1,600,000 for technical assistance and training. The Senate amendment struck the House designations for regional and local advocacy centers, and designated \$1,500,000 for technical assistance and training.

Amendment No. 19: Restores "(d)" as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Designates "(e) \$3,500,000" to expand local CASA programs as proposed by the House, instead of "(c) \$2,000,000" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: (f) \$500,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement designates \$500,000 to develop model technical assistance and training programs, instead of \$600,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement provides a total of \$29,457,000 and 348 FTE, the full base request, for the management and administration of the Office of Justice Programs (OJP). Because of the new programs that will have to be administered by OJP in fiscal year 1994, the conferees agreed not to include the FTE reductions requested by the Administration.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$119,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$119,000,000 for General Administration instead of \$117,196,000 as proposed by the House and \$115,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement provides requested adjustments to base and assumes the recommended reductions for deficit, FTE, and administrative savings.

Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR).—The agreement also restores the \$800,000 FTE/Administrative reduction requested for the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR), and provides \$1,000,000 of the program enhancement for 7 additional Immigration Judges requested in the budget amendment as part of the President's Immigration Initiative. The agreement assumes an appropriation of \$47,469,000 for EOIR with a resulting FTE ceiling of 579.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE DEBT COLLECTION ACTIVITIES

The Department of Justice is responsible for handling the litigation in Federal Courts necessary to obtain judgments which it can enforce to collect civil debts, penalties and fines owed the United States. The Department's civil debt collection activities will result in the recovery of an estimated \$918 million in fiscal year 1993 to be deposited into the Treasury. The Department estimates that hundreds of millions of dollars a year in additional debt could be recovered if it was provided more resources.

In order to provide additional resources to improve civil debt collection, the Department has been provided the authority, in section 108, to credit to its Working Capital Fund up to 3 percent of all amounts collected pursuant to civil debt collection litigation activities. Section 108 authorizes the Department to use these collections to pay for the costs of "processing and tracking" debt collection litigation, but not for the actual litigating expenses. The conferees understand that "processing and tracking" includes, but

is not limited to, the following services and functions:

- The Debt Collection Management Unit,
- The National Central Intake Facility,
- The Private Counsel Program,
- The Debt Accounting Operations Group, and

Other activities and adjunct debt collection tools associated with the litigation and collection of debts (e.g., skiptracing, credit reports, asset investigations, training, education and outreach, and costs in connection with sales of property to satisfy a U.S. Government debt, etc.)

If fiscal year 1993 civil debt collection levels of \$918,000,000 continue into fiscal year 1994, up to \$27,000,000 could be deposited into the Working Capital Fund (WCF) in fiscal year 1994. The conferees agree that should the \$27,000,000 be deposited to the WCF, it should be used first to pay for the existing costs of processing and tracking debt collection litigation throughout the Department, and next to expand such processing and tracking activities. Where appropriate, any appropriated funds supplanted by such payments from the Working Capital fund (WCF) should be used to expand civil debt collection litigating activities. Under this proposal, total debt collection resources would increase from \$33,000,000 to an estimated \$44,250,000—a 43 percent increase. The Department estimates that for each additional dollar applied to civil debt collection activities, between \$15 and \$32 in additional debt can be collected. The conferees estimate that by implementing this proposal, at least \$170 million and potentially up to \$360 million in additional civil debt would be collected and deposited into the Treasury. The following chart identifies resources available under this proposal, as follows: (1) appropriated amounts in the Department's fiscal year 1994 base for debt collection activities, (2) a proposed distribution of WCF collections for processing and tracking, (3) the resulting impact on appropriated funds, and (4) the total amount that could be available for debt collection in fiscal year 1994.

DEBT COLLECTION RESOURCES

[In thousands of dollars]

Appropriation/Program	FY 1994 Base			FY 1994 Conference		
	Appropr	Wk Cap Fnd	Total	Appropr	Wk Cap Fnd	Total
General Administration—						
Debt Collect Management Unit .....	3,000		3,000		3,000	3,000
Nat'l Central Intake Facility .....	2,100		2,100		4,700	4,700
Subtotal .....	5,100		5,100		7,700	7,700
U.S. Attorneys—						
Tracking and Processing .....	9,900		9,900		11,900	11,900
Litigation .....	9,100		9,100	14,000		14,000
Subtotal .....	19,000		19,000	14,000	11,900	25,900
General Legal Activities: Tax Division—						
Tracking and Processing .....	3,300		3,300		4,400	4,400
Litigation .....	4,400		4,400	6,000		6,000

DEBT COLLECTION RESOURCES—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

Appropriation/Program	FY 1994 Base			FY 1994 Conference		
	Appropriation	Wk Cap Fnd	Total	Appropriation	Wk Cap Fnd	Total
Subtotal	7,700		7,700	6,000	4,400	10,400
Civil Division—						
Tracking and Processing	506		506		750	750
Litigation	44		44	250		250
Subtotal	550		550	250	750	1,000
Environment Division—						
Tracking and Processing	350		350		550	550
Litigation						
Subtotal	350		350		550	550
U.S. Marshals Service—						
Tracking and Processing	300		300		1,700	1,700
Litigation						
Subtotal	300		300		1,700	1,700
Total Debt Collection Resources—						
Tracking and Processing	19,456		19,456		27,000	27,000
Litigation	13,544		13,544	20,250		20,250
Total	33,000		33,000	20,250	27,000	47,250

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 23: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$30,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$30,000,000 for the Office of Inspector General instead of \$30,898,000 as proposed by the House and \$30,723,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect that the various Department of Justice fee accounts will continue to reimburse the Inspector General for audit and inspection services.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$13,150,000 for the Weed and Seed Program as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,829,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees expect the Weed and Seed Program fund to provide existing Weed and Seed grantees with supplemental grants to support the continuance of ongoing projects.

Amendment No. 25: Includes the section number "605" as proposed by the House instead of "606" as proposed by the Senate. This is a technical change.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$9,123,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$9,385,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes language included in the Senate amendment concerning death penalty procedures for terrorists, and restrictions on assistance for Nicaragua. In both instances, similar language is being addressed in other, more appropriate, legislation—the Crime Bill for the death penalty legislation, and the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill for the restrictions on Nicaragua.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: \$403,968,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$403,968,000 for General Legal Activities, instead of \$400,968,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,086,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for the following changes from fiscal year 1993: an increase of \$25,772,000 for requested adjustments to base; a decrease of \$13,688,000 associated with requested deficit, FTE, and administrative savings; an additional base reduction of \$4,816,000; and \$400,000 of the \$1,600,000 program enhancement for the Civil Division requested in the budget amendment as part of the President's Immigration Initiative.

Office of Special Counsel for Immigration Related Unfair Employment Practices.—The conferees are concerned with the recent decision by the Office of Special Counsel (OSC) to cease funding of employer educational efforts in favor of increased funding for employee educational efforts. The conferees believe it is in the best interest of all parties associated with this endeavor to maintain a balanced program to inform both employees and employers of their rights and responsibilities under the law. The conferees encourage the OSC to reconsider its decision to cease funding of employer education.

VACCINE INJURY COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$2,000,000 for vaccine injury compensation expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

CIVIL LIBERTIES PUBLIC EDUCATION FUND

Amendment No. 29: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate that would have allowed any amounts remaining in the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund, after all redress payments had been provided, to be used for research, public education activities, and publishing for the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

Amendment No. 30: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: \$66,817,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides total new budget (obligational) authority of \$66,817,000 for the Antitrust Division, instead of \$63,817,000 as proposed by the House and \$62,092,000 as proposed by the Senate. This agreement, when added to unobligated prior year fee collections of \$3,500,000, provides total budget (obligational) authority of \$70,317,000 for fiscal year 1994. The agreement provides: \$3,634,000 for requested adjustments to base; \$1,288,000 to restore requested FTE, administrative and deficit reductions; \$1,837,000 for automation upgrades; and a \$3,000,000 program enhancement (including an estimated 50 FTE) to expand Antitrust Division enforcement efforts.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$45,997,000

and on page 9 line 19 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000",

and on page 10 line 3 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for a net appropriation (after offsetting fee collections have been deducted) of \$45,997,000 instead of \$44,817,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,092,000 as proposed by the Senate. The agreement also amends the bill to provide for estimated offsetting fee collections of \$20,820,000 instead of the \$19,000,000 included in both the House and Senate bills. The \$20,820,000 estimate assumes the same amount of fees will be collected in fiscal year 1994 as was collected in fiscal year 1993.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$813,797,000 for the United States Attorneys instead of \$808,797,000 as proposed by the House and \$818,797,000 as proposed by the Senate.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$99,000,000 instead of \$99,837,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$94,008,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides total new budget (obligational) authority of \$99,000,000 for the U.S. Trustees for fiscal year 1994. The agreement provides requested adjustments to base, assumes restoration of the requested FTE, administrative and deficit reductions, and allows for a \$2,000,000 program enhancement (including an estimated 36 FTE) for increased U.S. Trustee workload.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$61,513,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides that \$61,513,000 of the amount appropriated shall be derived from the U.S. Trustee System Fund, instead of \$56,521,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Provides that \$37,487,000 of offsetting fee collections shall be retained in this appropriation as proposed by the House, instead of \$53,687,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Provides that the \$99,000,000 appropriated in amendment number 33 shall be reduced as offsetting fees are collected, instead of \$99,837,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$94,008,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$61,513,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides that the net appropriation that results after offsetting fee collections are deducted is \$61,513,000, instead of \$56,521,000 as proposed by the House and \$46,150,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Provides that any fees collected in excess of \$37,487,000 shall be available for obligation in fiscal year 1995 as proposed by the House, instead of \$53,687,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$940,000 for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission as proposed by the House instead of \$898,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

The conference agreement appropriates the full \$339,808,000 requested by the Administration for the U.S. Marshals Service for fiscal year 1994. While the Administration did not request additional Deputy U.S. Marshals to handle security for newly authorized Federal judgeships, the conferees understand that protection of the judicial process is the highest priority program within the Marshals Service. The conferees expect the Marshals Service to distribute its available resources to cover its highest priority programs, and anticipate that all new judgeships will receive adequate security.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$312,884,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$307,700,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees understand that the \$312,884,000 provided under the conference agreement, when added to the \$12,500,000 in available prior year funds, will provide sufficient resources to allow the U.S. Marshals to handle current estimated jail days for fiscal year 1994.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$26,106,000 for the Community Relations Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$26,792,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42: Designates \$16,278,000 for costs associated with Cuban and Haitian entrants as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,415,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 43: Includes the section number "605" as proposed by the House instead of "606" as proposed by the Senate. This is a technical change.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

Amendment No. 44: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert: \$55,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriate \$55,000,000 from the Assets Forfeiture Fund instead of \$60,275,000 as proposed by the House and \$58,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates \$2,668,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,586,000 as proposed by the House.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

ORGANIZED CRIME DRUG ENFORCEMENT

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$382,381,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$384,381,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47: Includes the section number "605" as proposed by the House instead of "606" as proposed by the Senate. This is a technical change.

The conference agreement provides the full budget request less a reduction of \$2,000,000 associated with a nonrecurring expense in fiscal year 1993 under undistributed Regional Drug Information Squad funds.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$2,038,705,000 for the FBI as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,024,705,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Designates \$84,400,000 for the automation of fingerprint identification services as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$75,400,000 as proposed by the House.

*Counterterrorism Initiative.*—The conference agreement provides \$5,000,000 for the counterterrorism initiative described in the Senate report. The conferees understand a full \$10,000,000 will be available for this initiative, since the FBI plans to obligate an estimated \$5,000,000 from fiscal year 1993 appropriations to purchase equipment for a second Hostage Rescue Team, to expand and upgrade special weapons and tactics teams, and for other terrorist related programs.

*Identification Division Automation.*—The agreement provides \$84,400,000 for the revitalization of the Automated Fingerprint Identification System project, the full amount requested.

*Headquarters Staffing.*—The conferees remain concerned with the number of agents assigned to FBI headquarters, especially in light of recent information provided by the Department which identifies an average of 84 agents at FBI headquarters in fiscal year 1993. The conferees fail to understand how the FBI can justify such high agent staffing levels at headquarters at a time when the President is calling for major reductions in administrative expenses. The conferees expect the FBI to provide detailed justification for their fiscal year 1995 request for agents in all management and supervisory positions, both in the field and at headquarters, and for all agents at headquarters.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates \$722,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the DEA instead of \$718,684,000 as proposed by the House, and \$727,161,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement, when added to anticipated offsetting collections of \$42,123,000 from Diversion Fees, provides a total of \$764,123,000, an increase of \$15,770,000 over fiscal year 1993 amounts.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 51: Appropriates \$1,048,538,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,059,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base and assumes requested reductions for FTE (except the Border Patrol) and administrative savings.

*Immigration Initiative.*—The conference agreement provides over \$171,000,000 in additional resources to implement the President's Immigration Initiative. The INS will receive the bulk of these resources, over \$129,000,000 above fiscal year 1993 levels, as follows:

200 additional Land Border Inspectors .....	\$17,000,000
600 additional Border Patrol Agents .....	45,072,000
Additional detention/deportation resources .....	11,000,000
Immigration Emergency Fund .....	6,000,000
Detain/deport excludables circumventing inspect ....	11,900,000
Asylum officers/interpreters for airports .....	5,300,000
Overseas preinspection .....	10,700,000
Carrier consultation/training .....	2,000,000
Expedited exclusion (42 new inspectors) .....	2,527,000
Additional detention/deportation at airports .....	10,269,000
Expanded airport inspection services .....	7,304,000

Also, the conference agreement provides a total of \$42,500,000 in other Justice Department accounts to implement additional aspects of the President's Initiative:

Expand/construct four INS detention facilities. ....	\$40,300,000
Restore base/add 7 new Immigration Judges .....	1,800,000
Civil Division to handle legal challenges .....	400,000

**Border Barrier.**—Within the resources provided in the conference agreement, the conferees expect the Border Patrol to work with the community of Nogales, Arizona, and other border communities, on the design and construction of barriers which are acceptable to all interested parties.

**EXPEDITED EXCLUSION OF ILLEGAL ALIENS**

Amendment No. 52: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

*for projects on the northern border of the United States only.*

*In addition, section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1356), as amended, is further amended—*

*(1) in subsection (d), by striking "\$5", and inserting "\$6"; and*

*(2) in subsection (h)(2)(A), by deleting subsection (v), and inserting the following:*

*"(v) providing detention and deportation services for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry.*

*"(vi) providing exclusion and asylum proceedings at air or sea ports-of-entry for: excludable aliens arriving on commercial aircraft and vessels including immigration exclusion proceedings resulting from presentation of fraudulent documents and failure to present documentation; and any alien who is excludable under section 212(a) who has attempted illegal entry into the United States through avoidance of immigration inspection at air or sea ports-of-entry."*

**IMMIGRATION EMERGENCY FUND**

*For the Immigration Emergency Fund, as authorized by section 404(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U.S.C. 1101), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill included language extending the Land Border Fee Pilot Project from September 30, 1993 to September 30, 1996. The Senate amendment limits this pilot project to the northern border of the United States. The conference agreement includes the language proposed by the Senate and also adds new language, not in either the House or Senate bills, which was proposed by the Administration in its recent Immigration Initiative, as follows: (1) amends section 286 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 to raise the inspection user fee from \$5.00 to \$6.00 to fund enhanced enforcement efforts at airports and seaports; and (2) appropriates \$6,000,000 to the Immigration Emergency Fund to cover potential costs associated with third country repatriation of smuggled aliens. The agreement also amends section 286 to allow expenses associated with detention, deportation and expedited exclusion of illegal aliens attempting to enter through, or circumvent inspection at, airports and seaports, to be reimbursed from the Immigration User Fee Account.

The conference agreement will raise an estimated \$50,000,000 in additional offsetting collections to the Immigration User Fee Account. The conferees expect the Department to utilize these additional resources to expand and improve its ability to prevent excludable aliens from entering the United States, as requested by the President—specifically: up to \$10,700,000 to expand pre-in-

spection at foreign airports, \$2,000,000 for the Carrier Consultation Program, and up to \$11,900,000 to enhance Detention and Deportation. In addition, upon enactment of proposed legislation to expedite the exclusion process, the following expenses should be reimbursed from the aforementioned fee increase: \$5,274,000 for 24 additional asylum officers and 7 additional interpreters at airports and seaports, \$2,527,000 for 42 additional airport inspectors for secondary posts and to process exclusion orders, and up to \$10,269,000 for additional detention and deportation costs.

The conferees expect the INS to use these additional fee resources to expand contract detention space at international airports, especially in the New York City area.

**FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$1,950,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Federal Prison System as proposed by the House instead of \$1,971,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement, when added to prior year carryover of \$30,000,000, provides for requested adjustments to base and sufficient program enhancements to allow: (1) for full activation of all new prison facilities currently scheduled to open in fiscal year 1994; (2) for prisoner population increases; and (3) for activation of a joint BOP/INS contract facility in the Southwest.

**Parent/Child Programs.**—The conference agreement assumes the continuing maintenance and implementation of parent/child programs as described in the House report.

**Community Corrections.**—The conferees understand that the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) has increased its utilization of Community Corrections Center (CCC) beds and home confinement. The conferees encourage the BOP to continue to utilize the CCC beds under contract and to develop other appropriate community corrections programs for Federal offenders as a more cost-effective and efficient alternative to incarceration.

**Incarceration of Illegal Aliens.**—The conferees understand that illegal aliens convicted of crimes committed in the United States are given the option of serving out their sentence in a U.S. prison or being deported to their country of origin for imprisonment. While the conferees agree that the rights of aliens under the constitution should be safeguarded, we remain concerned that the American taxpayer is forced to pay for the cost to incarcerate these illegal aliens. The conferees urge the Committees of jurisdiction of both the House and Senate to consider legislation to provide either the Federal Judiciary or the Attorney General the authority to decide whether to incarcerate these illegal aliens in a U.S. prison or in a prison in their country of origin.

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CORRECTIONS**

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$10,211,000 for the National Institute of Corrections as proposed by the House instead of \$9,995,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect the NIC to continue to support training at the National Sheriffs' Institute, as described in the Senate report.

The conferees are aware of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Center for Mental Health Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the National Institute of Justice, and the National Institute of Corrections of the Department of Justice. The purpose of the MOU is to establish a framework for a continuing relationship between these organizations in

order to engage in joint planning and implementation of initiatives for mental health and criminal justice partnerships, particularly to improve delivery of mental health services to those incarcerated in the criminal justice system. Specifically, the joint efforts are intended to focus on the police handling of mentally ill offenders, including training for law enforcement officers; the special circumstances involved in the admission of the mentally ill; jail-based mental health services; and linking mentally ill offenders with community mental health services. The conferees encourage these organizations to expeditiously implement the MOU. The conferees urge the National Institute of Corrections to begin work in this area at the earliest possible date, and to provide a report on efforts taken to implement this MOU to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate by April 1, 1994.

**BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES**

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$269,543,000 for the buildings and facilities of the Federal Prison System instead of \$175,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$351,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Deletes language proposed by the Senate and not in the House bill which designated \$75,000,000 for INS detention facilities. The conference agreement includes \$30,000,000 for such facilities in amendment number 55.

Amendment Nos. 57 and 58: Includes the section number "605" as proposed by the House instead of "606" as proposed by the Senate. This is a technical change.

The conference agreement provides for requested adjustments to base, and provides for the following program enhancements:

Complete the Ft. Devens' Medical Facility .....	\$74,600,000
INS/Marshals Detention facility in Buffalo, NY .....	10,300,000
Expand the INS Detention facility in El Paso, TX ...	7,500,000
INS Detention facility at Krome, FL .....	11,250,000
INS Detention facility in San Francisco, CA .....	11,250,000
<b>Subtotal, New Construction .....</b>	<b>114,900,000</b>
Cooperative Agreement Program .....	20,000,000
Modernization and Repair .....	32,701,000

The agreement provides \$114,900,000 for new construction only to fund ongoing projects to completion, and to fund INS detention facilities which are part of the President's and the Senate's Immigration Initiative.

**FCI Loretto Expansion.**—The conferees are aware of a proposal to expand the Federal Correctional Facility (FCI) at Loretto, PA. The conferees expect the Bureau of Prisons to perform a detailed study on the possible expansion of this facility and report its findings to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate. This study should address the following issues: (1) the feasibility and cost of adding a third floor to the existing facility; (2) the need to expand existing service facilities (kitchen, dining facilities, laundry, medical, recreational, etc.) to accommodate additional prisoners, and related costs; (3) are existing utilities sufficient to handle an expansion, and if not, what are the costs to upgrade those utilities; and (4) will the local community support such an expansion.

**LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,  
FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED**

Amendment No. 59: Designates \$3,395,000 as proposed by the Senate for administrative expenses of the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, instead of \$3,100,000 as proposed by the House.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF  
JUSTICE**

Amendment No. 60: Includes the section number "605" as proposed by the House instead of "606" as proposed by the Senate. This is a technical change.

Amendment No. 61: Deletes language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which authorizes the use of extraordinary surpluses in the Assets Forfeiture Fund for certain law enforcement, prosecution and correctional initiatives.

Amendment No. 62: Report in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to repeal the authority for the Attorney General to use extraordinary surpluses in the Assets Forfeiture Fund for certain law enforcement, prosecution and correctional initiatives.

**VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT**

Amendment No. 63: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed in said amendment, insert the following:

**SEC. 110. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT.**—

(a) Section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10601), is amended—

(1) In subsection (d)(2)—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) 1 percent shall be available for grants under section 1404(c); and

"(D) 4.5 percent shall be available for grants as provided in section 1404A."

(2) In subsection (d)(3), by striking "1404(a)" and inserting "1404A".

(3) In subsection (g)(1), by striking "(d)(2)(A)(iv)" and inserting "(d)(2)(D)".

(b) Section 1404A of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10603(a)), is amended by striking "1402(d)(2)" and inserting "1402(d)(2)(D) and (d)(3)".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

**Less Costly Alternatives to Incarceration.**—

The conference agreement deletes language proposed by the Senate and not in the House bill, which would have authorized the Attorney General to enter into reimbursable agreements in fiscal year 1994 with the Federal Judiciary and State and local governments for the cost of less expensive alternatives to incarceration. The conferees understand that the Attorney General already has the necessary statutory authority to execute the provisions proposed in the Senate amendment. The conferees further understand that the Department could realize a savings of up to \$35 per day for each individual who is incarcerated by utilizing home confinement and electronic monitoring instead of the traditional form of confinement in a jail or prison. The conferees encourage the Attorney General, within the confines of existing sentencing guidelines, and without lessening the safety of our citizens and visi-

tors, to make maximum use of these less costly alternatives to incarceration.

**Victims of Crime Act.**—The conference agreement also adds language not in either bill to correct technical errors which arose when the Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) was amended by the Federal Courts Administration Act of 1992. Without these corrections, the Department will be unable to award grants for several purposes for which the legislation intended such grants to be awarded.

**FUNDING FOR BANKRUPTCY JUDGESHIPS**

Amendment No. 64: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

**SEC. 111. BANKRUPTCY FEES.**—

(a) **CHAPTERS 7 AND 13 FILING FEES.**—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(1) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "\$120" and inserting "\$130".

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(1), by striking "one-fourth" and inserting "23.08 percentum".

(3) **SEC. 406.** (b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by striking "25 percent", and inserting "30.76 percentum".

(b) **CHAPTER 11 FILING FEE.**—Effective 30 days after enactment of this Act—

(1) Section 1930(a)(3) of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking "\$600" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$800".

(2) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (b)(2), by striking "50 percentum" and inserting "37.5 percentum".

(3) Section 589a of title 28 of the United States Code is amended in subsection (f)(1), by striking "16.7 percentum" and inserting "12.5 percentum".

(4) **SEC. 406.** (b) of Public Law 101-162 (103 Stat. 1016) is amended by adding "and 25 percent of the fees hereafter collected under 28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(3)" immediately after "28 U.S.C. section 1930(a)(1)".

(c) No funds provided by this Act shall be expended to fill any bankruptcy judgeship unless such appointee was on a merit selection list or report submitted to the court of appeals by either the judicial council or a subcommittee of the members of the council, in accordance with section 120 of the Bankruptcy Amendments and Federal Judgeship Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-353; 98 Stat. 344), section 152 of title 28 of the United States Code, and the Judicial Conference of the United States' Procedures for the Selection and Appointment of Bankruptcy Judges.

(d) **REPORT ON BANKRUPTCY FEES.**—

(1) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than March 31, 1998, the Judicial Conference of the United States shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate, a report relating to the bankruptcy fee system and the impact of such system on various participants in bankruptcy cases.

(2) **CONTENTS OF REPORT.**—Such report shall include—

(A)(i) an estimate of the costs and benefits that would result from waiving bankruptcy fees payable by debtors who are individuals, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various revenue sources to offset the net cost of waiving such fees.

(B)(i) an evaluation of the effects that would result in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, from using a graduated bankruptcy fee system based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor, and

(ii) recommendations regarding various methods to implement such a graduated bankruptcy fee system.

(3) **WAIVER OF FEES IN SELECTED DISTRICTS.**—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out in not more than six judicial districts, throughout the 3-year period beginning on October 1, 1994, a program under which fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, may be waived in cases under chapter 7 of title 11, United States Code, for debtors who are individuals unable to pay such fees in installments.

(4) **STUDY OF GRADUATED FEE SYSTEM.**—For purposes of carrying out paragraphs (1) and (2), the Judicial Conference of the United States shall carry out, in not fewer than six judicial districts, a study to estimate the results that would occur in cases under chapters 11 and 13 of title 11, United States Code, if filing fees payable under section 1930 of title 28, United States Code, were paid on a graduated scale based on assets, liabilities, or both of the debtor.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment provided language, not in the House bill, which would raise Chapters 7 and 13 bankruptcy filing fees from \$120 to \$135 in order to fund additional workload in the U.S. Trustee System. The conference agreement provides for new or increased bankruptcy fees which will raise an anticipated \$12,800,000 on an annual basis in additional offsetting collections, as follows:

Subsection (a) raises \$8,600,000 by increasing Chapter 7 (Individual Litigation) and Chapter 13 (Individual Debt Adjustment) filing fees from \$120 to \$130.

Subsection (b) raises \$4,200,000 by increasing Chapter 11 (Business Reorganization) filing fees from \$600 to \$800.

The conferees have agreed to raise these various fees in order to address the critical needs of the Bankruptcy Courts. In the absence of these fee increases, available overall budgetary resources would not have allowed for any program enhancements to handle bankruptcy filings. The conferees agree that amounts collected as a result of these fee increases shall be applied to the filling of vacant bankruptcy judgeships (including the bankruptcy judgeships authorized by P.L. 102-36) and related expenses.

**Appointment of Bankruptcy Judges.**—The conference agreement also includes, in subsection (c), a provision to clarify the existing procedures to be utilized by the Courts of Appeals in the appointment of bankruptcy judges. Under existing statutory provisions and regulations promulgated by the Judicial Conference of the United States, bankruptcy judges are to be appointed following a rigorous merit selection process. This provision makes clear the intent of Congress that the Courts of Appeals select an appointee from a list or report submitted to the Courts of Appeals by either the judicial council or a subcommittee of the council.

**Report on Bankruptcy Fees.**—The conference agreement also includes, in subsection (d), a requirement that the Judiciary submit a report relating to the bankruptcy fee system and its impact on various participants in bankruptcy cases.

The report should include an analysis of the need for a provision which would permit the waiver of the filing fee for certain indigent individual debtors, the costs and benefits of waiving the filing fee, and financing options. To complete the report, the conferees expect the Judicial Conference to carry out a program in no more than six representative judicial districts whereby bankruptcy fees may be waived for individual debtors filing under chapter 7 who are unable

to pay in installments. The results of this program should allow the Congress to consider the feasibility and desirability of implementing a fee waiver program on a nationwide basis.

The report will also include a study of the estimated effect of implementing a graduated bankruptcy fee filing system for chapter 11 and 13 cases. The conferees expect this study to review data in not fewer than six judicial districts, including several districts in which a significant number of chapter 11 cases are filed. The conferees also expect there to be an overlap, in at least two districts, between the districts for the bankruptcy fee waiver program and the districts selected for the graduated fee study. Although the graduated fee study will not require any actual change in the chapter 11 or 13 filing fee, the results should allow the Congress to consider the advisability of implementing a graduated fee system in the future.

The conferees assume that the Judiciary will not incur a cost of more than \$1,500,000 to comply with this section, of which not more than \$100,000 shall be spent on the analyses associated with the report. If it appears that the costs will exceed these amounts, then the conferees expect the Judiciary to notify the Congress.

#### JURISDICTION OF THE OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Amendment No. 65: Deletes language proposed by the Senate and not in the House bill, which would have prevented enforcement of Attorney General Order No. 1638-92, relating to the jurisdiction of the Office of Inspector General. The conferees agree to delete this provision pending a review of the issue by the Attorney General.

Amendment No. 66: Deletes a Sense of the Senate provision included in the Senate bill but not in the House bill.

#### GANG TASK FORCE WAIVER

Amendment No. 67: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following:

*SEC. 112. For fiscal year 1994 only, grants awarded to State and local governments for the purpose of participating in gang task forces and for programs or projects to abate drug activity in residential and commercial buildings through community participation, shall be exempt from the provisions of section 504(f) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment proposed language, not in the House bill, which would have amended the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to waive the limitation of four years on providing grants for gang task force projects to abate illegal drug use. The conference agreement provides for a one-year waiver of this limitation. The conferees agree that any permanent change in existing law should be addressed as part of the Crime Bill.

#### RELATED AGENCIES

##### COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$7,776,000 instead of \$7,565,000 as proposed by the House, and \$7,923,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 69: Designates a limitation of \$26,500,000 for payments to State and local enforcement agencies instead of \$26,000,000 as proposed by the House, and \$28,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree with language in the Senate Appropriations Committee report that calls for EEOC, in conjunction with the General Accounting Office, to provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate on the total cost of implementing the Federal Employee Fairness Act of 1993, not later than 30 days following its enactment.

Amendment No. 70: Appropriates \$230,000,000 for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as proposed by the House instead of \$227,305,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 71: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *Provided, That \$60,400,000 of offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title 1 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: Provided further, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$99,900,000: Provided further, That any offsetting collections received in excess of \$60,400,000 in fiscal year 1994 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1994: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to continue a reexamination of, the policies of the Federal Communications Commission with respect to comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificates granted under 26 U.S.C. 1071, to expand minority ownership of broadcasting licenses, including those established in the Statement of Policy on Minority Ownership of Broadcasting Facilities, 68 F.C.C. 2d 979 and 69 F.C.C. 2d 1591, as amended 52 R.R. 2d 1313 (1982) and Mid-Florida Television Corp., 69 F.C.C. 2d 607 (Rev. Bd. 1978), which were effective prior to September 12, 1986, other than to close MM Docket No. 86-484 with a reinstatement of prior policy and a lifting of suspension of any sales, licenses, applications, or proceedings, which were suspended pending the conclusion of the inquiry: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission by this Act may be used to diminish the number of VHF channel assignments reserved for noncommercial educational television stations in the Television Table of Assignments (section 73.606 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations): Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this act may be used to repeal, to retroactively apply changes in, or to begin or continue a reexamination of the rules and the policies established to administer such rules of the Federal Communications Commission as set forth at section 73.3555(d) of title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations, other than to amend policies with respect to waivers of the portion of section 73.3555(d) that concerns cross-ownership of a daily newspaper and an AM or FM radio broadcast station.*

In addition, section 9(a) of Title 1 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) by striking "(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—" and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY.—

"(1) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—, and

(b) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) FEES CONTINGENT ON APPROPRIATIONS.—

*The fees described in paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be collected only if, and only in the total amounts, required in Appropriations Act.*" and on page 28 line 14 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$129,889,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$160,300,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

Both the House and Senate bills appropriated \$129,889,000, the full appropriations requested by the Commission for fiscal year 1994. The Senate amendment added language not in the House bill, but included in previous Appropriations Acts, which prohibits the use of funds by the FCC to: (1) change or reexamine changes of current policies governing comparative licensing, distress sales and tax certificate policies intended to expand opportunities for minorities; (2) diminish the number of VHF channels assigned for noncommercial educational television stations; and (3) reexamine rules governing cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations.

The conference agreement strikes the \$129,889,000 appropriation recommended in both bills and inserts \$160,300,000. The agreement includes new language not in either the House or Senate bills, which, pursuant to the provisions enacted in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, allows the FCC to collect \$60,400,000 in section 9 offsetting fees, and to credit those fees to this appropriation. The agreement will reduce the appropriation of \$160,300,000 as offsetting fees are collected for a net appropriation of \$99,900,000. The agreement also includes new language not in either the House or Senate bills, which amends Title I of the Communications Act of 1934 to require that the amount of section 9 fees that can be collected be designated in Appropriation Acts. Lastly, the conference agreement includes the restrictive language concerning minority ownership, noncommercial VHF education television stations, and cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations that was contained in the Senate amendment; however, the restrictive language concerning cross-ownership was amended as follows: *Cross-ownership of newspapers and broadcast stations.—*The conferees understand that the FCC has recently found that circumstances in the radio market have changed significantly, and that the Commission has modified its local ownership rules for radio. While the conferees do not endorse these findings or adopt the reasoning of the Commission's decisions, it nonetheless appears that it may now be appropriate to permit the FCC to establish a more liberal policy with respect to waivers permitting cross-ownership of newspapers and radio stations. The conference agreement permits the FCC to change its policy concerning waivers of the restriction against such cross-ownership. The conferees intend that the new policy allow such waivers to be granted only in the top 25 markets where at least 30 independent broadcast voices remain in the market after the transfer is completed. Concerns have been raised that, on occasion, the FCC has overlooked its obligation to make a separate determination that an application for waivers of its

cross-ownership rules be granted only if it serves the public interest. The conferees intend that the FCC also make a separate affirmative determination that such a transfer is otherwise in the public interest, based upon the applicants' showing that there are specified benefits to the service provided to the public sufficient to offset the reduction in diversity which would result from the waiver. The conferees also intend that the FCC retain the discretion to examine requests for other waivers of the radio-news-paper cross-ownership rule on a case-by-case basis upon a showing that such a waiver would have unique public benefits. The conferees agree that this amendment to the Senate amendment does not change the television-newspaper cross-ownership policies or any other aspect of newspaper-broadcast cross-ownership rules and policies, nor do the conferees intend that this action be regarded as an endorsement of past FCC actions granting waivers of ownership rules.

**Commission Funding.**—The \$160,300,000 included in the conference agreement provides the FCC with their full appropriations request, plus \$16,111,000 to continue to implement the Cable Act, \$9,300,000 to initiate the modernization/upgrade of their technical equipment and infrastructure, and \$5,000,000 to handle additional workload resulting from the President's technology initiatives. The agreement provides the Commission with a minimum of 240 FTE above their request, for a total of 1,964 FTE, to allow the FCC to fully implement its new responsibilities.

**Wireless Information Network.**—The conference agreement provides \$30,000 to permit the Commission to continue to subscribe to the Rutgers University Wireless Information Network.

**Fee Waivers.**—The FCC has authority under 47 U.S.C. 158(d)(2) to waive its fees "in any specific instance for good cause shown, where such action would promote the public interest." The conferees are aware of one such specific instance—that of non-profit entities which qualify for tax exempt status, and which seek to use the new cost-efficient technology of ultra-light, non-geostationary satellite systems to advance the public interest. The conferees believe that this is the type of situation that Congress envisioned when the fee waiver was authorized, and encourage the Commission to waive fees in this instance.

#### FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$18,900,000 for the Federal Maritime Commission instead of \$18,383,000 as provided by the House and \$19,450,000 as provided by the Senate.

The conferees agree with the concerns expressed in the House report accompanying this bill (H. Rept. 103-157) regarding the borrowing of funds from the Treasury in accordance with section 502(g)(2) of Public Law 102-582. The conferees expect that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees will be notified prior to any use of this borrowing authority.

#### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 73: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *Provided further, That the funds appropriated in this paragraph are subject to the limitations and provisions of sections 10(a) and 10(c) (notwith-*

*standing section 10(e)), 11(b), 18, and 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Improvements Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-252; 94 Stat. 374), except that this proviso shall cease to be effective upon enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission for fiscal year 1994*

and on page 29 line 11 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000",

and on page 29 line 21 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$69,740,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$67,920,000",

and on page 29 line 22 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$19,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,820,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate added language, not in the House bill, containing the policy decision made in 1980 and included in previous appropriations Acts regarding the operation of the Commission. The language restricts FTC as follows: (1) prohibits the use of FTC funds to engage in rulemakings concerning unfairness in advertising; (2) establishes limits on public participation; (3) prohibits the use of FTC funds to petition the Patent Commissioner for cancellation of a registered trademark; and (4) prohibits FTC from studying or investigating agricultural marketing orders or agricultural cooperatives.

The conference agreement includes the Senate restrictions, but adds an exemption to nullify the restrictions upon enactment of an FTC Authorization for fiscal year 1994. The agreement also amends the bill to allow for collection of \$20,820,000 of offsetting fee collections instead of the \$19,000,000 included in both the House and Senate bills. The \$20,820,000 estimate assumes the same amount of fees will be collected in fiscal year 1994 as was collected in fiscal year 1993. As a result of the revised fee estimate, the agreement amends the bill to provide a net appropriation of \$67,920,000 instead of the \$69,740,000 included in both the House and Senate bills.

The conference agreement provides the FTC new budget (obligational) authority of \$88,740,000, which when added to prior fee carryover of \$3,500,000, provides the Commission total budget authority of \$92,240,000 for fiscal year 1994. At this level, the Commission will receive its full adjustments to base, and will be able to fund necessary automation upgrades.

#### NATIONAL COMMISSION TO SUPPORT LAW ENFORCEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 74: Deletes the separate appropriation of \$500,000 recommended in the House bill and stricken by the Senate. The conference agreement, in Amendment No. 10, provides for a transfer of \$500,000 from the State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant Program to initiate this new National Commission to Support Law Enforcement. The conferees agreed to this transfer because of the importance of the Commission to State and local law enforcement.

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 75: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: *Provided, That immediately upon enactment of this Act, the rate of fees under section 6(b) of the Securi-*

*ties Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)) shall increase from one-fiftieth of 1 percentum to one-twenty-ninth of 1 percentum and such increase shall be deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation, to remain available until expended, to recover costs of services of the securities registration process: Provided further, That such fee increase shall be repealed upon enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 for full cost recovery of Commission expenses.*

*In addition, and subject to enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 to require the Commission to collect a \$171,621,000 in fees to be deposited to this appropriation as an offsetting collection; \$171,621,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That subject to the fee provisions contained in said legislation, \$171,621,000 of fees shall be assessed and deposited as an offsetting collection to this appropriation to recover the costs of services of the securities registration process: Provided further, That the \$171,621,000 herein appropriated shall be reduced as the aforementioned fees are collected during fiscal year 1994, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1994 appropriation estimated at not more than \$0.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House bill provided an appropriation of \$57,856,000, the full budget request, which when added to carryover amounts and anticipated offsetting fee collections of \$171,300,000 to be derived upon enactment of the Securities and Exchange Commission Authorization Act, 1993, would provide the SEC with its full budget request for fiscal year 1994. The Senate amendment allows for the same appropriated amount, and adds language not in the House bill, but similar to that in previous Appropriations Acts, which increases the rate of section 6(b) fees from 1/50th to over 1/29th of one percent. The amounts assumed in the Senate bill, when added to prior year unobligated balances would provide the SEC with its full budget request for fiscal year 1994.

The conference agreement allows for an appropriation of \$57,856,000, and assumes the collection of a total of \$171,621,000 in offsetting fee collections, for total new budget (obligational) authority of \$229,477,000. The agreement includes the fee language proposed by the Senate raising the rate of section 6(b) fees from 1/50th to 1/29th of one percent, but adds language to repeal this rate increase upon enactment of legislation amending the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to establish a new fee system in fiscal year 1994 for full cost recovery of Commission expenses. If H.R. 2239, or similar legislation, is ultimately enacted into law in fiscal year 1994, the conferees have included new language which allows the SEC to collect \$171,621,000 in fees in accordance with the provisions of that legislation.

The conferees agree that the section 6(b) fee increase included in this conference agreement is intended to be a temporary, one-year solution to the long-term problem regarding SEC funding. H.R. 2239, which passed the House and is pending in the Senate, was initiated by the House to be the long-term solution to this problem. The conferees agree that the following services of the Securities and Exchange Commission are covered by the fee authorized in the Senate amendment:

#### SERVICES OF THE SECURITIES REGISTRATION PROCESS

Receipt, processing, and public availability of securities registration statements.

Review of securities registration statements filed under the securities acts, including period reports, proxy soliciting material, and tender offer schedules.

Inspection of investment companies that have registered securities with the Commission to determine the accuracy and adequacy of related disclosures.

Oversight of the accounting profession with respect to financial statements contained in filings related to the registration process made with the Commission.

Activities, including rulemaking, planning, system development and coordination, associated with establishing and operating the system for mandatory electronic filing of registration statements and related disclosure documents.

Rulemaking, legal, interpretive, investor information and economic services related to the registration process.

Oversight and enforcement of securities markets and securities professionals in connection with the public offering and trading associated with the issuance of registered securities.

Automation and administrative support services related to the registration process.

The conferees agree that the following services of the Securities and Exchange Commission are not covered by the fee authorized in the Senate amendment:

#### SERVICES NOT INCLUDED IN THE SECURITIES REGISTRATION PROCESS

Regulation of investment advisers.

Regulation of public utility holding companies not related to the securities registration process.

Rulemaking, legal, interpretive, law enforcement, consumer information and economic services not related to the securities registration process.

Receipt, processing, and public availability of filings not related to the securities registration process.

Oversight of securities markets and securities professionals not related to distribution and trading of registered securities.

Automation and administrative support services not related to the securities registration process.

Other services not related to the securities registration process.

The conference agreement of \$229,477,000 in new budget authority, when added to anticipated fiscal year 1993 fee carryover of \$30,840,000, will provide the SEC with total budget (obligational) authority of \$260,317,000 for fiscal year 1994. This amount provides the Commission with their requested adjustments to base, and allows for requested reductions of \$4,200,000 associated with non-recurring fiscal year 1993 projects. Since funding for the SEC is totally offset through the collection of fees, and not from taxes or other sources of revenue, the conferees agree that FTE levels should be determined based upon filings and resulting workload and that administrative reductions should not be applied to the Commission.

*Investment Advisers.*—Both the House and Senate bills included language to allow the SEC to collect \$16,600,000 in Investment Adviser fees upon enactment of authorizing legislation. The conferees agree that, should the SEC begin to collect such fees, an estimated 100 FTE will be required to implement this new program above the 2,677 FTE assumed by the conferees for the Commission's ongoing duties and responsibilities.

#### STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 76: Inserts a citation to the State Justice Institute Authorization

Act of 1992 as proposed by the Senate, instead of the State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1988 as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$13,550,000 for the Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

##### SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$226,000,000 for the core research programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) instead of \$210,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$240,988,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided in the conference agreement will fully fund the adjusted base program for this account, and allows an additional \$28,812,000 to be distributed among high priority program increases. The conferees expect NIST and the Department of Commerce to submit a notification of reprogramming to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees as soon as possible indicating the proposed distribution of this amount.

The conferees agree that the amounts designated under NIST's Scientific and Technical Research and Services appropriations account and Industrial Technology Services appropriations account for transfer to the NIST Working Capital Fund are intended to increase the invested capital of the Fund as the transfers are made.

Amendment No. 78: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: \$1,500,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The Senate amendment provided for a transfer of \$3,000,000 from this account to the Department of Commerce Working Capital Fund. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. The conference agreement allows for a transfer of \$1,500,000 from NIST to the Department of Commerce Working Capital Fund. The conferees intend that this amount be used to fund procurement and grants management and financial oversight systems.

##### INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Amendment No. 79: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement includes \$232,524,000 for the external research programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as proposed by the Senate. The House passed bill did not include any funds for this purpose, although the House-reported bill included \$162,000,000 for this account. The conference agreement provides the full budget request for this appropriation account, which includes funding for the Advanced Technology Program (ATP), the Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP) program, and the Quality Outreach program. The conferees agree that these funds are to be distributed between the Advanced Technology Program, manufacturing extension partnership and quality outreach program as proposed in the report accompanying the Senate bill (S. Rept. 103-105) and the budget request.

##### CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

Amendment No. 80: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The conference agreement includes the full budget request of \$61,686,000 for the construction of NIST facilities as proposed by the Senate. The House-passed bill did not include a provision on this matter, although the House-reported bill also included \$61,686,000 for this purpose.

#### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

##### OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amendment No. 81: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: \$1,694,753,000, to remain available until expended; of which \$576,000 shall be available for operational expenses and cooperative agreements at the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas; and in addition, \$54,800,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries": Provided, That grants to States pursuant to section 306 and 306(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, shall not exceed \$2,000,000 and shall not be less than \$500,000: Provided further, That hereafter all receipts received from the sale of aeronautical charts that result from an increase in the price of individual charts above the level in effect for such charts on September 30, 1993, shall be deposited in this account as an offsetting collection and shall be available for obligation

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$1,694,753,000 for operations, research, and facilities of the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) instead of \$1,650,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,685,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement also includes language designating \$576,000 for the Fish Farming Experimental Laboratory at Stuttgart, Arkansas instead of \$600,000 for this purpose as included in the Senate bill. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement provides for a transfer of \$54,800,000 from the fund entitled "Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries" instead of \$55,544,000 as proposed by the House and \$54,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount transferred under this conference agreement will allow \$7,144,000 to be available for Saltonstall-Kennedy fisheries development grants in fiscal year 1994.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which provides minimum and maximum funding levels for section 306 and 306(a) Coastal Zone Management grants. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate allowing NOAA to retain collections derived from an increase in the price of aeronautical charts. In a fiscal year 1993 reprogramming request, NOAA proposed to significantly reduce aeronautical chart production since it does not directly relate to the agency's primary missions. The Committees on Appropriations did not approve this reprogramming, but urged NOAA and the user community to find a means to finance production and distribution of the charts that reduced reliance on NOAA

appropriations. In order for NOAA to continue such aeronautical chart production, users of these products will have to assume a greater share of the burden through increased chart prices. The conference agreement will allow these increased collections to go directly to supporting the aeronautical mapping and charting program. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement does not include language proposed by the Senate setting the reprogramming threshold for NOAA at a level more stringent than that in effect for the remainder of the accounts in this bill. The conferees expect that NOAA will continue to keep the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate informed of any changes in the levels provided for the

various programs, projects and activities designated in the table included in this report. The conferees also expect NOAA to continue providing to the Committees quarterly status reports on the obligation of funds.

The details of the conference agreement are provided in the following table with appropriate comparisons:

## NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1993 currently available	1994 request	1994 House	1994 Senate	1994 conference
<b>NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE</b>					
Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy:					
Mapping and Charting:					
Automated Nautical Charting System II	\$29,300	\$27,773	\$27,773	\$29,300	\$28,500
Great Lakes mapping project	1,500	1,500	1,300	1,500	1,300
	465	465	0	0	0
Subtotal	31,265	29,738	29,073	30,800	29,800
Geodesy:					
SC Cooperative Geodetic Survey	15,750	18,402	17,402	18,402	17,900
Land Info. Sys. (Multi-Purpose Cadastre)	554	0	0	600	554
	1,674	0	1,500	600	1,200
Subtotal	17,978	18,402	18,902	19,602	19,654
Total, Mapping, Charting, and Geodesy	49,243	48,140	47,975	50,402	49,454
Observation and Assessment:					
Observation and Prediction:					
Circulatory survey program	11,084	12,112	11,511	12,112	11,800
Observatory buoys/California	738	738	738	700	700
Chesapeake Bay Observation Buoys	140	0	140	0	140
Institute for Marine Engineering	400	0	400	0	400
Ocean services	500	0	0	0	0
COAP	4,442	4,442	4,442	4,442	4,442
	456	456	450	450	400
Subtotal	17,760	17,748	17,681	17,704	17,882
Estuarine and Coastal Assessment:					
Ocean assessment program	2,420	2,448	2,448	2,420	2,420
Damage assessment	11,925	11,925	11,925	17,369	17,369
Transfer fr Damage Assess Revolv fund	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
S. Carolina Wetland Management Demo	17,506	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Marine Protective Structure	1,800	1,800	0	500	500
NY Harbor water quality model	100	0	0	0	0
Oil Pollution Act of 1990	75	0	0	0	0
	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395	1,395
Subtotal	36,421	20,268	18,468	24,384	24,384
Coastal Ocean Science:					
Coastal Ocean program	12,000	11,874	11,874	10,000	11,000
Maui algal bloom crisis	450	0	0	400	400
Subtotal	12,450	11,874	11,874	10,400	11,400
Total, Observation and Assessment	66,631	49,890	48,023	52,488	53,666
Ocean and Coastal Management:					
Coastal Management:					
CZM 306 and 306A grants	33,534	33,287	41,500	42,000	41,500
Estuarine research reserves	3,214	3,214	3,214	3,214	3,214
CZM program administration	3,597	3,534	0	3,500	0
Charleston, SC, spec. area mgt. plan	960	0	0	1,000	1,000
Nonpoint pollution control	1,920	1,920	4,000	3,000	4,000
Subtotal	43,225	41,955	48,714	52,714	49,714
Ocean Management:					
Marine sanctuary sites program	1,627	1,841	1,700	1,500	1,500
Hawaii humpback mar. sanct. institute	7,000	7,000	9,000	9,150	9,150
	144	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	8,771	8,841	10,700	10,650	10,650
Total, Ocean and Coastal Management	51,996	50,796	59,414	63,364	60,364
Total, NOS	167,870	148,826	155,412	166,254	163,484
<b>NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE</b>					
Information Collection & Analyses:					
Resource Information:					
Conservation engineer/by-catch	49,056	52,872	52,000	53,000	52,872
Antarctic research	716	716	716	1,716	1,416
Fishery resource data error reduction	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200	1,200
Oyster disease research	960	960	960	960	960
Marine mammal research	1,500	0	1,500	1,500	1,500
Consolidation of NMFS facilities	2,314	2,314	2,314	2,314	2,314
Protected species research	-1,300	0	0	0	0
Halibut/Sablefish IFQ's	3,630	3,630	3,630	3,630	3,630
Chesapeake Bay Studies	0	0	0	1,370	1,200
Right Whale research	1,890	1,890	1,890	1,890	1,890
Gear entanglement studies	214	214	214	214	214
MARFIN	651	651	651	651	651
SEAMAP	3,780	3,780	3,780	3,780	3,780
Aquaculture	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340
Stuttgart	2,225	2,225	0	2,225	2,500
Alaskan groundfish surveys	576	0	0	600	576
Bering Sea pollock research	661	661	661	661	661
West Coast groundfish	945	945	945	945	945
	780	780	780	780	780

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year—				
	1993 cur- rently avail- able	1994 re- quest	1994 House	1994 Sen- ate	1994 con- ference
New England stock depletion	1,116	1,116	1,116	1,116	1,116
Hawaii stock management	500	0	0	500	500
Yukon River Chinook Salmon	700	700	700	700	700
Winter Run Chinook Salmon	500	500	250	250	250
Atlantic salmon research	710	710	710	710	710
United States/Canada lobster study	0	0	0	300	300
Gulf of Maine Groundfish survey	567	567	567	567	567
Dolphin Safe Technologies	500	500	500	500	500
Habitat Research/Evaluation	470	470	470	470	470
Pacific salmon treaty program	5,587	5,587	5,587	5,587	5,587
Fish Cooperative Inst. Enhancement	384	384	384	384	384
Hawaiian Monk Seals	520	0	0	520	520
Stellar Sea Lion Recovery Plan	1,440	1,440	1,440	1,440	1,440
Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Research	300	0	300	240	300
Hawaiian Sea Turtles	240	240	240	250	240
Center for Shark Research	140	0	140	0	140
Subtotal	84,812	86,392	87,485	92,310	92,153
<b>Fishery Industry Information:</b>					
Fish statistics	9,838	10,734	10,162	10,734	10,500
Alaska groundfish monitoring	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,500	4,500
PACFIN/catch effort data	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046	2,046
Rec. Fishery harvest monitoring	2,046	2,046	2,195	2,195	2,395
Subtotal	18,030	18,926	18,503	19,475	19,441
<b>Information Analyses and Dissemination</b>					
Computer hardware and software (IT-95)	19,424	21,562	20,112	21,562	20,112
	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,000	1,500
Subtotal	21,424	23,562	22,112	22,562	21,612
<b>Total, Info., Collection, and Analyses</b>	124,266	128,880	128,100	134,347	133,206
<b>Conservation and Management Operations:</b>					
<b>Fisheries Management Program</b>					
Columbia River hatcheries	12,007	13,070	14,069	13,070	13,500
Columbia River smolt	10,300	10,300	10,300	10,300	10,300
Columbia River endangered species	112	0	100	100	100
Regional Councils	288	288	288	288	288
International fisheries commissions	8,556	8,556	8,556	8,556	8,556
Management of Georges Bank	1,100	400	900	1,200	800
Sandy Hook lease	480	480	480	480	480
Pribilof Islands	1,500	1,500	0	0	0
Beluga whale committee	300	0	0	0	0
Pacific tuna management	192	0	192	200	192
	1,606	1,606	1,606	2,000	1,800
Subtotal	36,441	36,200	36,491	36,194	36,016
<b>Protected Species Management</b>					
ESA listing & status review	3,756	4,036	4,000	4,036	4,000
Tissue bank & stranding network	930	930	930	930	930
Driftnet Act implementation program	295	295	295	295	295
Marine Mammal Protection Act implement	3,278	2,900	2,900	3,278	3,278
Endangered Species Act recovery plan	7,750	7,750	7,750	7,750	7,750
Fishery observers training	218	218	218	218	218
East Coast observers	96	0	96	200	150
	700	0	700	700	700
Subtotal	17,023	16,507	16,889	17,407	17,321
<b>Habitat Conservation</b>	5,800	6,306	6,200	6,300	6,200
<b>Enforcement &amp; Surveillance</b>	11,000	12,637	11,700	12,600	12,000
<b>Total, Conservation and Mgmt. Opns</b>	70,264	71,650	71,280	72,501	71,537
<b>State and Industry Assistance Programs:</b>					
<b>Grants to States:</b>					
Interjurisdictional fisheries grants	3,239	3,156	3,156	3,156	3,156
Anadromous grants	2,108	2,108	2,108	2,108	2,108
Anadromous fishery proj (striped bass)	186	0	300	0	250
North Atlantic fish reinvestment	0	0	0	2,000	1,500
Louisiana emergency fund	5,100	0	0	0	0
Interstate fish commissions	295	295	295	295	295
Subtotal	10,928	5,559	5,859	7,559	7,309
<b>Fisheries Development Program:</b>					
Fisheries Trade Promotion activities	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,700
Product quality and safety	8,700	9,854	8,700	9,854	9,000
Fish oils	900	900	500	0	0
Fisheries biotechnology	0	0	0	2,000	1,750
Hawaiian fisheries development	768	0	0	750	750
Seafood Inspection program	5,500	5,500	5,000	5,500	5,500
Subtotal	17,568	17,954	15,900	19,804	18,700
<b>Total, State &amp; Industry Assist. Progs</b>	28,496	23,513	21,759	27,363	26,009
<b>Total, NMFS</b>	223,026	224,043	221,139	234,211	230,752
<b>OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH</b>					
<b>Climate and Air Quality Research:</b>					
Intra-annual & Seasonal Climate Research	7,909	7,945	7,945	7,945	7,945
Long-Term Climate & Air Quality Research	23,666	27,099	25,000	25,000	25,000
Nat'l Acid Precipitation Assess	1,376	1,376	1,376	1,376	1,376
High Performance Computing	0	2,600	1,000	0	1,000
Subtotal	25,042	31,075	27,376	26,376	27,376
<b>Climate and Global Change</b>	46,997	69,902	66,902	53,000	63,000

	Fiscal year—				
	1993 currently available	1994 request	1994 House	1994 Senate	1994 conference
Total, Climate and Air Quality .....	79,948	108,922	102,223	87,321	98,321
<b>Atmospheric Programs:</b>					
Weather Research .....	27,450	30,515	28,486	28,486	28,486
PROFS/advanced forecasting applications .....	1,870	1,870	1,870	0	1,870
Wind Profiler .....	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,350	4,350
Federal/State Atmospheric Mod. grants .....	2,639	0	2,900	2,500	3,000
Southeastern Storm Research .....	372	0	372	0	372
Subtotal .....	36,681	36,735	37,978	35,336	38,078
Solar-Terrestrial Services and Research .....	4,850	5,368	5,000	3,500	5,000
Total, Atmospheric Program .....	41,531	42,103	42,978	38,836	43,078
<b>Ocean and Great Lakes Programs:</b>					
Marine Prediction Research .....	8,850	9,693	9,409	9,000	9,200
GLERL .....	4,558	4,558	4,558	4,558	4,558
Great Lakes nearshore research .....	500	500	0	500	500
VENTS .....	2,496	2,496	0	2,496	2,496
SE US FOCI Program .....	1,000	0	1,000	0	500
GLERL/Zebra mussel .....	911	0	911	0	911
Lake Champlain Study .....	190	0	0	190	290
Pacific Island Tech. Assistance .....	190	0	0	200	190
Subtotal .....	18,695	17,247	15,878	16,944	18,345
Sea Grant .....	40,000	39,787	40,787	48,000	43,200
Sea Grant college program .....	2,800	0	2,800	0	2,800
National Coastal R&D Institute .....	1,300	0	1,300	1,000	1,100
Subtotal .....	44,100	39,787	44,887	49,000	47,100
Undersea Research Program .....	15,998	2,038	17,823	17,000	18,100
NOAA Undersea Research Program .....	1,900	0	0	1,900	1,900
Maine Marine Research Center .....	0	4,000	0	0	0
Regional Marine Research Centers .....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal .....	17,898	6,038	17,823	18,900	20,000
Total, Ocean and Great Lakes programs .....	80,693	63,072	78,588	84,844	85,445
Total, OAR .....	202,172	214,097	223,789	211,001	226,844
<b>NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE</b>					
<b>Operations and Research:</b>					
Local Warnings and Forecasts .....	298,725	319,868	319,868	319,868	319,868
MARDI .....	23,316	75,813	56,991	60,000	75,000
WSFOs—reduce 8 stations .....	752	752	752	752	752
Southern Region HQ .....	814	814	0	0	0
Data buoy engineering and test .....	518	0	0	0	0
Data buoy maint. for Hawaii .....	542	542	0	550	542
Pacific & Alaska Region HQ .....	366	366	366	366	366
Agricultural and fruit frost .....	2,316	2,316	2,316	2,316	2,316
Fire weather services .....	449	449	449	449	449
Susquehanna Riv Basin Flood Sys .....	669	669	900	669	900
Aviation forecasts .....	35,596	35,596	35,596	35,596	35,596
Flood Warning System/Colorado River .....	288	288	288	288	288
Contract observers .....	190	0	0	0	0
Samoa .....	240	0	0	240	200
Regional Climate Centers .....	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
California Data Buoys .....	205	205	200	200	200
Subtotal .....	367,986	440,678	420,726	424,294	439,477
Central Forecast Guidance .....	28,211	30,034	28,555	29,000	28,555
Atmospheric and Hydrological Research .....	2,350	2,544	2,390	2,544	2,400
Total, Operations and Research .....	398,547	473,256	451,671	455,838	470,432
<b>Systems Acquisition:</b>					
Public Warning and Forecast Systems .....	84,516	123,545	114,044	133,545	120,000
NEXRAD .....	18,000	18,135	18,135	18,135	18,135
ASOS .....	23,779	43,564	27,818	43,564	43,564
AWIPS/NOAAPort .....	7,826	14,600	12,000	8,000	8,000
NMC Computer facility upgrades .....	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Systems Acquisition .....	134,121	199,844	171,997	203,244	189,699
Total, NWS .....	532,668	673,100	623,668	659,082	660,131
<b>NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICE</b>					
<b>Satellite Observing Systems:</b>					
Polar Spacecraft and Launching .....	148,432	162,099	156,099	139,000	139,000
Geostationary Spacecraft and Launching .....	118,000	182,746	123,746	123,746	123,746
Environmental Observing Services .....	47,600	50,284	49,443	50,000	49,443
Total, Satellite Observing Systems .....	314,032	395,129	329,288	312,746	312,189
<b>Environmental Data Management Systems:</b>					
Data and Information Services .....	22,346	23,768	23,139	22,000	22,000
Subtotal .....	10,300	10,300	10,300	15,300	15,300
Total, NESDIS .....	32,646	34,068	33,439	37,300	37,300
Total, NESDIS .....	346,678	429,197	362,727	350,046	349,489
<b>PROGRAM SUPPORT</b>					
<b>Administration and Services:</b>					
Executive Direction and Administration .....	25,000	25,269	25,269	25,000	25,000
Systems Program Office .....	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,500	1,100

## NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION—Continued

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—				
	1993 currently available	1994 request	1994 House	1994 Senate	1994 conference
Subtotal	26,100	26,369	26,369	26,500	26,100
Central Administrative Support	38,000	39,244	39,244	38,000	38,000
Retired Pay Commissioned Officers	7,333	7,706	7,706	7,706	7,706
Total, Administration and Services	71,433	73,319	73,319	72,206	71,806
Marine Services	60,056	62,037	62,037	63,000	62,037
Maintain S.E. Marine Facility	258	258	258	0	0
Marine Electronics Agenda	700	0	0	0	0
New England Science Center	186	0	0	0	0
Total, Marine Services	61,200	62,295	62,295	63,000	62,037
Aircraft Services	9,000	8,995	8,995	9,500	9,000
Aircraft Critical Safety and Inst	500	500	500	500	500
Subtotal	9,500	9,495	9,495	10,000	9,500
Total, Program Support	142,133	145,109	145,109	145,206	143,343
Direct obligations, ORF	1,614,547	1,834,372	1,731,844	1,765,800	1,774,043
Reimbursable Obligations	369,081	390,385	390,385	390,385	390,385
Total Obligations, ORF	1,983,628	2,224,757	2,122,229	2,156,185	2,164,428
Financing:					
Deobligations	-11,800	-13,800	-24,800	-25,300	-22,990
Offsetting Collections					
Federal Funds	-332,128	-353,650	-353,650	-353,650	-353,650
Non-Federal Funds	-36,953	-36,735	-36,735	-36,735	-36,735
Trust Funds	0	0	0	0	0
Budget authority, ORF	1,602,747	1,820,572	1,707,044	1,740,500	1,751,053
Financing from proposed transfers:					
Promote and develop fishery products	-55,000	-61,400	-55,544	-54,000	-54,800
Damage Assessment	-17,506	-1,500	-1,500	-1,500	-1,500
Appropriation, ORF	1,530,241	1,757,672	1,650,000	1,685,000	1,694,753

Activities funded under this conference agreement which were originally addressed in only the House report (H. Rept. 103-157), or only the Senate report (S. Rept. 103-105), are provided in accordance with any direction given in that report, unless expressly modified in the following statement.

## NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

The conference agreement includes a total of \$163,484,000 for the fiscal year 1994 activities of the National Ocean Service instead of \$155,412,000 as proposed by the House and \$166,254,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The amount provided includes \$9,150,000 for the National Marine Sanctuary Program. The conferees intend that the increase provided be used to support activities and expenses associated with newly designated and soon-to-be designated sanctuaries, as well as to maintain and strengthen the activities of existing sanctuaries. The amount provided includes funding for the Hawaiian humpback whale marine sanctuary as provided in the Senate report.

The conference agreement includes \$41,500,000 for section 306 and 306(a) Coastal Zone Management grants and \$4,000,000 for nonpoint pollution control grants. Program administration costs are expected to be funded from the Coastal Zone Management Fund as proposed by the House; however, the conferees intend that program administration expenses not exceed \$3,500,000.

The conference agreement includes language specifying minimum and maximum amounts for grants to States under section 306 and 306(a) for fiscal year 1994 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees expect NOAA to submit an allocation plan, including an allocation formula with appropriate minimum and maximum levels, to the Committees on Appropriations and appropriate authorizing committees of the House and the Senate when the fiscal year 1995 President's

Budget request is transmitted to the Congress.

The conferees have provided \$11,000,000 for the Coastal Ocean program. Of this amount, the conferees expect \$700,000 to be used to conduct research by the Baruch Institute and the University of South Carolina on small, high salinity estuaries. This research is to be conducted in coordination with the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeastern Fisheries Laboratory. In addition, the conferees expect \$800,000 to be provided to the National Institute of Environmental Renewal in Pennsylvania for a program to identify and quantify sources of pollution in the Chesapeake Bay.

## NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

The conference agreement includes a total of \$230,752,000 for the programs and activities of the National Marine Fisheries Service, instead of \$221,139,000 as proposed by the House and \$234,211,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have included \$52,872,000 for NMFS resource information programs. Of this amount, not less than \$750,000 is for Marine Resources, Monitoring, Assessment and Prediction Program (MARMAP) activities carried out by the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department.

The conference agreement includes \$700,000 above the request for conservation engineering and bycatch. This increase is intended to support ongoing programs of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) through the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Development Foundation to assess finfish bycatch in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic shrimp trawl fisheries.

Within the funding provided, the conferees expect that the Auke Bay Laboratory will receive not less than \$5,243,000. Funds provided for implementation of the Driftnet Act may be used for high seas salmon research as well as other purposes specified in the House and Senate reports.

The conference agreement includes \$2,500,000 for the aquaculture program. Within the amounts provided, \$250,000 is for the "Nantucket Program" for shellfish aquaculture, \$80,000 is for bay scallop restoration on Long Island, and \$250,000 is for the Newport, Oregon, Marine Science Center.

The conferees have included \$2,395,000 for the recreational fishery monitoring program. Of this amount, \$200,000 is for a grant to the South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department to support enhanced red drum and recreational species assessments, tagging and resource management.

The conference agreement includes \$1,800,000 for a grant to the Joint Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Research in Hawaii for Pacific tuna and billfish management, instead of \$2,000,000 as provided by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$1,500,000 for the Northwest Atlantic Ocean Fisheries Reinvestment program to address the decline of groundfish stocks in New England. These funds will be used for development of underutilized species, aquaculture and expanded uses for fish waste.

The conference agreement includes \$1,750,000 for fisheries biotechnology and toxicology research at the National Marine Fisheries Service Southeastern Laboratory in Charleston, South Carolina.

The conferees have provided \$1,200,000 for Halibut/Sablefish individual fisheries quotas (IFQs) instead of \$1,370,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no funds for this purpose. These funds are provided because of a realization that NMFS will incur significant costs in implementing the management plan recently approved for Pacific halibut and sablefish. The funds are provided only for the implementation of this particular management plan and this provision does not imply any endorsement by the conferees of IFQs in general. The conferees are concerned about the costs of implementing and

enforcing IFQs and agree that the Appropriations Committees and the appropriate authorizing committees will continue to review this fisheries management system during hearings and review of the fiscal year 1995 budget for NOAA.

Within the funding provided for NMFS, \$10,300,000 has been included for the operations of the Columbia River hatcheries as authorized by the Mitchell Act. The conferees expect NMFS to comply with reprogramming guidelines in the obligation of these funds, and expect that a report on a program plan for these funds, as well as those provided for the Columbia River hatcheries in the construction account, be provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate no later than December 1, 1992.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$800,000 for international fisheries commissions. The amount provided over the request is intended to be applied as follows: \$300,000 for transfer to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for addressing the reregistration of lampricide with the Environmental Protection Agency; and \$100,000 for the continuation of sea lamprey control in Lake Champlain.

The conferees have included \$300,000 for the conclusion of the United States/Canada lobster study as provided by the Senate. The conferees agree that this amount represents the final installment for completion of this study.

Within the amounts provided, NMFS is expected to reimburse any unpaid costs incurred in research on bowhead whales pursuant to section 313 of Public Law 102-567.

#### OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC RESEARCH

The conference agreement includes a total of \$226,844,000 for NOAA's Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, instead of \$223,789,000 as proposed by the House and \$211,001,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$290,000 to continue the Lake Champlain research program carried out cooperatively between the Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory and the Lake Champlain Basin Consortium. Of this amount, \$100,000 is for the GPS differential station as described in the Senate report.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$46,000,000 for the Sea Grant college program, of which \$2,800,000 is specifically designated toward research, public education and outreach on the problem of zebra mussels. The increase above base levels for the National Sea Grant program should be used for marine biotechnology programs and is to be awarded on a competitive basis.

The conferees have included \$18,100,000 for the National Undersea Research Program. Of the amount provided, \$3,372,000 is for the Hawaii NURP program. The conferees intend that no ongoing program will receive less than \$1,000,000.

Within the increase provided over fiscal year 1993 levels for long-term climate and air quality research, \$500,000 is specifically provided for the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory.

#### NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

The conference agreement includes a total of \$660,131,000 for the fiscal year 1994 expenses of the National Weather Service, instead of \$623,668,000 as proposed by the House and \$659,082,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The managers expect the National Weather Service to provide a weather radio transmitter for Craig, Alaska, to serve the west coast of Prince of Wales Island. The conferees also

expect that NOAA will take no action to plan for or to implement any reduction in the Jackson, Kentucky, Weather Service Office.

In the interest of aviation safety, the conferees intend that the weather observation station at Stampede Pass, Washington, will be maintained only until the new ASOS is fully operational in the first quarter of fiscal year 1994.

Within the amounts provided under the National Weather Service, \$800,000 is intended for the continued maintenance of fourteen coastal data buoys funded in fiscal year 1993 under the GOES Contingency Fund. The conferees expect that future budget requests for NOAA will include the necessary funding to maintain these data buoys.

The conference agreement includes an increase of \$100,000 above the amounts included in the House report for the Federal/State Cooperative Atmospheric Weather Modification Program. This increase is to be provided to the State of Arizona to begin a winter snowpack enhancement research program on the Navajo Nation in Arizona and New Mexico.

The conference agreement includes \$75,000,000 for training and staff for the new weather service facilities associated with the modernization efforts of the NWS. The conferees expect this amount to be allocated to allow increased staffing for the maximum number of weather stations receiving new radars and equipment under the Weather Service modernization plan. The conferees further expect NOAA to provide to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees quarterly updates, beginning on January 1, 1994, on the status of opening the new weather service offices, by location, and to submit a reprogramming notification to the Committees on Appropriations should the full \$75,000,000 not be required for this stated purpose in fiscal year 1994.

The conference agreement includes a total of \$189,699,000 for weather service systems acquisition. This amount fully funds the request for ASOS and AWIPS, and provides sufficient funding to continue NEXRAD system acquisition and the Class VII computer.

#### NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SATELLITE, DATA, AND INFORMATION SERVICES

The conference agreement includes a total of \$349,489,000 for the National Environmental and Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS), instead of \$362,727,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,046,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have included the Senate level of \$139,000,000 for the Polar Orbiting Environmental Satellite (POES) program, noting that the Senate Defense Appropriations bill continues Air Force support for launch services at the fiscal year 1993 level. The conferees continue to support the concept, recently endorsed by the National Performance Review, of converging NOAA's polar orbiting satellite program with that of the Department of Defense should such a plan prove to be feasible and to provide cost savings. However, the conferees remain skeptical of the cost effectiveness and feasibility of consolidation with NASA's polar satellite programs. The conferees further agree that convergence will not be practicable unless budgetary resources for NOAA are increased in future years.

#### PROGRAM SUPPORT

The conference agreement includes a total of \$143,343,000 for the program support activities of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, instead of \$145,109,000

as proposed by the House and \$145,206,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees expect NOAA to follow the lead of the State Department in reducing the increases for foreign national employees overseas.

The conferees have included \$7,706,000 for the retirement pay of NOAA commissioned officers. The conferees expect NOAA and the Department of Commerce to work with the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to ensure that this item is funded as a mandatory account in fiscal year 1995 and subsequent fiscal years to provide for consistency with other retirement accounts for the uniformed services.

The amount provided under the NOAA Operations, Research, and Facilities account assumes \$22,290,000 in prior year deobligations.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 82: Provides \$109,703,000 for the NOAA construction account, and designates funding for several items for construction and related activities. The conference agreement also includes a technical language correction relating to the transfer of land in Eureka, California, to NOAA for the purpose of building a weather forecast office for a new NEXRAD facility. This item was contained in neither the House or Senate bills. The House bill included \$89,775,000 for this appropriation account, with no designation of the funds in bill language. The Senate amendment included \$109,703,000 for this account and designated in bill language \$5,000,000 for the acquisition of real property for national estuarine reserves and \$6,250,000 for the construction of a National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana.

The conference agreement designates amounts for specific construction and related activities, including: \$2,000,000 for the construction of the National Marine Fisheries Service Estuarine and Habitat Research Laboratory in Lafayette, Louisiana; \$1,000,000 for a grant for the purchase of equipment for the Ruth Patrick Science Education Center in Aiken, South Carolina; and the following amounts for several continuing construction activities: \$1,000,000 for construction and related expenses for a Multi-Species Aquaculture Facility to be located in the State of New Jersey; \$1,000,000 for a grant to the Mystic Seaport, Mystic, Connecticut, for a maritime education center; \$1,395,000 for a grant to the Indiana State University Center for Interdisciplinary Science Research and Education (funded under the Small Business Administration in previous fiscal years); and \$1,000,000 for a grant for the Boston Biotechnology Innovation Center.

The conferees are aware that many NOAA-owned facilities, at an average age of 30 years, may require significant major repairs or upgrades, particularly the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) laboratories. The conferees have received many requests for specific NMFS facility projects ranging from minor repairs to new facility construction. The conferees recognize that many of these requests represent bona fide program requirements, but are concerned that this piecemeal approach may not take into account long-term funding for equipment and staffing for the new and expanded laboratories. The conferees expect the Department of Commerce to submit to the Committees on Appropriations, and the appropriate authorizing committees, a comprehensive facilities plan for NMFS. This plan should address any requirements for new laboratory or other office space, modifications or repairs

to existing space, and any recommended closures of outdated or unnecessary facilities. The plan should also indicate NOAA's proposed staffing for the existing and proposed facilities. This plan should be submitted to the Congress no later than January 1, 1994.

In that regard, the conferees are aware that NOAA is in the process of determining a site for a replacement for the National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory that is engaged in groundfish research on the West Coast. The conferees expect that Newport, Oregon, will be included in a study of potential sites, and that local real estate and construction costs, as well as operating costs and cost-of-living expenses, will be included as major criteria for determining a new site. In addition, the conferees would expect that co-location with existing NOAA personnel and offices, as well as other existing Federal science agencies, be among the highest criteria for a new site. The conferees expect a report on this item by January 1, 1994.

The conferees have included \$5,000,000 for the National Estuarine Research Reserve Program for acquisition of real property and construction. The funds for this authorized program are not designated in the bill, as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$683,000 for planning and design of a joint Federal and State Marine Laboratory to be located at the marine resources center at Fort Johnson, South Carolina. The conference agreement also includes \$178,000 for the Beaufort NMFS laboratory. In addition, the conference agreement provides \$1,800,000 for the Newport, Oregon, Marine Science Center and \$500,000 for the Kodiak, Alaska, Fisheries Center, both of which are described in the Senate Report.

The conference agreement includes the following amounts for the NOAA construction account:

(In thousands of dollars)

	FY 1994 Conference
<b>Construction:</b>	
NEXRAD Facilities and Land	62,784
Beaufort, NC Laboratory .....	178
Charleston Fish Lab Repair ...	683
Oxford, MD fisheries lab .....	750
Lafayette, LA fisheries lab ....	2,000
Nat'l Estuarine Research Reserves .....	5,000
Monitor Marine Sanctuary museum .....	800
Boston biotechnology innovation center .....	1,000
Mystic, CT maritime educ. & research ctr. ....	1,000
Newport, OR Marine Science Center .....	1,800
Kodiak Fisheries Center .....	500
Sandy Hook lease .....	1,500
Environmental Compliance ...	4,000
Boulder Lab .....	2,441
Multispecies Aquaculture Center .....	1,000
Silver Spring Consolidation ..	2,421
Real Property Maintenance ...	6,500
NOAA Research Facilities & Other Const. ....	4,751
Indiana State University .....	1,395
Ruth Patrick Science Center ..	1,000
Columbia River Facilities .....	8,200
<b>Total, Construction .....</b>	<b>109,703</b>
<b>FLEET MODERNIZATION, SHIPBUILDING, AND CONVERSION</b>	

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates \$77,064,000 for NOAA Fleet Modernization, Shipbuilding, and Conversion as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$23,064,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes funding for the acquisition of an oceanographic research vessel. The conferees expect NOAA to apply the economic model developed by NOAA, and the recommendations included in the Department of Commerce Inspector General's report of September 1993, to ensure that the most cost-effective means of acquiring such a vessel is selected. The conferees encourage NOAA to consider full and open competition as well as the option of utilizing existing Navy contracts.

The conferees are not convinced that NOAA should proceed with its plans to perform major repair-to-extend (RTE) or modernization packages on older vessels such as the *Oceanographer* and suggest that such funds would be better used to proceed with repair and upgrade of Navy T-AGOS vessels, as noted in the fiscal year 1993 conference agreement.

The conferees are concerned that NOAA has not complied with reprogramming procedures in its use of funds provided under this heading in previous fiscal years. The conferees expect that notification will be provided to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees regarding any change in the use of funds provided in this bill and in the use of any unobligated balances from previous fiscal years. The conferees further agree that NOAA budget justifications for this account have provided little information and detail on the distribution of the funds requested. Accordingly, beginning in fiscal year 1995, the budget justification material for this account should fully detail shipbuilding, repair and modification projects by vessel.

**AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT AND MODERNIZATION**

Amendment No. 84: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: \$43,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$43,000,000 for the new Aircraft Procurement and Modernization account instead of \$46,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House bill contained no provision on this matter. The amount provided is sufficient for the acquisition and equipping of a mid-size research aircraft capable of performing more advanced hurricane research and environmental missions in climate and global change, air chemistry and mesocyclone research. The conferees agree that this should be a fully competitive procurement.

**GENERAL ADMINISTRATION**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 85: Appropriates \$33,042,000 for the Department of Commerce General Administration account as proposed by the House, instead of \$31,712,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

Amendment No. 86: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for the Department of Commerce Office of Inspector General instead of \$15,860,000 as proposed by the House and \$16,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**BUREAU OF THE CENSUS**

**SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 87: Appropriates \$128,286,000 for Census Bureau salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$131,170,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees support the Senate recommendation to continue to maintain on a monthly basis the M22P, M20J, and M20K reports.

**PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS**

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$110,000,000 for periodic censuses and programs as proposed by the House instead of \$120,084,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees support the designation of \$600,000 of these funds for intercensal poverty estimates as proposed in the House report.

The conferees remain concerned that the efforts of the Census Bureau to plan for the Year 2000 decennial census have not adequately addressed the concerns expressed by the Congress regarding the cost and the scope of the next decennial census. The conferees expect the Secretary of Commerce and the Office of Management and Budget to take a more active role in planning for the Year 2000 decennial census to ensure that all concerns of the Congress, the absolute data requirements of Federal departments and agencies, as well as State and local government data needs, are considered in the planning effort. The conferees expect that other Federal departments and agencies with significant data requirements, for which the decennial census is determined to be the most effective means of collection, will reimburse the Census Bureau for a portion of the costs of planning for and conducting the Year 2000 Census. The conferees expect the Secretary of Commerce to report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, as well as the appropriate authorizing committees, by January 1, 1994, on the status of the Year 2000 decennial census planning efforts, including any proposals for legislative changes which may be necessary to address the concerns expressed by Congress.

The conferees continue to support the efforts of the Census Bureau to work with the U.S. Postal Service to develop procedures to simplify and lower the cost of the next decennial census. The conferees expect the status report requested above to include an update on the progress being made with the Postal Service.

**INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION**

**OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION**

Amendment No. 89: Provides language which allows funding provided to the International Trade Administration (ITA) to be used to fund grants and cooperative agreements, and designates specific funding levels for certain activities aimed at promoting U.S. exports, particularly in the sectors of textiles, biotechnology, and manufacturing, and increasing the competitiveness of U.S. businesses. These specific activities include: \$9,000,000 for National Technology Center university consortium; \$3,400,000 for the Tailored Clothing Textile Corporation; \$800,000 for the Center for Global Competitiveness at Saint Francis and Saint Vincent Colleges in Pennsylvania; \$465,000 for the Center for Manufacturing Productivity at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst; \$1,395,000 for the Massachusetts Biotechnology Research Institute; and \$930,000 for the Michigan Biotechnology Institute. The Senate amendment included language allowing funds under ITA to be used for grants and cooperative agreements, including those in support of the National Textile Center university consortium and the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation. The House bill contained no similar language provision, although funding for both the National Textile Center and Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation had been included in the House bill.

Amendment No. 90: Appropriates \$248,590,000 for the expenses of the International Trade Administration instead of

\$221,445,000 as proposed by the House and \$251,103,000 as proposed by the Senate. The

following table reflects the distribution of the funds provided by activity:

## INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal years—				
	1993	1994 request	1994 House	1994 Senate	1994 conference
Trade Development	54,707	51,511	51,346	57,063	59,903
Int'l Economic Policy	17,325	24,833	17,838	21,101	19,748
Import Administration	28,423	29,341	28,261	32,341	32,341
U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service	113,396	140,598	124,000	140,598	136,598
Total	213,851	246,333	221,445	251,103	248,590

**Trade Development.**—The conference agreement includes a total of \$59,903,000 for the Trade Development office under ITA. Of this amount, \$9,000,000 is for the National Textile Center, \$3,400,000 is for the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation, and \$3,590,000 is for additional activities identified under Amendment No. 89.

The conference agreement includes \$4,040,000 for the Office of Textiles and Apparels, exclusive of the National Textile Center and the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation.

**International Economic Policy.**—The conference agreement includes \$19,748,000 for International Economic Policy. This amount represents a current services level for this office.

**Import Administration.**—The conferees have agreed to provide the Import Administration with an increase of \$3,000,000 to hire additional accountants and financial analysts for antidumping and countervailing duty case investigations as proposed by the Senate.

**U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service.**—The conferees have not provided the full budget request for the United States and Foreign Commercial Service (US&FCS), although an increase of \$6,475,000 is provided over the base for this activity for restoration of purchasing power losses overseas. The conferees expect the US&FCS, and the other programs within ITA, to realize efficiencies and savings as a result of the result of the recent review of Federal export programs conducted by the Interagency Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee chaired by the Secretary of Commerce. The conferees also expect the US&FCS to follow the lead of the State Department in reducing foreign national pay increases.

The conferees endorse the Senate language confirming that the US&FCS should remain in the Department of Commerce and that other Federal departments and agencies should not duplicate US&FCS's mission and programs. The conferees are supportive of the efforts of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee (TPCC), particularly with regard to the submission of a unified export promotion budget.

The conferees encourage the establishment of an international trade specialist position in the State of Vermont as provided in the Senate report.

The conferees intend that the funding distribution indicated above be used as thresholds against which the reprogramming procedures outlined in section 605 of the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act are to be applied. The conferees are concerned that ITA has, in previous fiscal years, shifted funds between offices and activities without notifying the House and Senate Appropriations Committee as required. Such reprogramming procedures also apply to the use of unobligated balances which carry over from previous fiscal years.

The conferees encourage ITA to utilize unobligated carryover balances to support the NIS Business Information Service (BISNIS) and the Special American Business Intern Training Program (SABIT).

The managers are aware that the Department of Commerce, Department of State, Department of Justice, and the U.S. Trade Representative have not yet reached an interagency agreement regarding future remedies to be applied against former republics of the Soviet Union that are disrupting domestic and export markets for potash and other fertilizers. The Administration is urged to act in an expeditious manner to end any unfair pricing and injurious surges of potash exports from these republics. Steps should be taken to implement bilateral proposals that would comply with United States trade statutes.

Because of the overall funding constraints, the conference agreement does not include funding under the International Trade Administration for a program to provide technical assistance to help foreign governments enforce intellectual property laws, as included in the Senate Report. The conferees expect ITA to work with the Patent and Trademark Office, also under the Department of Commerce, to develop a program under PTO's Office of Legislation and International Affairs to provide assistance in this area.

## EXPORT ADMINISTRATION

## OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 91: Deletes language proposed by the Senate earmarking funds for the Office of Antiboycott Compliance. The House bill contained no similar provision. The conferees expect this activity to be maintained at not less than the current staffing level during fiscal year 1994.

## MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

## MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 92: Provides \$42,100,000 for the Minority Business Development Agency (MBDA), instead of \$38,362,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,381,000 as proposed by the Senate, and includes language not in either bill designating funding for specific minority business development activities as follows: \$800,000 for a grant to the city of Williamsport, Pennsylvania, for the revitalization of small merchants and development of minority firms, and \$500,000 for a grant to the Catawba Indian Tribe in South Carolina for business and economic development planning and technical assistance.

The conference agreement also designates that \$30,300,000 of the funds provided are to remain available until expended, instead of \$22,800,000 as proposed by the House and \$29,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement does not include bill language limiting amounts for MBDA program administration as included in the

House bill. However, the conferees expect that no more than \$15,500,000 will be expended for program management activities in fiscal year 1994.

The conferees agree with the Senate report language regarding the importance of assisting minority businesses in rural as well as urban areas. The conferees expect that none of the funds provided for new minority business development centers, including MEGA Centers, will be expended prior to MBDA submitting a reprogramming notification to the Appropriations Committees in accordance with section 605 of this Act notifying the Committees of the proposed distribution of the funds provided.

## UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM

## ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 93: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

## UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM

## ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

*For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration including travel and tourism promotional activities abroad for travel to the United States and its possessions without regard to 44 U.S.C. 501, 3702 and 3703, including employment of American citizens and aliens by contract for services abroad; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding five years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; advance of funds under contracts abroad; payment of tort claims in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672, when such claims arise in foreign countries; and not to exceed \$15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; \$17,120,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available to carry out the provisions of section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended: Provided further, That in addition to fees currently being assessed and collected, the Administration shall charge users of its services, products, and information, fees sufficient to result in an additional \$3,000,000, to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$17,120,000 for the fiscal year 1994 expenses of the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration (USTTA) instead of \$20,298,000 as proposed by the Senate. The House-passed bill contained no funding for this program. The House-reported bill included \$17,120,000 for USTTA.

The conference agreement also includes language originally included in the House-reported bill prohibiting any of the funds provided from being used to carry out section 203(a) of the International Travel Act of 1961, as amended. The Senate bill had limited amounts available for a new cooperative tourism marketing program to \$2,500,000.

The conference agreement also includes language proposed by the Senate, and included in the House-reported bill and the President's budget request, allowing up to \$3,000,000 in additional fees to be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury. The House-passed bill contained no similar provision.

The conferees expect USTTA to follow the lead of the State Department in reducing foreign national pay increases.

**TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 94: Appropriates \$5,700,000 for the operating expenses of the Technology Administration instead of \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided will allow the Under Secretary for Technology to carry out new responsibilities and Congressional mandates under the national civilian technology policy.

**NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND  
INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

Amendment No. 95: Appropriates \$19,927,000 for the operating expenses of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) instead of \$18,927,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,927,000 as proposed by the Senate.

**PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES  
PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION**

Amendment No. 96: Appropriates \$24,000,000 for NTIA's Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction (PTFP) program instead of \$20,254,000 as proposed by the House and \$28,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: *Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 391 and 392 of the Communications Act, as amended, not to exceed \$700,000 appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for the Pan-Pacific Educational and Cultural Experiments by Satellite program (PEACESAT)*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

This amendment designates \$700,000 of the funds under PTFP grants toward the Pan-Pacific Educational and Cultural Experiments by Satellite (PEACESAT) program. The Senate amendment designed \$1,000,000 for this purpose and also designated \$500,000 for the American Indian Higher Education Consortium. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conferees also understand that NTIA has existing legislative authority to continue to support the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and expect NTIA to favorably consider an application from the Consortium for utilization of telecommunications technologies, and provide a grant if warranted.

**INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE GRANTS**

Amendment No. 98: Appropriates \$26,000,000 for the new national information infrastructure demonstration grant program under NTIA instead of \$21,746,000 as proposed by the House and \$31,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees expect NTIA to run competitive solicitations in the selection and award of information infrastructure grants. In this regard, the conferees endorse the review and consideration of the various proposals named in the House and Senate reports should applications be submitted. The conferees have been made aware of additional proposals which may be eligible under the application guidelines and authorities for this program, and urge NTIA to examine the following proposals and provide grants if warranted:

(1) a proposal from Somerset Community College in Kentucky for a model distance learning and information technology network;

(2) a proposal from the State of North Carolina to link health care activities at four teaching hospitals/medical schools and a military hospital to the North Carolina Information Highway for a telemedicine demonstration;

(3) a proposal from the American Academy of Distance Learning to build and equip a multi-State telecommunication network to train minority unemployed and underemployed workers;

(4) a proposal from Mount Sinai Medical Center in Miami Beach, Florida, to expand its critical pathways program to reduce resource consumption and patient stay;

(5) a proposal from the Oregon Community College Association for the Advanced Computing Environment (ACE) project, which involves the development of an information utility that will allow widespread access to a variety of technological resources throughout the State;

(6) a proposal from the City of Atlanta and the State of Georgia to develop an integrated, comprehensive information infrastructure for public safety, transportation, and public works management; and

(7) a proposal from the Hispanic Information and Telecommunications Network (HITN) to develop the technical infrastructure to support a nationwide network linking schools, universities, community centers, and other locations serving the Latino community.

Amendment No. 99: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement includes language proposed by the Senate which further clarifies that these funds may be used for the provision of educational, cultural, health care, public information, public safety or other social services. The House passed-bill contained no similar provision, although the House-reported bill had included similar language.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Amendment No. 100: Inserts a new title as proposed by the Senate. The House-passed bill included this heading as well as funding for the Economic Development Administration under Title IV of the bill.

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE  
PROGRAMS**

Amendment No. 101: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

*For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, Public Law 91-304, and such laws that were in effect immediately before September 30, 1982, and for trade adjustment assistance, \$322,642,000: Provided, That none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading may be used directly or indirectly for attorneys' or consultants' fees in connection with securing grants and contracts made by the Economic Development Administration: Provided further, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce may provide financial assistance for projects to be located on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment to grantees eligible for assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, without it being required that the grantee have title or ability to obtain a lease for the property, for the useful life of the project, when, in the opinion of the Secretary of Commerce, such financial assistance is necessary for the economic development of the area: Provided further, That the Secretary of Commerce may, as the Secretary considers appropriate, consult with the Secretary of Defense regarding the title to land on military installations closed or scheduled for closure or realignment.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a total of \$322,642,000 for Economic Development Assistance Programs. This amount includes increases for public works grants, planning assistance, technical assistance, and economic adjustment grants, including defense conversion activities. The conference agreement also includes language originally proposed by the Senate under a separate account for defense economic conversion (see Amendment No. 103) which will allow the Commerce Department to make grants to communities impacted by base closures even if title to land has not been transferred by the Federal government. The conferees have included this language as a temporary, one-year solution to the problem of title conveyance of military installations slated for closure. The conferees anticipate that the appropriate authorizing committees will address this concern in reauthorization legislation for EDA. The House-passed bill did not include any funding or the language for this account, which was stricken on a point of order during floor consideration of the bill. The House-reported bill provided \$233,150,000 for economic development assistance programs, but did not address the issue of grantees having title prior to awarding funds in relations to military base closures. The Senate bill included \$242,642,000 under this heading for economic development assistance programs, and included a separate appropriation account for defense economic conversion funded at \$80,000,000.

The following table reflects the proposed distribution of these funds:

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

[In thousands of dollars]

Fiscal years—					
	1993	1994 re-quest	1994 House	1994 Sen-ate	1994 con-ference
Public works grants	147,435	135,385		147,435	160,000
Planning assistance	24,770	24,770		26,770	26,000
Technical assistance (including University Centers)	9,000	10,420		9,142	10,600
Defense economic conversion	0	33,000		(?)	80,000
Research and evaluation	0	500		0	500
Trade adjustment assistance	13,720	0		13,720	10,000
Economic adjustment grants	22,075	19,075		45,575	35,542
<b>Total</b>	<b>217,000</b>	<b>223,150</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>242,642</b>	<b>322,642</b>

<sup>1</sup> Funding for the economic development assistance programs were stricken from the House version of the bill on a point of order.  
<sup>2</sup> The Senate included \$80,000,000 for defense economic adjustment in a separate appropriation account.

The Conferees expect that funds designated under Title I and Title IX in the above table will be awarded for proposals not eligible for funding provided in this and other bills for defense conversion activities. Funds provided for defense conversion are for grants and assistance necessary to assist communities adversely impacted by Department of Defense and Department of Energy contract reductions and installation realignments and closures.

The conferees have provided an increase for Title IX assistance to communities impacted by severe economic dislocations, such as communities impacted by reductions in the coal and timber industries. The conferees encourage the Administrator of EDA to give favorable consideration to applications received for rehabilitation of abandoned lumber and plywood mill sites. The conferees also encourage the Administrator of EDA to give favorable consideration to applications received for assisting communities in adjusting to the downturn in the coal industry.

The conferees have agreed to include the budget request of \$500,000 for EDA research and development programs.

The conferees endorse EDA's review and consideration of all of the proposals named in both the House and Senate reports accompanying this bill, should proposals be submitted. The conferees have also been made aware of the following additional proposals for economic assistance, and encourage EDA to consider applications for these proposals within applicable procedures and guidelines:

- (1) for infrastructure renovation and improvements to the Macon Coliseum, in the City of Macon, Georgia;
- (2) for assistance to the Wood County Airport Authority in West Virginia in its construction of a new hangar maintenance facility;
- (3) for water and sewer infrastructure expansion in the City of Wheelwright, Kentucky, to support the requirements of construction of a new prison;
- (4) for site preparation and infrastructure for the development of an industrial park in Wolfe County, Kentucky.

DEFENSE ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 102: Deletes language proposed by the Senate creating a separate new account for defense economic adjustment community assistance. The Senate bill provided \$80,000,000 for this purpose, and included language clarifying that grants may be made to communities impacted by military base closures even if the issue of title to the property is not yet resolved. The House bill did not contain any provision on these matters. The conference agreement includes the funding for this purpose and language addressing the military installation title issue under the Economic Development Assistance

Programs account addressed under Amendment No. 101.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 103: Appropriates \$28,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Economic Development Administration instead of \$26,284,000 as proposed by the House in Amendment No. 136 and \$30,151,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees support the efforts of EDA to reduce the paperwork and processing time for review and approval of grant applications.

The conferees are concerned about recent actions taken by the Department to create new offices and make other organizational changes within EDA. The conferees expect to receive notification of any funding or organizational changes at least fifteen days prior to any action on or announcement of such a change.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 104: Restores a section number as originally proposed by the House in a reference to reprogramming procedures. The reprogramming notification procedures are included in section 605 of the FY 1994 Appropriations Act, as proposed by the House, instead of section 606 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates \$23,000,000 instead of \$22,326,000 as proposed by the House and \$23,217,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects savings totaling \$1,257,000 achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and a reduction in administrative overhead consistent with the President's proposal for these items for Executive Branch agencies.

CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

Amendment No. 106: Appropriates \$2,850,000 instead of \$2,699,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,983,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects savings totaling \$117,000 to be achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead consistent with the President's proposal for these items for Executive Branch agencies. The conference agreement includes funds to support modifications in the Court building to meet Americans with Disability Act requirements and renovation of elevator number 4.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 107: Appropriates \$12,900,000 instead of \$13,127,000 as proposed by the House and \$12,195,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects savings totaling \$327,000 achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead consistent with the President's proposal for these items for Executive Branch agencies. The conference agreement also includes \$279,000 for the residual workload of the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals. Public Law 102-572 terminated this Court and transferred its functions to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. The conference agreement also includes up to \$200,000 for program increases for additional staff attorneys and clerical positions.

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 108: Appropriate \$11,000,000 instead of \$11,100,000 as proposed by the House and \$10,718,000 as proposed by the Senate

The conference agreement reflects savings totaling \$356,000 achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and reductions in administrative overhead consistent with the proposal of the President for these items for the Executive Branch in fiscal year 1994.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 109: Appropriates \$2,156,000,000 instead of \$2,189,131,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,070,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$16,000,000 for program increases to meet the highest priority needs of the Federal courts funded in this account, of which \$12,800,000 shall be derived from an increase in certain fees which are addressed in Amendment No. 64. The conference agreement also reflects a total of \$55,559,000 in savings achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead and FTE reductions consistent with those proposed by the President for the Executive Branch for fiscal year 1994.

Although the funding provided by the conference agreement is sufficient to fund the 35 bankruptcy judgeships which were authorized by the Bankruptcy Act of 1992, the conferees expect the Judicial Conference to examine carefully the pending bankruptcy caseload of each of the districts with newly authorized judgeships and fill those with the greatest backlog and complexity of cases first. The conferees note that the increase in the number of bankruptcy cases pending and the total volume of such cases in a district may not be as good an indicator of workload or need as the complexity of the individual cases.

The conferees are aware of the problem of disparity of staffing among the various Federal courts. However, sufficient funds cannot be appropriated to hire additional personnel

for understaffed courts or to provide for relocation expenses of supporting staff for courts where there are disparities between the workload formula and staffing levels. The conferees expect the Judicial Conference of the United States to establish as a high priority, the provision of assistance to understaffed courts to address this problem and submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees no later than February 1, 1994.

As stated above, the conference agreement reflects savings from administrative savings and FTE reductions similar to those proposed by the President for Executive Branch agencies. The conferees recognize, however, that the appointment of new judges and increases in workload require appropriate supporting staff.

Amendment No. 110: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$2,160,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$2,160,000 for expenses of the United States Court of Federal Claims for processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986. The House had proposed \$2,063,000 for this purpose and the Senate had proposed \$2,975,000.

The conference agreement includes sufficient funds for the Office of Special Masters to maintain the current level of clerical and professional support staff and case-related travel.

#### DEFENDER SERVICES

Amendment No. 111: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$280,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$280,000,000 for the Defender Services account instead of \$297,252,000 as proposed by the House and \$286,170,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount in the conference agreement, together with an estimated carryover of unobligated balances of approximately \$18,000,000 from fiscal year 1993, will provide a total availability of approximately \$298,000,000 for fiscal year 1994 for this account.

The conference agreement reflects \$4,821,000 in savings achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead reductions consistent with reductions proposed by the President for these items for the Executive Branch.

Amendment No. 112: Deletes language proposed by the Senate that would have prohibited any of the funds appropriated for the Defender Services account to be used to increase the hourly rate paid panel attorneys above the rate in effect on July 2, 1993. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Although the conference agreement deletes the prohibition contained in the Senate bill on an increase in the hourly rate paid panel attorneys, the conference agreement reflects a reduction of \$18,900,000 associated with a five-year Federal pay comparability catch up for panel attorneys proposed in the budget

request. The conferees are agreed that none of the funds provided in the conference agreement are to be used for implementing the disapproved five-year catch up of pay comparability adjustment and that the rate of compensation during fiscal year 1994 will be the rate in effect on July 2, 1993. Similarly, the conferees continue to oppose expansion of the \$75 hourly out-of-court rate for panel attorneys in United States judicial districts outside the 16 districts currently using this rate. The conferees note that the Judiciary suspended payments to court-appointed attorneys under the Criminal Justice Act on May 27, 1993, as a result of a fiscal year 1993 shortfall in the Defender Services account. Implementation of a five-year aggregate cost-of-living adjustment in the hourly rate paid panel attorneys, or an increase in the \$75 hourly rate currently paid panel attorneys in the 16 districts, would only serve to reduce representation for indigent defendants in Federal criminal proceedings.

Amendment No. 113: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named by said amendment, insert: \$19,800,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a limitation of \$19,800,000 for death penalty resource centers. The Senate had proposed a limitation of \$11,524,000 for the centers. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conference agreement provides \$19,800,000 for death penalty resource centers. Although this amount is \$10,844,000 below the budget request for fiscal year 1994 and is \$265,000 below the program level for fiscal year 1993, the amount in the agreement will provide fiscal year 1994 current services funding for the centers and some allowance for states expected to qualify for the program which requires state applicants to provide matching funds. In this regard, the conferees expect the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to submit a reprogramming proposal in accordance with the procedures contained in section 605 of this Act before allocating any of the funds appropriated for this program to any new centers.

#### COURT SECURITY

Amendment No. 114: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$86,000,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides for \$86,000,000 for the Court Security account instead of \$84,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$80,952,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes \$1,500,000 above the House mark to cover the highest priority needs of the Judiciary in this account, consistent with program increases provided to the Judiciary overall by this conference agreement. The conference agreement also reflects savings totaling \$220,000 achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and reductions in administrative overhead consistent with proposals by the President for these items for Executive Branch agencies.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 115: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: \$44,900,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$44,900,000 for the Administrative Office of the United States Courts instead of \$44,612,000 as proposed by the House and \$43,358,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees commend the recent action of the Judicial Conference of the United States in establishing the new Economy Subcommittee of the Conference's Budget Committee. The conferees expect the Economy Subcommittee to take the necessary action to help the Judicial Branch improve its entire budget process from formulation through execution. To that end, the conferees have included \$325,000 in the conference agreement to be used only to provide enhanced support above the base level for the work of the Economy Subcommittee.

The conference agreement reflects savings of \$2,612,000 to be achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead and FTE reductions consistent with proposals of the President for these items for Executive Branch agencies.

The conferees are concerned that, in some instances, the Judiciary has not adhered to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees reprogramming policy and procedures detailed in section 606 of the fiscal year 1993 Appropriations Act. The conferees expect the Judiciary to follow the reprogramming notification procedures for fiscal year 1994 precisely and not reallocate resources prior to submitting the required notifications to the Appropriations Committees. The Committees have provided the Judiciary with transfer authority in the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act which is the same as the transfer authority provided in fiscal year 1993. The conferees believe that such authority, together with the traditional reprogramming policy contained in section 605 of the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act, provides the Judiciary the needed discretion to respond to unanticipated circumstances and needs.

The conferees are encouraged by the decision of the Judicial Conference to establish the Economy Subcommittee of the Conference's Budget Committee. The conferees expect the Economy Subcommittee to examine the entire budget process of the Judiciary and to make certain that all elements of the Judicial Branch, including the courts and all supporting offices and functions, are performing their constitutional and statutory responsibilities in the most efficient manner possible. As part of this effort, the conferees strongly urge the Economy Subcommittee to review its procedures for establishing the base budget amounts for each appropriation account within the Judiciary's budget and, if necessary, bring these procedures more in line with those of the Legislative and Executive branches of the Federal Government. The conferees expect the Economy Subcommittee will consult on this matter with the Executive Branch in an effort to try to eliminate or rectify any substantive differences and inconsistencies and expect the Judiciary to apply generally accepted

budget principles to the development of future budget requests.

FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 116: Appropriates \$18,450,000 instead of \$18,467,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,296,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects savings of \$672,000 to be achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead and FTE reductions consistent with proposals of the President for these items for Executive Branch agencies.

JUDICIAL RETIREMENT FUNDS

PAYMENT TO JUDICIARY TRUST FUNDS

Amendment No. 117: Inserts "\$20,000,000," as proposed by the Senate instead of "\$20,000,000" as proposed by the House. This is a technical change.

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 118: Appropriates \$8,468,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,474,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement reflects \$335,000 in savings to be achieved through implementation of a pay freeze and administrative overhead and FTE reductions consistent with proposals of the President for these items for Executive Branch agencies.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

Amendment No. 119: Inserts a reference to section 605 of this Act as proposed by the House instead of section 606 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION  
OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Amendment No. 120: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which designates \$28,877,000 for the United States Merchant Marine Academy and \$10,344,000 for the State maritime academies. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees agree that within the overall amounts provided for MARAD operations and training, \$242,000 is available for the Massachusetts Center for Marine Environmental Protection at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy authorized by section 6203 of Public Law 102-587.

READY RESERVE FORCE

Amendment No. 121: Appropriates \$298,000,000 for the Maritime Administration's Ready Reserve Force as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House.

The conferees agree that none of the funds provided for acquisition of new Ready Reserve Force vessels may be obligated prior to notification of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate under the reprogramming procedures outlined in section 605 of this Act. The conferees further agree that administrative expenses related to the National Defense Reserve Fleet should be funded from this account.

COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION REFORM  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 122: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert the following: \$1,118,000 of which \$500,000 shall be available by transfer from unobligated balances remaining from the appropriation entitled "Commission on Agricultural Workers, Salaries and Expenses"

and on page 51 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, after the heading "Salaries and Expenses" on line 9, insert the following new heading "(including transfer of funds)".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$1,118,000 for the Commission on Immigration Reform, of which \$500,000 shall be available by transfer from the unobligated balance for the Commission on Agricultural Workers. The House had proposed \$900,000 for the Commission on Immigration Reform and the Senate has proposed \$500,000. The agreement also adds the heading "including transfer of funds" not in either the House or Senate bill.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 123: Appropriates \$1,099,000 for the fiscal year 1994 expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,047,000 as proposed by the House.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 124: Appropriates \$1,290,000 for the Marine Mammal Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,226,000 as proposed by the House.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. FEDERAL HOLIDAY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates \$500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 126: Appropriates \$20,600,000 for the fiscal year 1994 operating expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative instead of \$21,318,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,143,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 127: Appropriates \$258,900,000 for the Salaries and Expenses appropriation of the Small Business Administration and includes the following earmarkings: (1) \$71,266,000 for Small Business Development Centers; (2) \$3,500,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives; (3) \$18,000,000 to carry out section 24 of the Small Business Act, as amended; (4) \$3,000,000 for the Small Business Institute program (SBI); and (5) \$9,000,000 for Microloan technical assistance. The House had proposed an appropriation of \$243,326,000 for Salaries and Expenses with an earmark of \$71,266,000 for Small Business Development Centers. The Senate had proposed an appropriation of \$215,000,000 with the following earmarkings: (1) \$3,500,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives; (2) \$3,000,000 for the Small Business Institute program; and (3) \$9,500,000 for Microloan technical assistance.

The conference agreement also includes certain additional earmarkings in Amendment No. 128.

The following table shows the distribution of the funds provided in the conference

agreement for the SBA Salaries and Expenses account, including the earmarking of funds in Amendment Nos. 127 and 128:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION			Conference Agreement
SALARIES AND EXPENSES			
<i>[In thousands of dollars]</i>			
Regular Expenses	Operating Expenses	Ex-	
Disaster Assistance Expenses			102,796
			19,869
Non-Credit Programs:			
	SBDC Program		71,266
	SBDC Technical Assistance		677
	SBDC Central Europe Development		1,091
	Natural Resources Development		18,000
	7(j) Program		8,073
	SCORE Program		3,500
	SBI Program		3,000
	Women's Outreach		2,000
	Veterans Outreach		445
	International Trade Outreach		481
	Advocacy Research & Database		1,514
	PASS		1,098
	Women's Council		500
	White House Conference		2,490
	Data Collection/Proc. System-U of Central A		200
	U. of North. Iowa Small Business Assistance		465
	Seton Hill Center for Entrepreneurial Opp ..		930
	North Carolina Capital Access Program		750
	City of Prestonsburg, KY, Small Business Assistance		1,000
	Hazard Community College		750
	WVHTC Small Business Incubator		1,000
	Microloan Technical Assistance		9,000
	National Center for Genome Resources		5,000
	Nebraska Small Business Data Base		680
	Western Kentucky University Small Business Consulting		100
	Van Emmons Population, Marketing Analysis Center		500
	Ben Franklin Center SBIR Assistance		175
	U. of Arkansas small business incubator		1,000
	Grant County, WV, small business development fund		250
	Paducah, KY, small business incubator		300
Total, Salaries and Expenses			258,900
Business Loans Admin			94,737
Disaster Loans Admin			76,101
Total SBA Operations (non credit)			429,738

The conference agreement includes sufficient funds to provide for an FTE level of 2,723 for the agency which is approximately 150 below the FY 1993 level.

The conference agreement includes \$500,000 above the House allowance for the SCORE

program. The conferees are agreed that this amount is to be used entirely for enhanced training for all participants in the program.

The conferees endorse the SBA Administrator's efforts to reduce administrative overhead expenses and duplicative management positions at SBA's central headquarters and its regional offices. The conferees note that the House and Senate Appropriations Committees recently approved a reprogramming request which will permit SBA to relocate central office employees to district offices around the country with the objective of improving service to applicants for SBA services and loan programs. The conferees look forward to future proposals from the Administrator to continue this effort to improve the efficiency of the agency's administrative operations and delivery of programs.

Amendment No. 128: Provides designations for the following items:

\$175,000 for a grant to the Ben Franklin Center in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to assist small businesses to qualify for and participate in the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program;

\$750,000 for a grant to the North Carolina Rural Economic Development Center for the North Carolina Small Business Capital Access Program to provide financial development assistance to small businesses;

\$500,000 for a grant to the Van Emmons Population, Marketing Analysis Center in Towanda, Pennsylvania, for continuation of an integrated small business data base to aid Appalachian Region small businesses;

\$1,000,000 for a grant to the City of Prestonsburg, Kentucky, for small business development assistance;

\$680,000 for a grant to the State of Nebraska for a statewide small business data base to facilitate the development of small businesses in rural communities;

\$100,000 for a grant to the Institute for Economic Development, Western Kentucky University to provide small business consulting services for senior citizens;

\$5,000,000 for a grant for a National Center for Genome Resources in New Mexico to provide consulting assistance, information and related activities to small businesses;

\$1,000,000 for a grant to the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas, for the Genesis small business incubator facility;

\$1,000,000 for a grant to the WVHTC Foundation in West Virginia for build out, equipment and operations costs for a small business incubator facility;

\$300,000 for a grant to the Economic Development Council of Paducah, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business incubator facility;

\$250,000 for a grant to Grant County, West Virginia, to establish a small business development fund to provide financial assistance to small businesses and grants; and

grants for the following continuing activities at the level designated for these activities under this heading in Public Law 102-395: Hazard Community College in Hazard, Kentucky, to assist in the development of a small business consulting, information and assistance facility; Seton Hill College in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, to provide for a small business consulting and assistance center for entrepreneurial opportunity; the University of Central Arkansas to assist the Small Business Institute Program of the Small Business Administration to establish and operate a National Data Center; and the Iowa Waste Reduction Center, University of Northern Iowa for a demonstration program to assist small business in complying with Federal regulatory requirements.

The Senate has proposed an earmarking of \$5,000,000 for a grant to the National Center for Genome Resources to provide technical assistance and information to small businesses and for related activities. The House bill contained no similar provision.

Amendment No. 129: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment amended to read as follows:

*None of the funds appropriated for the Small Business Administration under this act may be used to impose any new or increased loan guaranty fee or debenture guaranty fee, or any new or increased user fee or management assistance fee, except as otherwise provided in this Act: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act may be used for the cost of direct loans to any borrower under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to relocate voluntarily outside the business area in which the disaster has occurred.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which prohibits funds appropriated for the Small Business Administration under this Act from being used to impose any new or increased loan guaranty fee, debenture fee, or any new or increased user fee or management assistance fee. The conference agreement also includes new language which was originally carried in the bill under the disaster loans program account which prohibits any of the funds provided in this or any other Act from being used for the cost of direct loans to any borrower under section 7(b) of the Small Business Act from relocating voluntarily outside the business area in which a disaster has occurred.

**BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT**

Amendment No. 130: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert: *\$16,946,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$16,946,000 for the credit subsidy cost of SBA direct business loans. The House had proposed \$22,994,000 for this purpose and the Senate had proposed \$21,032,000 and an earmarking of \$5,135,000 for the microloan program.

The conferees expect the Small Business Administration to obligate all of the \$3,418,000 in credit subsidy budget authority provided in this paragraph for the microloan program before obligating any of the credit subsidy budget authority carrying over for this program from fiscal year 1993.

The conference agreement reflects new credit subsidy estimates developed by the Office of Management and Budget and the Small Business Administration for fiscal year 1994.

The following table shows the allocation of subsidy costs and program levels for the various SBA direct loan programs under the conference agreement:

**DIRECT LOANS**

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1994 conference	
	Program level	Subsidy amount
Direct:		
Handicapped .....	9,553	3,252
Veterans .....	12,000	3,006
Economic opportunity .....	8,500	1,861
8(a) loans .....	4,991	663
Microloans .....	33,672	3,418
Investment Company .....	15,000	4,746
Total, direct .....	83,716	16,946

<sup>1</sup> In addition to this amount, \$52.9 million is carried over from FY 1993.

Amendment No. 131: Appropriates \$196,041,000 in credit subsidy budget authority to support the SBA business loans guarantee program instead of \$191,955,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$219,459,000 as proposed by the House.

The following table shows the allocation of subsidy costs and program levels for the SBA business loans guarantee program:

**BUSINESS LOANS GUARANTEES**

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year 1994 conference	
	Program level	Subsidy amount
General Business .....	16,976,744	150,000
502 .....	40,000	640
504 .....	1,000,000	5,100
SBIC .....	100,000	16,250
Participating Securities .....	207,833	18,705
SSBIC .....	17,868	5,346
Total, guaranteed .....	8,342,445	196,041

<sup>1</sup> In addition to this amount, \$1.812 billion is carried over from FY 1993.

The conference agreement provides the reduced credit budget subsidy authority to support a program level of \$6,976,744,000 for SBA's business loans guarantee program. The conferees note that a carryover of \$1.8 billion from FY 1993 is expected in the General Business loan guarantee program. This carryover amount, together with the amount provided in the conference agreement, will provide total program authority of \$8.8 billion for the General Business loan guarantee program. In addition, the conference agreement provides \$1,000,000,000 for the section 504 Development Company program to meet anticipated demand in fiscal year 1994.

Finally, the conference agreement includes \$100,000,000 for the Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) program and \$207,833,000 for the new equity participation program which is expected to begin in fiscal year 1994 once the required regulations for this program are approved.

**DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT**

Amendment No. 132: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted and strike all on line 14, page 54 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through "In addition," on line 24, page 54 on page 53, line 12 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "this amount" and insert in lieu thereof "the total amount in this paragraph".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement strikes both the House and the Senate amounts proposed for this item, makes a technical change in the

second paragraph under this heading and makes a technical change in the language in the Salaries and Expenses account. The House had proposed an appropriation of \$75,000,000 for the credit subsidy cost of SBA disaster loans. The Senate had proposed \$65,000,000 for this purpose. The conference agreement eliminates both the House and the Senate amounts proposed for this item because the expected carryover of unused credit budget authority of \$132,741,000, contingent credit subsidy budget authority totaling \$170,000,000 that has not been used and the additional \$140,000,000 in contingent credit subsidy budget authority provided in Amendment No. 133 will provide a total program availability of up to \$1,926,220,000 for fiscal year 1994.

Amendment No. 133: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: \$140,000,000, and on page 55, line 6 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike "\$12,369,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$7,000,000".

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a contingency appropriation of \$140,000,000 for the cost of emergency disaster loans and associated administrative expenses which shall be available in fiscal year 1994 to the extent that the President notifies the Congress of his designation of any or all of these amounts as emergency requirements under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. The conference agreement also provides that Congress designates this amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Budget

Enforcement Act of 1990. The Senate had proposed a contingency appropriation of \$75,000,000 for the cost of SBA emergency disaster loans and associated administrative expenses. The House bill contained no provision on this item.

The conference agreement also adds a new provision reducing the appropriation for additional capital for the "Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund" from \$12,369,000 as originally proposed by the House and the Senate to \$7,000,000. Because of reduced activity in the construction industry during fiscal year 1993, the demand for surety bond guarantees was lower with the result that anticipated claims for fiscal year 1994 will be lower also. Therefore, the conferees have reduced the amount appropriated for additional capital to the fund needed to pay surety bond claims in fiscal year 1994.

THOMAS JEFFERSON COMMEMORATION  
COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 134: Restores an appropriation of \$62,000 for the Thomas Jefferson Commemoration Commission as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES  
CORPORATION

Amendment No. 135: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION  
PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES  
CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Serv-

ices Corporation Act of 1974, as amended, \$400,000,000; of which \$341,865,000 is for basic field programs; \$8,950,000 is for Native American programs; \$12,759,000 is for migrant programs; \$1,402,000 is for law school clinics; \$1,274,000 is for supplemental field programs; \$795,000 is for regional training centers; \$9,611,000 is for national support; \$10,564,000 is for State support; \$1,101,000 is for the Clearinghouse; \$651,000 is for computer assisted legal research regional centers; \$10,928,000 is for Corporation management and administration; and \$100,000 is for board initiatives.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$400,000,000 and certain designations of the funds for the various components of the Legal Services Corporation's budget. The Senate amendment had provided a total of \$349,000,000 with different designations for the various components of the Corporation's budget. The House bill contained no provisions on these matters.

The conference agreement provides \$400,000,000 for the Legal Services Corporation, an increase of \$43,000,000 above the fiscal year 1993 enacted appropriation, but a reduction of \$125,515,000 from the Corporation's budget request. The Corporation has the authority to submit its budget directly to the Congress. The conference agreement is also \$32,000,000 below the request in the President's budget for the Corporation.

The following table shows the amounts for each program provided for in fiscal year 1993, in the Corporation's budget request, in the Senate bill, and in the conference agreement. The House bill contained no funding for the Corporation.

[In thousands of dollars]

Program component	Fiscal years—				
	1993	1994 request	House <sup>1</sup>	Senate	Conference
Basic field programs	305,305	457,957		298,904	341,865
Native American program and components	8,005	9,606		7,825	8,950
Migrant programs and components	11,056	13,267		10,808	12,759
Law school clinics	1,254			1,226	1,402
Supplemental field programs	1,139	1,367		1,113	1,274
Regional training centers	711	800		695	795
National support	8,241	9,889		8,056	9,611
State support	9,448	11,338		9,236	10,564
Clearinghouse	985	1,182		963	1,101
CALR regional centers	582	698		569	651
Corporation management and administration	9,774	14,661		9,555	10,928
National Resource and Training Center	450				
Special emergency funds		400			
Attorney recruitment program		1,000			
Training study		100			
Client training		500			
ADR initiatives		500			
Board initiatives	50	2,250		49	100
Total	357,000	525,515		349,000	400,000

<sup>1</sup> The House bill contained no funds for the Corporation.

In recognition of the fact that there are no support centers to coordinate and further the work of local programs in the District of Columbia, Guam, Micronesia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, up to \$100,000 of additional state support funds provided in the conference agreement should be apportioned by the Legal Services Corporation among jurisdictions for use as district, territorial or commonwealth support planning grants.

The conferees intend that each existing state support program receive an increase of not less than 2.5 percent over its fiscal year 1993 grant level. The conferees further intend that additional increases in state support funding be distributed in a manner directed toward equalization of funding among the

states. For each state, the Legal Services Corporation shall determine a target state support amount which shall be used as the basis to compute the distribution of any new funds appropriated by this law. The target amount shall be determined as follows:

(1) Four percent of the total 1994 field funding (the sum of basic field, native American and migrant funding) for each state receiving more than \$4,375,000 in total field funding, including new funds distributed pursuant to this law;

(2) Ten percent of the total 1994 field funding (the sum of basic field, native American and migrant funding) for each state receiving less than \$1,750,000 in total field funding,

including new funds distributed pursuant to this law;

(3) \$175,000 for all other states.

The additional state support funds provided under the conference agreement not required for support planning grants or for the 2.5 percent increase as provided shall be allocated to the states that receive the lowest percentage share of the target state support amount determined in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of the preceding paragraph. The allocation of such funds to such states shall be done in a manner that raises the funding level of the greatest number of the lowest percentage share states to an equal percentage of the target state support amount. In states receiving funds that have

more than one state support grantee, the additional state support funds shall be apportioned among the grantees in a manner that provides each grantee with the same percentage increase above its current funding level.

The conferees intend that increases in training support money be distributed in a manner directed toward equalizing funding regionally. It is the conferees' intention that in allocating increases in funding for regional training centers, each regional training center FY 1993 grant recipient ("RTC") shall be allocated a FY 1994 grant equal to 103% of its FY 1993 grant. The Legal Services Corporation shall determine a target grant amount for each RFP equal to .29% of the "field" (basic field migrant and Native American) funding of the states in each RTC's regional service area. The additional regional training funds appropriated by this law which are not necessary to pay the grants provided in the second sentence in this paragraph shall be allocated to the RTCs which receive the lowest percentage share of their target grant amount defined above in a manner that funds the greatest number of RTCs at an equal percentage of the target grant amount.

It is the conferees' understanding that the Corporation will have minimal fiscal year 1993 carryover funding due, in large part, to its compliance with the conferees' directives against utilizing funds for new initiatives or other budget categories unrelated to the activities for which they were originally statutorily mandated. It is the conferees' desire that all of the funds allocated in fiscal year 1994 for delivery of legal assistance and for the support of the delivery of legal assistance be used for the purposes for which they are allocated.

It is the conferees' intention that the Corporation study means to ensure client input into program operation, including but not limited to the development of a national client organization.

Amendment No. 175 provides a statutory formula for the allocation of Legal Services funds and language continuing certain restrictions governing the use of Legal Services funds for fiscal year 1994.

Amendment No. 136: Deletes language included in the House bill providing funds for the Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate. Funding for the Economic Development Administration in the Senate bill and in this conference agreement is included under Title II of the bill and is addressed at Amendment No. 103.

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 137: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate which makes the appropriation for Diplomatic and Consular Programs available for necessary expenses not otherwise provided for. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 138: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$1,704,589,000.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$1,704,589,000 for the Diplomatic and Consular Programs account instead of \$1,612,206,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,653,184,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement includes \$5,000,000 for international environmental and scientific research under the sponsorship of the Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental Scientific Affairs.

The conferees support the Administration's proposal to upgrade consular visa and passport systems which is part of the Administration's immigration control initiative. The conferees note that the Department of State is seeking the authority to retain machine readable visa processing fees, which is included in the pending authorization bill for the Department for fiscal years 1994 and 1995. Pending the possible enactment of this authority, the conferees encourage the Secretary of State to make available additional funds to accelerate the upgrade of consular visa and passport systems and consider submitting a reprogramming proposal to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees for this purpose.

The conference agreement includes \$15,000,000 to further the integration of the Diplomatic Telecommunications Service (DTS) by consolidating its respective separate networks and to continue enhancement of the consolidated DTS communications network.

The conferees recognize that the establishment of a new, more modern and responsive DTS is evolutionary, and note that some progress is being made toward improving communications services to the Federal agencies engaged in foreign activities. Examples of progress which has been made toward improving international communications include: the transfer of additional communications personnel to the DTS Program Office (DTS-PO) to engineer, install and manage new DTS communications installations; establishment of a service function to coordinate Federal agency requirements and the subsequent reduction of their communications backlog by the use of consolidated resources; establishment of a test facility to enable Federal agency subsystems to be integrated into the DTS; and the initiation of new packet communications services at a number of overseas locations.

The conferees continue to be concerned, however, about the slow rate of progress being made by the DTS-PO in achieving full integration of DTS resources and assets as well as consolidated management and operation of the DTS network. Despite previous direction by Congress, DTS-PO has failed to update the DTS Strategic Plan to provide for the inclusion of voice and facsimile services as part of the basic DTS services available to the various Federal agencies overseas. Installations for the enhanced DTS packet network are substantially behind schedule, and there has been little progress in removing the barriers to permit the consolidation of communication facilities at embassies worldwide.

Therefore the conferees are agreed and expect that the Department not obligate the \$15,000,000 included in the conference agreement for the DTS until a revised DTS Strategic Plan is submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. The amended plan should be provided by November 30, 1993, and be accompanied by a detailed accounting of previously appropriated DTS funds for fiscal years 1992 and 1993. Further, the conferees are agreed and expect that \$15,000,000 of the

Department of State Information Management budget is to be similarly withheld from obligation pending receipt and approval of the revised DTS Strategic Plan developed by the DTS Program Office.

The conferees continue to be concerned about the administration and financing of the Department of State's foreign affairs administrative support (FAAS) system, which provides for shared support costs for the Department and agencies it services at State Department posts overseas. The FAAS system is the primary method by which the Department charges for support to agencies doing business overseas. Estimated costs are shared among serviced agencies through a complex system of workload counts and calculations.

The conferees note that many problems have arisen under the FAAS system and that State Department and serviced agency officials generally agree that the FAAS system is deficient. Among the problems are the following: (1) costs of services provided cannot be substantiated and become a point of contention between the State Department and the serviced agencies; (2) the Department has been unable to determine the expense of managing FAAS; (3) the Department has inadequate standards for reporting reimbursed funds; and (4) some support costs, not shared under FAAS, are paid directly at posts with serviced agency funds and are unknown in their entirety.

Given these problems and the dissatisfaction with the FAAS system on the part of the State Department and the serviced agencies, the conferees expect the Department to submit a plan to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to implement an acceptable per capita cost sharing system to replace FAAS by the beginning of fiscal year 1996. In addition, the conferees expect the Department to advise serviced agencies at each post annually of the amount of administrative support funding approved for the post, by agency and define associated levels of services to be provided at each. Finally, the conferees expect the Department to allot 100 percent of reimbursed FAAS funds to the posts for which they were approved and to not obligate FAAS funds for any other purpose; and within geographic bureaus, allot to each post not less than 95 percent of the approved Department share of FAAS. In addition, the conferees expect that the other departments and agencies for which funds are appropriated in this bill and which receive support services overseas from the Department of State under the FAAS system will identify their overseas support funding requirements in their fiscal year 1995 appropriations request to the Congress. Further, the conferees expect the Department of State to submit an informational budget presentation of the totality of overseas support in its fiscal year 1995 budget submission to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

The conferees recognize the current financial, consular, personnel, and administrative computer systems have been declared highly vulnerable to waste, fraud, and abuse. It is also understood the Department's existing proprietary computer systems have become costly to maintain, unreliable, and incapable of incorporating technological advances now widely available. The conferees understand there is a need to implement a strategic plan to replace these systems with more capable and reliable open systems.

The conferees continue to be concerned, however, that the Department has thus far failed to develop a comprehensive strategic

plan for migrating to open computer systems. Without such a plan the conferees cannot be assured that the Department's migration effort will result in systems that: (1) provide accurate and timely information on the Department's operations, (2) allow system users to become more efficient, and (3) enhance overall productivity.

The conferees expect the Department to accelerate development of a comprehensive strategic plan which addresses the concerns listed above. The plan should be provided no later than March 31, 1994, and include system requirements, major milestones, funding needs, and procurement projections. Further, assurances must be provided that a management team with sufficient authority is in place to direct the migration project. Finally, it must be demonstrated that this team has or acquires the capability and experience necessary to guide this complex project to a successful conclusion.

The conferees support the Department of State's new policy to assign priority to promote U.S. business interests overseas. Senior departmental officials and Ambassadors can make a significant contribution in helping American firms compete successfully for foreign contracts. The conferees agree, however, that the principal responsibility for assisting U.S. businesses overseas resides with the United States and Foreign Commercial Service (US&FCS), Department of Commerce. While the conferees endorse the policy change at the Department of State, funds provided in this bill for the Department of State should not be used for any personnel, programs or activities that would duplicate the mission and activities of US&FCS.

Amendment No. 139: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: *and for expenses of general administration: Provided, That notwithstanding section 502 of this Act, not to exceed 20 percent of the amounts made available in this Act in the appropriation accounts, "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" and "Salaries and Expenses" under the heading "Administration of Foreign Affairs" may be transferred between such appropriation accounts: Provided further, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement inserts language proposed by the Senate which makes the funds appropriated for Diplomatic and Consular Programs available for expenses of general administration of the Department.

The conference agreement also includes new language not in either bill which provides that not to exceed 20 percent of the amount made available in this Act for Diplomatic and Consular Programs and Salaries and Expenses may be transferred between such appropriation accounts. The agreement further provides that any transfer pursuant to this section will be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with procedures set forth in that section.

The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 140: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of

the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *\$396,722,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$396,722,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account of the Department of State instead of \$481,416,000 as proposed by the House and \$455,816,000 as proposed by the Senate.

This appropriation provides for the general administration and related support costs of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. This account, together with the diplomatic and consular programs account, constitutes a new account structure for the Department in accordance with the pending authorization bill. The conferees are concerned that this new account structure not impose undue financial burdens in converting the existing Salaries and Expenses account of the Department to the new structure. The conferees expect the Department to consult closely with the Appropriations Committees on this matter in order to minimize such conversion costs.

The conferees support the President's decision to establish a task force to conduct a review of the United States Government security classification rules and procedures. The conferees expect this effort to produce a comprehensive post-Cold War reform plan that addresses the current problem of overclassification, which exacts excessive costs both in dollars and in the ability of a democratic society to function. The conferees further expect that the new security classification policies and practices will be reflected as savings in future budget requests, and request and expect the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State to submit reports to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by March 31, 1994, that provide: (1) an estimate of the total amount of funds spent for fiscal year 1993 and an estimate of expenditures for fiscal year 1994 on all security classification-related activities including, but not limited to, physical, personnel, and document security, (2) an estimate of the number of personnel assigned within each agency to such security activities, and (3) a plan to reduce expenditures for classifying information and for keeping information classified, which shall include a specific expenditure-reduction goal for fiscal year 1995.

The conference agreement reflects a reduction of \$5,149,000 requested in the budget for Foreign Service National (FSN) employee pay raises. The conferees are agreed that it would not be equitable to provide funding for FSN pay raises and cost-of-living increases since U.S. national employees of the State Department will not receive any cost-of-living adjustment during fiscal year 1994 as part of the Government-wide program to reduce the Federal deficit.

#### BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 141: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted

, and

strike all on line 24, page 57 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, and all that follows through line 3, page 58.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The House had proposed \$3,800,000 for the Buying Power Maintenance account of the Department of State.

The Senate had proposed \$3,000,000 for this item. The conference agreement strikes both the House and the Senate amounts proposed for this item because the account has gained in excess of \$18,000,000 during fiscal year 1993 as a result of gains in currency transactions in OECD countries.

#### ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

Amendment No. 142: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert: *\$410,000,000, of which \$10,000,000 is for relocation and renovation costs necessary to facilitate the consolidation of overseas financial and administrative activities in the United States*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$410,000,000 for Acquisition and Maintenance of Buildings Abroad as proposed by the Senate and adds language not in either the House or Senate bill which designates \$10,000,000 of this amount for renovation costs necessary to facilitate consolidation of overseas financial and administrative activities of the State Department in the United States as proposed in the National Performance Review. The House bill had proposed \$381,481,000 for the account without any designation of the use of funds.

The conferees intend that the remaining amount of the increase provided in the conference agreement above the House level be allocated to real property maintenance, energy conservation, antiterrorism, and security upgrade programs of the Department's Office of Foreign Buildings.

#### EMERGENCES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

Amendment No. 143: Provides a limitation of \$1,500,000 for representation expenses instead of \$1,000,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Amendment No. 144: Appropriates \$593,000 for the credit subsidy cost of direct loans in this account as proposed by the Senate instead of \$186,000 for this purpose as proposed by the House.

The conferees expect the Department of State to improve its efforts to collect delinquent loans which were made to destitute Americans overseas to enable them to return to the United States. In this regard, the conferees note that the Administration's National Performance Review (NPR) includes a recommendation that the Department of State needs to do a better job collecting debts owed to the Department. The conferees fully endorse this recommendation and expect the Department to submit a plan to carry out the recommendation to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees by February 1, 1994.

Amendment No. 145: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$183,000 for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the repatriation loan program and provides that these funds may be transferred to the Salaries and Expenses account under Administration of

Foreign Affairs. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND  
CONFERENCES

Amendment No. 146: Inserts a heading as proposed by the Senate.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS

Amendment No. 147: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL  
ORGANIZATIONS

*For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, \$860,885,000: Provided, That any payment of arrearages made from these funds shall be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for the assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations, ten percent of said assessment shall be available for obligation only upon a certification to the Congress by the Secretary of State that the United Nations has established an independent office with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended: Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$860,885,000 for assessed contributions to international organizations. The conference agreement also provides that any payment of arrearages made from these funds shall be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organizations. The conference agreement further provides that of the funds appropriated in this account for the assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations, 10 percent of that assessment shall be available only upon a certification to the Congress by the Secretary of State that the United Nations has established an independent office with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended. The conference agreement further provides that none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

The Senate bill had proposed \$904,926,000 for payment of United States assessed contributions to international organizations, of which not to exceed \$44,041,000 would have been available to pay arrearages. The Senate bill also included the provision included in

the conference agreement that the payment of arrearages shall be directed towards special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization and a provision also included in the Senate bill which prohibits any of the funds from being used for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

The Senate bill also included language which would have prohibited the payment of funds available for arrearage payments to the United Nations until the Secretary of State certified to Congress that the United Nations had established an independent office of audits and inspections with responsibilities and powers substantially similar to offices of Inspectors General authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978 or that the United Nations had established a mechanism, process or office to institute certain audit investigation procedures of United Nations operations including a means for keeping the Secretary General fully informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of such operations and the necessity for corrective action. Further, the Senate bill included language which would have provided authority to the Secretary of State to propose that the Secretary General of the United Nations establish an advisory committee to assist in the creation of such mechanism, process or office and included language governing the composition of such an advisory committee.

Finally, the Senate bill included language which would have established a policy stating that Congress calls upon the Government of the Russian Federation to remove its troops from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania according to a firm schedule. Although the conference agreement does not include this provision, the conferees endorse the removal of troops of the Government of the Russian Federation from the Baltic States as soon as possible and call upon the administration to continue to press this policy on the Government of the Russian Federation.

The House bill contained no provisions on any of these matters.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL  
PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 148: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: \$401,607,000

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$401,607,000 for assessed United States contributions for support of United Nations peacekeeping forces. The House had proposed \$422,499,000 including a limitation of \$20,892,000 for arrearages and the Senate had proposed a total of \$444,736,000 including a limitation of \$21,992,000 for arrearages. The conference agreement contains no limitation or earmarking of funds for arrearage payments.

Amendment No. 149: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

Delete the matter stricken and delete the matter inserted

and  
on line 5, page 60 of the House engrossed bill, H.R. 2519, strike ", of" and all that follows through "arrearages" on line 7.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement strikes both the House and the Senate earmarks to pay arrearages owed by the United States for United Nations peacekeeping forces. The House had proposed \$20,892,000 for this purpose. The Senate had proposed \$21,992,000.

The conferees fully support the Administration's efforts to reduce significantly the United States' assessment rate for United Nations peacekeeping activities to a level that more equitably reflects the responsibilities of other Member nations, who can and should pay a greater percentage of peacekeeping costs. Given the conferees' strong belief that the United States is already being assessed at an inequitably high level, the conferees are deeply disturbed that the United Nations has increased the United States' rate for peacekeeping activities from 30.4 percent to 31.7 percent. Further, the conferees believe that the United States should receive credit toward its assessed contribution for additional costs incurred by the United States Government as a result of its direct participation in U.N. sanctioned peacekeeping activities. Therefore, the conferees recommend that the Administration conduct a thorough review of the current process of committing to peacekeeping operations including the policy of seeking all funding for such operations within the Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act. Further, the conferees expect that the Administration will notify the U.N. that the United States will not accept an assessment of more than 25 percent of peacekeeping costs for any new or expanded peacekeeping commitments after the date of enactment of this Act. Further, the conferees strongly recommend that the Administration consider not agreeing to participate in any new peacekeeping operations until the U.N. and pertinent United States agencies undertake badly needed organizational and management changes to carry out peacekeeping activities effectively. The conferees expect the Department of State in the fiscal year 1995 budget submission to include an annual three-year projection of United States peacekeeping costs and submit a detailed plan to the Appropriations Committees which identifies United States actions needed to correct policy and structural deficiencies in U.S. involvement with United Nations peacekeeping activities.

The conferees are deeply concerned that the United States continues to vote to approve new, expanded, or renewal of United Nations peacekeeping missions given the fiscal constraints on the account. The conferees are particularly concerned that the United States continues to make financial commitments to the United Nations without any certainty that the funds will be available. The conferees note that the current fiscal year 1994 assessed peacekeeping requirements are now projected to total at least \$1,299,770,000, including \$58,716,000 for three new missions in Haiti, Liberia, and Rwanda just approved by the United Nations with the concurrence of the United States Representative without prior consultation with the House and Senate Appropriations Committees. The conferees note that this projection is \$855,034,000 above the fiscal 1994 budget request for assessed peacekeeping contributions.

Therefore, the conferees fully expect the Secretary of State to notify the House and Senate Appropriations Committees 15 days in advance, where practicable, of a vote by the United Nations Security Council to establish any new or expanded peacekeeping operation. The conferees expect that the notification concerning any such peacekeeping operation shall include the total estimated cost, the United States share of such cost, the mission and objectives, the duration and estimated termination date, and the source of funding for the United States share (i.e. annual budget request, reprogramming, budget amendment, or budget supplemental request).

Amendment No. 150: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: *Provided, That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement inserts language which provides that funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services and materials for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers. The Senate amendment had proposed the provision included in the conference agreement and an additional provision that would have required the Secretary of State to certify that the United States' Mission to the United Nations has established procedures to provide information on all United Nations procurement regulations and solicitations to American manufacturers and suppliers. The House bill contained no provision on these matters.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CONTINGENCIES

Amendment No. 151: Appropriates \$6,000,000 instead of \$5,463,000 as proposed by the House and \$6,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

##### INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 152: Appropriates \$11,200,000 for the Salaries and Expenses account of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico instead of \$11,054,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,330,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 153: Appropriates \$14,400,000 for the Construction account instead of \$14,051,000 as proposed by the House and \$14,790,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes \$2,500,000 to reimburse the City of San Diego, California, for treatment of Tijuana, Mexico sewage. This amount together with \$316,000 provided for this item in the Salaries and Ex-

penses account will provide a total of \$2,816,000 for such reimbursement.

The conference agreement also includes \$2,000,000 for construction costs to stabilize the Rio Grande River channel near Caballo Dam in New Mexico.

Amendment No. 154: Deletes language proposed by the Senate which would have earmarked not more than \$2,500,000 in the Construction account to reimburse the City of San Diego, California, for treatment of Tijuana, Mexico sewage. The House bill contained no provision on this item.

The conference agreement provides \$2,500,000 in Amendment No. 153 for this item. The conferees have received a clarification from the Department of State that existing authority is sufficient to reimburse the City of San Diego for treatment of Tijuana sewage from funds available in the Construction account. Therefore, the Senate provision is unnecessary.

#### INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION

Amendment No. 155: Appropriates \$16,200,000 for the International Fisheries Commissions instead of \$14,200,000 as proposed by the House and \$18,200,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes a total of \$2,700,000 to the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for the cost of the re-registration of lampricide of which \$2,000,000 is provided above the budget request and the House bill and \$700,000 is allocated from the Commission's operating budget for this purpose. The total amount provided in the conference agreement (\$2,700,000) in this amendment, together with \$300,000 provided to NOAA for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission in Amendment No. 81, \$1,500,000 which was made available for the re-registration project in fiscal year 1993 from the Commission's operating budget and \$500,000 included in the Commission's budget plan for fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996, will provide for the full cost of the re-registration project.

Amendment No. 156: Deletes a proviso proposed by the Senate that would have earmarked \$4,000,000 for the Great Lakes Fishery Commission for the registration of the pesticide TFM. The House bill contained no similar provision. This matter is addressed in Amendment No. 155.

#### OTHER

##### PAYMENT TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

Amendment No. 157: Appropriates \$16,000,000 for payment to the Asia Foundation instead of \$16,287,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 158: Restores a reference to section 605 of this Act as proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate.

Amendment No. 159: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers of the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

*SEC. 503. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended for compensation of the United States Commissioner of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, only for actual hours worked by such Commissioner.*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides that the United States Commissioner of the Inter-

national Boundary Commission, United States and Canada may be compensated only for actual hours worked. The Senate amendment would have prohibited any funds in this or any other act from being expended for the salary of such commissioner. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 160: Deletes a provision proposed by the Senate stating that it is the sense of the Senate that funds made available under Public Law 102-391, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1993, for the Economic Support Fund, which have been allocated for Nicaragua, be instead made available for emergency humanitarian assistance for Bosnia-Herzegovina. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

#### RELATED AGENCIES

##### ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

Amendment No. 161: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: *\$53,500,000, of which not less than \$9,500,000 is available until expended only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$53,500,000 for ACDA. The conference agreement also provides that not less than \$9,500,000 of the amount appropriated to ACDA be available until expended only for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Organization of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. The House bill provided \$47,279,000 for ACDA. The Senate amendment provided \$58,000,000 for ACDA and added language not in the House bill which designated \$14,000,000 for payment of United States contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the organization on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

##### BOARD OF INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING GRANTS AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 162: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum "\$206,000,000" named in said amendment, insert: *\$210,000,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the house to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$210,000,000 for expenses of the Board for International Broadcasting, including grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, incorporated. The Senate had proposed \$206,000,000 for this purpose. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

##### ISRAEL RELAY STATION (RESCISSION)

Amendment No. 163: Deletes a rescission of \$180,000,000 for the Israel Relay Station proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate. These funds were rescinded in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-50).

##### INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 164: Appropriates \$43,500,000 for the fiscal year 1994 expenses of

the International Trade Commission (ITC) instead of \$44,391,000 as proposed by the House and \$42,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Of this amount, the conferees have included \$8,400,000 for the studies and analyses performed primarily by the ITC staff. The conferees expect the International Trade Commission to perform trade studies in response to requests from Members of the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

#### UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Amendment No. 165: Appropriates \$730,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$741,693,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conference agreement reflects the President's initiative to reduce FTE and administrative costs. The conference agreement also reflects a reduction of \$5,477,000 requested in the budget for Foreign Service National (FSN) employee pay raises. The conferees are agreed that it would not be equitable to provide funding for FSN pay raises and cost-of-living increases since U.S. national employees of the USIA will not receive any cost-of-living adjustment during fiscal year 1994 as part of the Government-wide program to reduce the Federal deficit. Further, the conferees endorse the provision in the Senate Appropriations Committee Report (S. Report 103-105) concerning the conflict resolution center.

The conferees support the Administration's initiative to enhance United States Government supported broadcasting services to Asia. Therefore the conferees have included in the overall conference agreement for the United States Information Agency, resources to begin this initiative if the necessary authorization is enacted. The conferees expect the United States Information Agency to submit a reprogramming proposal for this initiative to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees once an authorization is enacted.

##### EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Amendment No. 166: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: *to include other educational and cultural exchange programs, \$242,000,000*

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement appropriates \$242,000,000 for USIA's educational and cultural exchange programs and provides language not in either the House or Senate bill which makes the appropriation available for additional educational and cultural exchange programs that were not cited in the House or Senate bill language. The House proposed an appropriation of \$217,650,000 and the Senate had proposed \$250,702,000.

The conference agreement includes an increase of \$24,350,000 for the general enhancement of USIA's educational and cultural exchange programs above the amount provided in the House bill. The conferees are agreed that this increase be used to supplement programs above the level provided by the House for such items as the International Visitor program, the Fulbright and other academic programs (to include Vietnamese student exchanges and CAMPUS), the Claude and Mildred Pepper Scholarship program, various new exchange programs (to include the Mike

Mansfield Fellowship Program and exchanges for Pacific Island nations in the Western and South Pacific, both if authorized), the American Studies program (if authorized) and Humphrey Fellowships. The conferees expect USIA to submit a reprogramming proposal to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees in accordance with section 605 of the fiscal year 1994 Appropriations Act, which would propose an allocation of the total amount provided in the conference agreement among the various educational and cultural exchange programs.

##### RADIO CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 167: Appropriates \$75,164,000 for the Radio Construction account as proposed by the House instead of \$57,620,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees note that the overall broadcasting priorities of the United States Government are changing and that, pending enactment of an authorization bill for the United States Information Agency, preparations must be made for consolidation of international broadcasting assets and facilities. Accordingly, the conferees expect USIA to develop a plan for use of the Radio Construction account that reflects these new priorities. The conferees also expect that the Agency will submit this plan to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees under the reprogramming procedures set forth in section 605 of the Fiscal Year 1994 Appropriations Act.

##### EAST-WEST CENTER

Amendment No. 168: Appropriates \$26,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$23,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The conference agreement includes \$250,000 to support the U.S. Government's participation in the establishment of the Joint Commercial Commission (JCC) pursuant to the memorandum of understanding signed by 13 Pacific Island nations. The Commission's purpose is to promote the development of mutually beneficial commercial and economic relations between and among the Pacific Island nations and the United States. The recommended funding will allow the United States to establish a secretariat in Hawaii. These funds are to be administered by the East-West Center in consultation with the State of Hawaii Office of International Relations.

##### BROADCASTING TO CUBA

Amendment No. 169: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

*In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:*

##### BROADCASTING TO CUBA

###### RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA

*For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a), of which \$5,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until 30 days after the Director of the United States Information Agency submits a report to Congress which certifies receipt of the report of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti and specifies the measures*

*the United States Information Agency is taking with respect to the recommendations of the panel.*

##### TELEVISION BROADCASTING TO CUBA

*For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act (22 U.S.C. 1465aa et seq.), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for television transmission and reception, \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That not later than July 1, 1994, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to Congress, after consulting with the Board for International Broadcasting and after taking into account any relevant recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, his recommendations as to whether TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation and whether the interests of the United States are better served by maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba, by terminating television broadcasting to Cuba and strengthening radio broadcasting to Cuba, or by funding other activities related to promoting democracy in Cuba authorized by law: Provided further, That of the amount appropriated in this paragraph, \$2,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until after July 1, 1994, and, after that date, funds shall be available only for the orderly termination of television broadcasting to Cuba unless the Director of the United States Information Agency determines, in the report to Congress called for in the Administrative Provision Establishing the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, that maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba is technically sound and effective, is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation, and is in the best interests of the United States.*

##### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION ESTABLISHING

###### THE ADVISORY PANEL ON RADIO MARTI AND TV MARTI

(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an advisory panel to be known as the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti (in this section referred to as the "Panel").*

(b) *FUNCTIONS.—The Panel shall study the purposes, policies, and practices of radio and television broadcasting to Cuba (commonly referred to as "Radio Marti" and "TV Marti") by the Cuba Service of the Voice of America.*

(c) *REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the members of the Panel have been appointed pursuant to subsection (d), the Panel shall submit to the Congress and the United States Information Agency (USIA) a report which shall contain—*

(1) *a statement of the findings and conclusions of the Panel on the matters described in subsection (b); and*

(2) *specific findings and recommendations with respect to whether—*

(A) *such broadcasting consistently meets the standards for quality and objectivity established by law or by the United States Information Agency;*

(B) *such broadcasting is cost-effective;*

(C) *the extent to which such broadcasting is already being received by the Cuban people on a daily basis from credible sources;*

(D) *TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation;*

(d) *COMPOSITION.—(1) The Panel shall be composed of three members, who shall among them have expertise in government information*

and broadcasting programs, broadcast journalism, journalistic ethics, and the technical aspects of radio and television broadcasting.

(2) The Director of the United States Information Agency shall appoint the members of the Panel not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. Individuals appointed to the Panel shall be noted for their integrity, expertise, and independence of judgment consistent with the purposes of the Panel.

(3) Each member of the Panel shall be appointed for the life of the Panel. A vacancy in the Panel shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(4) Each member of the Panel shall serve without pay, except that such member shall receive travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with Sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) TEMPORARY PERSONNEL.—(1) The Panel may procure temporary and intermittent services under Section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code (relating to employment of experts and consultants), at rates for individuals not to exceed the maximum rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(2) Upon request of the Panel, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of the agency to the Panel to assist it in carrying out its duties under this section.

(3) Support Services.—The United States Information Agency shall provide facilities, supplies, and support services to the Panel upon request.

(f) TERMINATION.—The Panel shall terminate immediately upon submitting its report pursuant to subsection (c).

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides new language not in either the House or Senate bill that appropriates \$14,000,000 for Radio Broadcasting to Cuba. Of this amount, \$5,000,000 shall be withheld until 30 days after the Director of the United States Information Agency submits a report to Congress which certifies receipt of the report of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti and specifies the measures the United States Information Agency is taking with respect to the recommendations of the Panel.

The conference agreement also includes new language not in either bill which appropriates \$7,000,000 for Television Broadcasting to Cuba. The conference agreement further provides that not later than July 1, 1994, the Director of the United States Information Agency shall submit to Congress after consulting with the Board for International Broadcasting and after taking into account any relevant recommendations of the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, his recommendations as to whether TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation, and whether the interest of the United States is being served by maintaining broadcasting to Cuba, by terminating television broadcasting to Cuba and strengthening radio broadcasting to Cuba, or by funding other activities related to promoting democracy in Cuba authorized by law. The conference agreement further provides that of the \$7,000,000 appropriated, \$2,500,000 shall be withheld from obligation until after July 1, 1994, and after that date funds shall be available only for the orderly termination of television broadcasting to Cuba unless the Director of USIA determines in the report to Congress that maintaining television broadcasting to Cuba is technically sound and effective,

is consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation and is in the best interest of the United States.

The conference agreement also includes an administrative provision not in either the House or Senate bill which establishes the Advisory Panel on Radio Marti and TV Marti, sets forth its functions, provides for the appointment of the Panel members, supporting staff and support services and requires that the Panel report to the Congress and the United States Information Agency not later than 90 days after its establishment. The report required by the conference agreement is to contain a statement of the Panel's findings concerning the purposes, policies, and practices of Radio and TV Marti and whether broadcasting consistently meets the standards for quality and objectivity established by law or by the United States Information Agency, whether such broadcasting is cost effective, the extent to which such broadcasting is already being received by the Cuban people on a daily basis from credible sources, and whether TV Marti broadcasting is technically sound and effective and consistently being received by a sufficient Cuban audience to warrant its continuation.

The Senate amendment would have appropriated \$28,351,000 for Broadcasting to Cuba which would have provided funding for Radio and Television Marti. The House bill contained no provision on this item.

#### NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

Amendment No. 170: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

#### NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the North/South Center Act of 1991, (22 U.S.C. 2075), by grant to an educational institution in Florida known as the North/South Center, \$8,700,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That funds appropriated by this Act for the United States Information Agency and the Department of State may be obligated and expended at the rate of operations and under the terms and conditions provided by H.R. 2519 as enacted into law, notwithstanding section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 except that this proviso shall cease to be effective after April 30, 1994 or upon enactment into law of H.R. 2333, the State Department, USIA, and Related Agencies Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 or similar legislation, whichever first occurs.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House of the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides \$8,700,000 for the North/South Center instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and no appropriation for the Center as proposed by the Senate. The amount in the conference agreement provides the same level of resources for the North/South Center for fiscal year 1994 as was appropriated for fiscal year 1993.

The conference agreement also includes a new proviso that makes the funds appropriated by this Act for the USIA and the State Department available for obligation and expenditure at the rate of operations and under the terms and conditions provided by

H.R. 2519 as enacted into law, notwithstanding section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956. The conference agreement also provides that this proviso shall cease to be effective after April 30, 1994 or upon enactment into law of H.R. 2333, the State Department, USIA, and Related Agencies Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 or 1995 or similar legislation, whichever first occurs.

The conference agreement waives certain provisions of permanent law which prohibit the obligation of funds appropriated to USIA and the State Department in the absence of an enacted authorization for appropriations. The conferees have taken this action because the necessary authorizing legislation has not been enacted into law and the prospects for action are uncertain. Therefore, the conferees believe they have taken the only responsible action in temporarily setting aside these provisions until April 30, 1994 or until an authorization is enacted, whichever first occurs, and that without this action, the principal foreign affairs agencies of the United States Government would be forced to shut down all operations.

The conferees note that the appropriation for the North/South Center is the only annual discretionary appropriations account in USIA or the State Department for which the authorizing committees have chosen to provide a permanent authorization and thus waive the requirements of section 701. While the conferees appreciate the importance of the North/South Center item which basically provides a Federal grant to a university, they believe that the necessary authority to permit the obligation of all the other funds provided in this Appropriations Act to the State Department and the USIA is fundamental. Without the authority provided in the conference agreement, for example, the State Department would have to shut down all United States embassies and consulates, and the USIA would have to terminate all United States Government international broadcasting activities.

The conferees note that recognition of a similar potential impact on State Department refugee programs, which are funded in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act led to enactment of a full year waiver of section 15 in the fiscal year 1994 Act (P.L. 103-87) signed on September 30, 1993. Requiring annual or biennial authorization for spending levels is an important process, but prohibiting the obligation of appropriations in the absence of such authorization is unduly restrictive. Therefore, the conferees strongly recommend that the authorizing committees give the most serious consideration to offering legislation to repeal section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

#### NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

Amendment No. 171: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$35,000,000 for the National Endowment for Democracy. The Senate amendment also provides that none of these funds may be disbursed to grantees who have not reimbursed the National Endowment for Democracy from nongovernmental funds for disallowed expenditures by such grantees for first-class travel, alcohol and entertainment, identified in the March 1993 report of the Inspection General of the U.S. Information Agency.

The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees note that since its inception, the National Endowment for Democracy has had a special relationship with the following four institutes: the Center for International Private Enterprise; the Free Trade Union Institute; the International Republican Institute; and the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. These institutes, representing major institutions in an American democracy, have received a substantial percentage of the Endowment's funds to enable these organizations to develop a program of democratic institution building throughout the world. The conferees note the important role played by the institutes and that as a measure of their success, they have begun to attract for many of their projects, significant funding from other sources.

During the debates in the House and Senate on the Endowment, some Members were critical of the fact that the Endowment allocates funds to these institutes on a non-competitive basis. To address this concern, the conferees expect that the Endowment will move toward a more competitive process in its grant-making procedures. Accordingly, the conferees expect that all program funds made available from the increase in the funding level for the Endowment for fiscal year 1994 should be open equally to all potential applicants.

#### TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 172: Deletes language proposed by the Senate that would have prohibited any of the funds made available in this Act to be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), overhaul, conversion, or modernization of vessels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in shipyards located outside of the United States. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

This matter is further addressed in Amendment No. 174.

Amendment No. 173: Deletes a section number change proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 174: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

#### SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE

SEC. 606. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, to the extent feasible, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Head of the agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 607. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), overhaul, conversion, or modernization of vessels for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in shipyards located outside of the United States.

(b) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the construction, repair (other than emergency repair), conversion, or modernization of aircraft for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration in facilities located outside the United States and Canada.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate which provides that in the case of equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending such assistance, to the extent feasible, purchase only American-made equipment and products, and that a notice describing this statement must be provided to each recipient provided financial assistance under this Act. In addition, the conference agreement also inserts new language originally proposed by the Senate in Amendment No. 172 that prohibits any of the funds made available in this Act from being used for construction, repair, overhaul, conversion or modernization of vessels for NOAA in shipyards outside of the United States. Finally, the conference agreement inserts a provision not in either the House or Senate bill that prohibits any of the funds made available in the Act from being used for construction, repair, conversion or modernization of aircraft for NOAA in facilities outside the United States or Canada.

Amendment No. 175: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate with an amendment as follows:

SEC. 608. (a) Funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation and distributed to each grantee funded in fiscal year 1994, pursuant to the number of poor people determined by the Bureau of the Census to be within its geographical area, shall be distributed in the following order:

(1) grants from the Legal Services Corporation and contracts entered into with the Legal Services Corporation under section 1006(a)(1) of the Legal Services Corporation Act, as amended, shall be maintained in fiscal year 1994 at not less than the annual level at which each grantee and contractor was funded in fiscal year 1993 pursuant to Public Law 102-395; and

(2) each grantee or contractor for basic field funds under section 1006(a)(1) shall receive an increase of not less than 2.5% over its fiscal year 1993 grant level. Any additional increase in funding for grants and contracts to basic field programs under section 1006(a)(1) shall be awarded to grantees and contractors funded at the lowest levels per-poor-person (calculated for each grantee or contractor's fiscal year 1993 grant level by the number of poor persons within its geographical area under the 1990 census) so as to fund the largest number of programs possible at an equal per-poor-person amount; and

(3) any increase above the fiscal year 1993 level for grants and contracts to migrant programs under section 1006(a)(1) shall be awarded on a per migrant and dependent basis calculated by dividing each such grantee's or contractor's fiscal year 1993 grant level by the state migrant and dependent population, which shall be derived by applying the state migrant and dependent population percentage as determined by the 1992 Larson-Plascencia study of the Tomas Rivera Center migrant enumeration project. This percentage shall be applied to a population figure of 1,661,875 migrants and dependents. These funds shall be distributed in the following order:

(A) forty percent to migrant grantees and contractors funded at the lowest levels per migrant

(including dependents) so as to fund the largest number of programs possible at an equal per migrant and dependent amount; and

(B) forty percent to migrant grantees and contractors such that each grantee or contractor funded at a level of less than \$19.74 per migrant and dependent shall be increased by an equal percentage of the amount by which such grantee's or contractor's funding, including the increases under subparagraph (A) above, falls below \$19.74 per migrant and dependent, within its State; and

(C) twenty percent on an equal migrant and dependent basis to all migrant grantees and contractors funded below \$19.74 per migrant and dependent within its State.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by or contrary to any of the provisions of—

(1) section 607 of Public Law 101-515, and that, except for the funding formula, all funds appropriated for the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions as set forth in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 and all references to "1991" in section 607 of Public Law 101-515 shall be deemed to be "1994" unless subparagraph (2) or (3) applies;

(2) subparagraph 1, except that, if a Board of eleven Directors is nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, provisions 20 and 22 shall not apply to such a confirmed Board;

(3) authorizing legislation for fiscal year 1994 for the Legal Services Corporation that is enacted into law.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement provides a distribution formula governing the allocation of funds among the basic field programs. The formula provides that programs shall be held harmless from the funding cuts resulting from the 1990 Census. The conference agreement also provides that each grantee or contractor for basic field funds shall receive an increase of not less than 2.5% over its 1993 grant level. Any additional increase in funding for grants and contracts to basic field programs shall be awarded to grantees and contractors funded at the lowest levels per-poor-person so as to fund the largest number of programs possible at an equal per-poor-person amount. In addition, the conference agreement includes a formula for calculating resources for migrant programs. The formula uses the report of the 1992 Larson-Plascencia study of the Tomas Rivera migrant project. The conference agreement also provides that in the absence of a reauthorization, the funds appropriated for the Legal Services Corporation in this Act will continue to be governed by the restrictions contained in section 607 of Public Law 101-515, including the proviso restricting any abortion litigation. Finally, the conference agreement provides that two provisions contained in Public Law 101-515 restricting the authority of past and current Boards of Directors to revise or adopt regulations are removed with respect to any new Board of 11 directors nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The Senate amendment provided a distribution formula which would have required that funds appropriated in the Act to the Legal Services Corporation be distributed under a formula that would have maintained basic field programs in fiscal year 1994 at not less than 97.9% of fiscal year 1993 level. The Senate language also included the provision governing the use of funds in the absence of a reauthorization.

The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 176: Deletes language proposed by the Senate stating it is the sense of Congress that entities purchasing goods or services with the funds available in this Act should, to the maximum extent feasible, where available, purchase only American-made equipment, products, and services. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

Amendment No. 177: Deletes language proposed by the Senate that would have prohibited any of the funds made available by this Act to be used for contributions to the International Coffee Organization. The House bill contained no provision on this matter.

The conferees note that the United States was among the countries that proposed extending the International Coffee Agreement (ICA) for an additional year to allow for the possibility of resuming negotiations on a new agreement. The conferees believe that the United States should continue to pursue opportunities to negotiate a new ICA that would serve the interests of American consumers and the American coffee industry. The conferees note that a new ICA with economic provisions would be subject to Congressional approval.

Amendment No. 178: Deletes language proposed by the Senate, but not in the House bill, which would have required the Federal Communications Commission to submit an analysis to Congress outlining options for addressing telephone calling card procedures which will maximize consumer benefits. The conferees understand that the Commission is currently considering issues related to procedures for making telephone calls using calling cards in FCC Docket 92-77, the Billed Party Preference proceeding. The conferees encourage the Commission to include the analysis envisioned by the Senate amendment as part of any action it is taking on this issue.

#### CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 1994 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 1993 amount, the 1994 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 1994 follows:

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	\$23,616,242,000
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	24,928,085,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	20,839,956,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	23,540,484,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 1994 .....	23,396,781,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1993 .....	-219,461,000
Budget estimate of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 1994 .....	-1,531,304,000
House bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	+2,556,825,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 1994 .....	-143,703,000

NEAL SMITH,  
BOB CARR,  
ALAN MOLLOHAN,  
JAMES MORAN,  
DAVID E. SKAGGS,  
DAVID E. PRICE,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
HAL ROGERS,  
JIM KOLBE,  
JOSEPH MCDADE,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
DALE BUMPERS,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
JIM SASSER,  
BOB KERREY,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
TED STEVENS,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
PHIL GRAMM,  
MITCH MCCONNELL,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ACKERMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for Wednesday, October 13, on account of official business.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today and October 15, on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BOEHLERT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SANTORUM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCANDLESS, for 60 minutes, on October 20.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes today, and on October 15.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SANDERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, on October 18.

Mr. KANJORSKI, for 60 minutes each day, on October 14, 15, 18, and 19.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 60 minutes each day, on October 18 and 19.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOOLITTLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CALLAHAN.

Mr. ZIMMER.

Mr. COX.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

Mr. SOLOMON.  
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. GRAMS.

Mr. LEACH.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mrs. BENTLEY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. LAROCCO.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Ms. HARMAN.

Mr. HOAGLAND.

Mr. KLEIN.

Mr. TAUZIN.

Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. GUTIERREZ in two instances.

Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. MCDERMOTT.

Mr. RUSH in two instances.

Mr. DELLUMS.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. BONIOR) to revise and extend his remarks:)

Mr. CONYERS.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2517. An act to enable the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to demonstrate innovative strategies for assisting homeless individuals, to develop the capacity of community development corporations and community housing development organizations to undertake community development and affordable housing projects and programs, to encourage pension fund investment in affordable housing, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 15, 1993, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

2025. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his follow-up report on the deployment of U.S. combat-equipped aircraft to support NATO's enforcement of the no-fly zone in Bosnia and Herzegovina (H.

Doc. No. 103-150), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 334, A bill to provide for the recognition of the Lumbee Tribe of Cheraw Indians of North Carolina, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIXON: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2492. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-291). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BEVILL: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 2445. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-292). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2519. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-293). Ordered to be printed.

**PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 3282. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to improve towing vessel navigational safety; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KLUG, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan):

H.R. 3283. A bill to provide for the use of Department of Defense golf courses by the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. BENTLEY (for herself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. LEVY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. MACHTLEY):

H.R. 3284. A bill entitled the "Asylum Abuse Prevention Act of 1993"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Miss COLLINS of Michigan:

H.R. 3285. A bill to redesignate the postal facility located at 1401 West Fort Street, Detroit, MI, as the "George W. Young Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Ms. PELOSI:

H.R. 3286. A bill to amend the act establishing Golden Gate National Recreation Area to provide for the management of the

Presidio by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 3287. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to award grants to improve wastewater treatment for certain unincorporated communities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming (for himself and Mr. PASTOR):

H.R. 3288. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to create an exception from copyright infringement for certain performances in places of public accommodation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 3289. A bill to exempt from the anti-trust laws certain joint activities of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 3290. A bill to amend the Asbestos School Hazard Abatement Act of 1984 and title II of the Toxic Substances Control Act to expand the coverage of those acts to include Head Start Programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mr. BREWSTER):

H.J. Res. 277. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to limit the number of years an individual may serve in certain positions in the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning the International Year of the World's Indigenous Peoples; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H. Con. Res. 166. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to Taiwan's membership in the United Nations and other international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Ms. BYRNE introduced a bill (H.R. 3291) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States for the vessel *Pelican*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

**ADDITIONAL SPONSORS**

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

- H.R. 54: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.
- H.R. 55: Mr. DIXON.
- H.R. 144: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.
- H.R. 350: Ms. LOWEY and Ms. ROYBAL-AL-LARD.

- H.R. 455: Mr. BOEHLERT.
- H.R. 509: Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 703: Mr. PORTER, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. ARMEY.
- H.R. 796: Ms. DANNER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 830: Mr. FISH, Mr. STENHOLM, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
- H.R. 833: Mrs. MINK and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 893: Mr. CONYERS.
- H.R. 962: Mr. ORTON and Mr. BROWN of California.
- H.R. 967: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COX, and Mr. CLEMENT.
- H.R. 1055: Mr. SPENCE.
- H.R. 1181: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. RAVENEL.
- H.R. 1277: Mr. BREWSTER.
- H.R. 1280: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. FROST, Mr. MANTON, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. LOWEY, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mrs. KENNELLY.
- H.R. 1332: Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin.
- H.R. 1450: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
- H.R. 1541: Mr. EMERSON.
- H.R. 1627: Mr. GORDON.
- H.R. 1671: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. DELLUMS.
- H.R. 1697: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.
- H.R. 1734: Mr. STARK.
- H.R. 1886: Mr. SCOTT.
- H.R. 1900: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COYNE, Mr. CARR, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 1925: Mr. WYNN.
- H.R. 1943: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
- H.R. 1968: Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. KLEIN.
- H.R. 2001: Mr. PENNY, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
- H.R. 2135: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DELLUMS.
- H.R. 2210: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ENGEL.
- H.R. 2229: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
- H.R. 2287: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, and Mrs. FOWLER.
- H.R. 2319: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mrs. MORELLA.
- H.R. 2345: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
- H.R. 2425: Mr. GINGRICH.
- H.R. 2443: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. STARK, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. DICK-EY, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. LINDER, Mr. TEJEDA, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MAZZOLI.
- H.R. 2512: Mr. CLINGER.
- H.R. 2557: Mr. SHAYS.
- H.R. 2588: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.
- H.R. 2602: Mr. HOLDEN.
- H.R. 2622: Mr. GINGRICH.
- H.R. 2623: Mr. SMITH of Oregon and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
- H.R. 2641: Mrs. MEEK and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 2831: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. MILLER of California.
- H.R. 2866: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. COP-PERSMITH, and Mr. HILLIARD.
- H.R. 2880: Mr. GINGRICH.
- H.R. 2884: Mr. FISH, Mr. CLYBURN, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 2896: Mr. EMERSON.
- H.R. 2921: Mr. SISISKY.
- H.R. 2925: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey and Mr. FISH.
- H.R. 2927: Mr. BAESLER, Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. HOEKSTRA.

