We need to respond to that as members of Congress, not just as Democrats but as a Congress, because we need to make sure that disparity is not there. The beauty of America has always been that we have a middle class and the hope for people to go into that middle class. And yet what we see is the disparity is getting bigger. The people who make the most are making more money and the people who make less are making even less.

Mr. Speaker, I understand we are getting ready to go to the budget, but I would hope we would also see sometime in the near future a clean vote on the minimum wage issue.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3019, BALANCED BUDGET DOWN PAYMENT ACT, II

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–538) on the resolution (H. Res. 415) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 415 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 415

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], 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. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the rule before us will allow us to immediately consider the conference report on H.R. 3019. It is the Balanced Budget Downpayment Act II. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration, and it provides that the conference report be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, this is a day that has been a long time coming as we wrap up the remaining five regular appropriations bills for fiscal year 1996 whereby we will have a full budget in place for this year. Notwithstanding all the short-term continuing resolutions and all of the long, hard, and tough negotiations on this bill, the wait has been well worthwhile, in my opinion.

This truly is a historic day when one considers that we are making this substantial downpayment toward a balanced budget that we promised at the beginning of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on any bill of this magnitude, with all of the complex and all of the difficult issues to be resolved, I think it is fair to say that no one is happy with every aspect of the final conference agreement, certainly not this Member. But I would strongly urge every single Member to come over here and keep their eyes on the big picture of what this is all about, and what this is all about is, make no mistake about it, reducing the size and the role of this Federal Government and putting this country once again on a second fiscal footing by taking the first big steps toward a balanced budget by the year 2002, and this bill today does just that.

The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that the fiscal year 1996 deficit would fall to $144 billion. That is not million, that is billion dollars, and that is $28 billion below last December's projection. And make no mistake about it, the Congressional Budget Office confirms that our actions on appropriation bills for this fiscal year have played a major role in bringing about this downturn in spending.

Mr. Speaker, our final action today on these remaining five appropriation bills will contribute even further to that deficit reduction effort. When this bill is signed into law, and the President is going to sign it, we will have saved $23 billion from last year's spending levels alone. That is $23 billion below last year's spending. Who would have ever imagined we could have made such substantial strides? Just our first full year? And that is added to another, and this is important to remember, we have already cut $23 billion, but if we add that to the $20 billion in savings that we made in fiscal year 1995, in savings and rescissions, when we add all that up, it means that we have saved some $43 billion since we took control of this Congress in January of 1995, $43 billion.

Mr. Speaker, one can say we even outdid ourselves when we consider that we have saved $2 billion more than our budget resolution projected in discretionary spending, $2 billion more than we even said we were going to. That, my friends, is a record of accomplishment which we can all be very, very proud. I know I am. And it is one which will benefit the American people, and it will benefit the economy of this Nation, which means jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs.

Interest rates will be lower than the CBO projected; the economy is growing faster than the CBO projected; and inflation has been lower than CBO projected, all because we have had the courage to stick by our convictions and our commitments and to make those hard votes on the floor of this Congress, and, ladies and gentlemen, they were hard, but that is the only way we get this kind of savings to put the fiscal house in order of this Government.

Mr. Speaker, what does all this mean? It means the $43 billion in savings we have made in fiscal years 1995 and 1996 translates into money we will not have to borrow. It means we do not have to borrow another $43 billion, it means less debt and it means less interest for our children and our grandchildren to have to pay, already $5 trillion in debt requiring $250 billion in interest payments alone annually. We are not going to add to that. It means an ever expanding economy with more opportunities for more jobs, better jobs, and better pay because we are reducing the cost of Government by bringing our own fiscal house in order.

Mr. Speaker, that is really what this whole debate today in all about. Yes, there has been a great deal of give and take between the President and the Congress in these difficult negotiations. That is all a part of the political process. It is the toughest part to learn sometimes when one is principled and believes very strongly in the things they believe in. But the art of compromise is something that Ronald Reagan taught all of us that we had to live by in order to accomplish anything.

But let me emphasize the fact that for all the areas in which some concessions have been made to the administration there have been offsets to pay for them, and we are going to hear during the next hour of debate all the restorations that were made, whether it was in education or the environment or in other areas. But every single dollar that was restored over what we wanted to cut has been offset with cuts elsewhere, so we have not given in one thin dime, and that is how we realize the savings we have today.

In the process of arriving at this mutually agreed upon budget we have managed to eliminate, and this is so terribly important because it also is what this debate is all about, we have eliminated, that means we have zeroed out, 200 programs, while still paying for emergency supplemental funding for such things as disaster assistance, and goodness knows we have had enough of that with all the disasters throughout the country lately, and also our troop deployment in Bosnia. That is all paid for and yet we still have realized these very significant savings.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, and his Committee on Appropriations for making the very hard choices and for sticking with our core values of providing a better future for this country by reducing the deficit and reducing that public debt.

When we consider where we were at the beginning of this Congress, I do not think anyone would have predicted we would have been capable of this degree of success in just this short space of time. I think we owe a great deal of gratitude to the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, who has worked hand in glove with our leadership and the Senate leadership in negotiating this final agreement.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us be under no illusion that this is the end of these efforts. I do not want it to sound like this is all over and we have won, we have accomplished what we set out to do. We have a long way to go in the coming fiscal years to establish and to achieve that balanced budget and seemed so illusory just 2 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this final part of this year's budget we have lived up to our commitment to stick to, and this is important for everybody back in your offices listening, we are sticking to that glidepath of a balanced budget. We are even below the glidepath that we set back in January of 1995.

That is why I am going to vote for this piece of legislation, because we have not used smoke and mirrors. We have not lied to the public. We are actually cutting the deficit down and we are staying on that glidepath. In coming years there will still be many pieces that are required to balance this puzzle, but if we stick to what we are doing, if we accomplish next year what we did this year, and we do it for 5 more consecutive years after that, we will have brought this fiscal house in order and it will have saved this country from drowning in a sea of red ink.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge support of this rule. I strongly urge support of the bill to finally put an end to this year's budget. By passing this, we will have finally adopted the 1996 budget.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON for yielding me the customary half hour and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all over the country today we should be hearing a sigh of relief. The 6-month anxiety we've been feeling about possible Government shutdowns has come to an end. The bill we will vote on today will make it impossible for my Republican colleagues to shut down the Government for political reasons again, at least until October 1st.

Mr. Speaker, today the Democratic position prevailed. Today we showed that it is possible to cut spending while still supporting education, the environment, and community police.

Throughout this budget battle Democrats held tough.

Throughout this budget battle Democrats stood up for education and the environment and now that the budget battle is over the American people are having a sigh of relief.

Because thanks to the Democrats in Congress 1 million children will still be able to get extra help in math and reading.

Thanks to the Democrats in Congress our clean air and clean water acts will not be gutted.

And thanks to the Democrats in Congress we can still put 100,000 police on the street while not busting the budget.

But even though this Republican budget game has finally come to an end it's 6 months overdue.

If Republicans had worked with Democrats we could have kept the Government open. If Republicans had worked with Democrats we could have settled this 6 months ago and come a lot closer to giving the American people the kind of Government they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, there's one question the American people want to ask of Republicans in Congress, what took you so long?

Why did you wait to open up the Government and why did you hold on so long to your education and environment cuts?

I congratulate my Republican colleagues for seeing the merits of the Democratic defense of education, the environment, and community policing.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, Mr. DAVID DREIER, My vice chairman of the Committee on Rules and my right arm. He is a Member of this body that came here with Ronald Reagan a couple years after I did, who helped me in introducing the first balanced budget ever to come on this floor. We did not get many votes for it back in those days, but by persevering, this gentleman, along with myself and others, have brought these balanced budgets to the floor.

□ 1430

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am very flattered by that. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I want to join in extending congratulations to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and to others who have worked to bring about this agreement. Clearly, we have gotten to the point where we are taking a step, a step in the direction towards ending the concept of big government. This does not do it, but it is a step in that direction, and I am pleased that we are going to be doing that.

During the arduous national debate on the President's massive tax increase back in 1993, the American people said, ''Cut spending first.'' There was a clear national consensus to balance the budget by reducing the waste in government and slowing the growth of Federal spending, not by increasing taxes.

Our Contract With America was historic not for the specific policies proposed but for the unprecedented effort of political candidates to make substantive legislative proposals during a campaign and then to win the election and actually proceed with implementation of those promises. This was above all an effort to address the well-founded mistrust that has existed with the American people who had grown sick and tired of Presidents and congressional majorities, both political parties saying one thing in a campaign and doing another while in office.

One of the fundamental tenets of our contract was to balance the budget by reducing Federal spending, not by raising taxes. The principle of the Republican Party resulted in a historic budget confrontation. The majority in Congress promised to balance the budget by slowing the growth of Federal spending and provide tax cuts to families so that people could spend their own money on their own priorities in the budget.

The President opposed that effort and had more than enough support from the minority in Congress to enforce his vetoes. The unstoppable force met the immovable object.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report brings the appropriations portion of the fiscal year 1996 process to a close. That in itself is a very good and positive thing. It involves compromise, but it does not change the basic fact regarding this historic effort of the Committee on Appropriations over the past 16 months.

With enactment of this legislation, the 104th Congress will have reduced Federal discretionary spending by $23 billion in fiscal year 1996 spending. The Congress has saved the Federal taxpayers and, more importantly, their children who will pay for the Federal debt an additional $20 billion in rescissions from the previous fiscal year. The result has been the lowest projected deficit in 14 years and the single largest reduction in Federal spending since the 1940's.

With the passage of this legislation, Congress will have terminated over 200 Federal programs. Congress has done what it promised to do and what the American people asked for. We cut spending first. Critical rhetoric will always to be part of politics, but one thing that cannot be said truthfully about the 104th Congress is that we have not done what we said we would do. We cannot fully reform 40 years of big government congressional policies in just 2 years, but today we are making a very good and important start.

This is a bill that deserves bipartisan support, and I am convinced it is going to get it. It may be the product of a process that was not enjoyable to watch, but it is a product that is well worth supporting from both sides of the aisle. It is time to move ahead with fiscal year 1997 spending issues. However, be assured this majority will remain fully committed to balancing the budget by cutting spending first, not raising taxes on hard-working families

to feed the bloated Federal behemoth. It is gratifying that we have finally gotten to this point. I hope very much that we sill be able to move as expeditiously as possible to pass this legislation.

I thank my friend for yielding time to me.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that goes, if you first do not succeed, try, try again. Well, 2 Government shutdowns later, 13 continuing resolutions later, 6 months after the deadline of October later, we have finally come up, finally come up with a bipartisan solution for this year's budget. What is it? It is trying to work together in a bipartisan way but not cutting and devastating education, like the Republicans did initially. Let me talk about a couple programs that are now fully restored that never should have been cut in the first place.

Safe and drug free schools were cut by $265 million. When we ask children in our schools what is the biggest risk they face today, they do not say an algebra test; they say drugs. Yet, they wanted to cut that program. Now it is restored. This is a good bill.

They also wanted to cut Head Start programs to keep our children learning that are at risk from dropping out, because if we do not keep them in school, they are going to get in trouble and go to jail, and we are going to have to build a prison. What would you rather do as a taxpayer? Educate our children or build jails and prisons later on?

Third, title I programs that were cut back by 16 percent, now they are fully restored. Title I educates 7 million at-risk school children, teaching them the basics so that they can learn and become productive citizens and work in good jobs later on.

Title I has been restored. Head Start has been restored. Drug free schools have been restored.

I would hope that this would be a lesson that we here in Congress will begin to work together, Republicans and Democrats, because, Mr. Speaker, this is not a victory for the Democrats because we got this education money back in. This is a victory for the American people. This is what the American people want. They want to make sure that their children can get to school and a good school and that we try new ideas in making our schools work better. They want to make sure, when Newsweek has a cover story this week that colleges can cost $1,000 a week, that we help our students get a student loan or a student grant so that they could pursue higher education.

This is the best investment we can make in this country, investing in education for our children. It never should have been cut the first time.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] said, we can cut spending first in Washington, DC, and cut back on committees and cut back on the overhead here and return money out of our budgets. But we should not cut education dollars for at-risk children. We should not use the budget axe on the most vulnerable people in our society, especially when we want these children getting good jobs and not ending up in trouble where they are even more of a tax burden later on.

This is a lesson, Mr. Speaker. I hope for 1997 and 1998 and so on into the future that Republicans and Democrats will work together to protect education, to cut wasteful spending here in Washington first, and to get to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] for his very generous extension of time to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Just briefly, the previous speaker has called, recalled an old axiom that says, if at first you do not succeed, try and try and try again. I just recall back on February 1995, when the President of the United States presented this Congress of the United States his 5-year projected budget, which called for increases of more than $250 billion in the deficit each year for 5 consecutive years, that would have added another $1 trillion 250 billion to the deficit.

In that same budget, he called for increases across the board. So we Republicans persevered. We were not about to increase the deficit by $250 billion annually for 5 consecutive years. We were not about to increase spending. By persevering and trying and trying and trying again, what we have before us today is the 1996 budget that does not call for increases of huge magnitudes, it calls for a $23 billion cut in actual spending.

That is what we have accomplished by trying and trying and trying again, and we had a lot of good support from both sides of the aisle individually coming to that.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, the gentleman knows I respect him; he and I worked together on the Russian and Chechnyan issue. I would just say that I think, if the gentleman will continue to yield to me for a little bit of time here, I think that the budget that we came up with, the blue dog coalition budget, balances the budget by the year 2002. It cuts wasteful spending out of Washington. But we did not cut a dime out of education. We did not cut a nickel out of student loans. We did not cut a penny out of Head Start programs for children at risk.

I think if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] and I can work together on some foreign policy issues, certainly we Republicans and Democrats can work together.

Mr. SOLOMON. I think the gentleman may be right.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Sanibel, FL [Mr. GOSS], another member of the Committee on Rules who has had a great deal to do with putting this budget together over the last seven months.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Glens Falls, NY [Mr. SOLOMON]. Indeed, he has shown extraordinary leadership and persistence in getting us to this point. I congratulate him and, of course, all the others who have participated in what has been a very lengthy exercise.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this fair rule which allows us to consider H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress was elected to change the way Washington does business: Returning fiscal responsibility to the budget process and improving accountability to the American taxpayer. This omnibus appropriations conference report reflects those principles by finalizing an appropriations cycle that cut $23 billion from last year's levels. With its passage this Congress' total savings reach $32 billion, the single largest real spending cut in Government spending since World War II.

This Congress has changed the way Washington works in another very important respect—setting priorities. The Clinton administration asked for $30 billion more in indiscriminate spending but we insisted on applying the brakes. Instead of haphazardly funding every project and program, we have prioritized our limited resources and eliminated billions of dollars of low-priority spending, canceling 200 programs completely. We have recognized our responsibility to the victims of natural disasters and to our soldiers in Bosnia without breaking our contract with the American taxpayer. The concept of fiscal responsibility, which seems simple to most families in my district struggling to prioritize spending within their own budgets, marks a revolutionary change in the way this town does business. Despite some potholes that have slowed us down, we are on the road to a balanced budget.

I would like to highlight one example from my district of how the Federal Government can do more for less. H.R. 3019 contains language authorizing a lease for expansion of a veterans outpatient clinic in Fort Myers. Built to accommodate 40,000 visits a year, the clinic served more than 51,000 last year, with many more on the waiting list. We have come up with a way to meet the need with just over a million dollars—far less than it would have cost to build an entire new facility.

The issue comes down to fairness and providing the services where the veterans are. While many hospitals in the North remain half empty most of the year, the 150,000 veterans in southwest Florida currently must contend with one limited facility and denial of services altogether for non-service-connected injuries and illnesses. This lease, building on the innovations of the private sector, will allow more veterans to be served in a cost-effective manner.

In past years, we have received authorization but have been denied the appropriation. Today's bill ties everything together. There will be no more excuses or loopholes—we will move forward and provide for the veterans. This should be the final chapter in a long and frustrating saga, as today we finally achieve our goal and keep our contract with southwest Florida veterans. I applaud the efforts of Chairmen LIVINGSTON, LEWIS, and STUMP for their hard work to get this done.

□ 1445

The issue comes down to fairness in providing the services where the veterans are. While many hospitals in the North remain half empty most of the year, the 150,000 veterans in southwest Florida who have moved from the North to southwest Florida currently must content with one limited facility and denial of services altogether for non-service-connected injuries and illnesses, and that is just plain not fair, and it is not smart, and it is not good management. So this lease building on the innovations of the private sector will allow more veterans to be served in a cost-effective manner.

That is the kind of change that we have brought about and, I think, the kind of change America is looking for, and I applaud the efforts of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for their hard work in that area.

Change for the better is not easy. It cannot be done in a moment. Those who unfairly or unnecessarily gain from the status quo resist change; we know that. But today the time has come to move forward. This is fiscal responsibility. There will never be a better opportunity to do what we should than right now.

Mr. MOAKELY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the former chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues that this is a good clean bill and that there is no pork and no outrage here. But nothing is further from the truth. Some of my colleagues on the other side are going to be looking rather sheepish and hangdog, and they properly should. The Republicans here are creating an indefensible giveaway of $645 million to Louisiana and New Hampshire in the forthcoming conference report on the CR. The $45 million will go to New Hampshire, $600 million will go to Louisiana.

The pork is to reward two safe Republican States for abusing Federal taxpayers by using loopholes and accounting gimmicks to increase Federal matching payments they receive under Medicaid while depressing their own State spending. In other words, Federal spending goes up here, State spending goes down. These are scams which were popular in the 1980's during the Bush administration. They increased the Federal Government spending on Medicaid alone to a tune of $10 billion.

Guess who the biggest abusers were? Louisiana and New Hampshire. They still are the two biggest abusers.

In 1993 we cleaned the situation up after extensive hearings in the Committee on Energy and Commerce. We passed a bipartisan measure to eliminate these abuses and to protect the Federal Treasury and at the same time to take and give consideration to the problems that the States had. We gave them 2 years to wean themselves from their addiction to these Federal payments and to get away from the Federal trough.

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues seem to be operating under the philosophy that no bad deed should ever go unrewarded. The CR is going to reward these States with more time at the Federal trough to the tune of about $645 million.

Louisiana, by the way, will spend these moneys not for health, but they will continue to spend them for things like roads, highways, bridges, and the prison system.

Incidentally, there are other States now who are living under the constraints of the 1993 law; that is, all 48 of the other States. It is interesting to note, however, that since this process commenced of Louisiana and New Hampshire seeking additional moneys to continue an abuse which was roundly decried as long ago as 1993, six other States are now asking that they be permitted to belly up to the trough so that they can get their share of the slop.

For 48 other States whose Members of Congress are represented here, I ask if they can explain how it is and why it is that the Congress voted for a special Federal bailout for two States who simply failed to manage their budgets properly at the expense of their own State and at the expense of the rest of the Nation.

I also ask my colleagues to be prepared to explain to the people of their States why it is after 2 years was given to these two States to clean up their act, they are given an additional time.

I know that one Presidential candidate came back not long back from New Hampshire and that very shortly thereafter disappeared in the language of the Senate bill. I wonder if this ought to appear on the FEC report of that particular candidate.

This happens to be a genuine outrage. It is a continued raid upon funds which are needed for important public purposes or for the purpose of reduction of the budget deficit and for the purpose of balancing the budget. These are funds which are being taken away from other essential and important uses, such as student loans, such as school lunches, such as education, such as research into health problems, such as improving the quality of life, to law enforcement, to protection of the environment, and they are going to two States which have roundly abused the system for years and which, under this legislation, are going to get the permission of the Congress to continue to abuse the public interests and public monies for special purposes, in a fashion that no other State is being permitted to do.

But note, my dear friends and colleagues, this is but the first crack in the dike because now already six other States are saying, ''Well, if you are going to let Louisiana, if you are going to let New Hampshire, have access to these funds without responsibility, how about letting us do that?''

So, I would tell my colleagues, prepare for a phone call from their constituents, prepare for a phone call from their Governor, prepare for the call from their State to let them share in this pork also.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, these same folks who shut down the Government now claim to be working in a fiscally responsible manner to balance the Federal budget. They are asking us to support a continuing resolution laden with $342 million in special-interest pork to help the Republican Governors of New Hampshire and Louisiana balance their budgets without violating their no new taxes pledge. It is easy. Here is how to do it:

''You run for Governor. You say you are not going to increase taxes. You overspend and run up a deficit. Then you call your political friends in Washington to bail you out with a little bit of money. You than can go back and run for reelection, say, 'Look, I did not raise taxes, and I balanced my budget.' ''.

The fact is the taxpayers in 48 other States are going to have to have their taxes raised or their spending cut so that we can have this little payoff to help these two Governors in New Hampshire and Louisiana.

Every State in this Nation grapples with balancing their books. My State, the State of Ohio, is plagued by the rules, has made the tough choices to keep spending in line. We will never be able to balance the Federal budget if a couple of States that have particularly good political connections in Washington, or might have had an early Presidential primary, if those States are

overspending and get bailed out by the Federal Government.

We have had too many bailouts in this Congress, we have had too many times in this new Congress, where pork has been the order of the day, ''We have to have more pork in these bills in order to satisfy special interests.''

Think, Mr. Speaker, how much pork we would have had to put in this bill if a certain other Presidential candidate had won New Hampshire. Think of what the price might have been, how much money would have had to be in this bill, in order to satisfy those demands in one of those States then.

Mr. Speaker, if this is how the Republicans handle block grants, I want to know where my State can apply.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. One of the reasons we are here today is because of the outstanding work of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. We all owe him a great deal, and so do the American people.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me a little bit of time to respond, and, playing on that last statement, does the gentleman want to know why his State will not apply for this deal? I am sure that his State would probably argue that they do not want this kind of deal because the fact is that the State of Louisiana unfortunately has placed itself in the predicament from which it is extracting itself, and I stress that.

I am not going to deny that abuses by various States around the country took place in the Medicaid Program years ago. They did. Two previous administrations of the Louisiana State government frankly abused the Medicaid Program; there is no doubt about it.

But this administration that just took over a few short months ago is taking great steps to remedy the situation. In fact, some steps began at the end of the previous administration, because unfortunately there were abuses, they had to acknowledge there had been abuses, and they ultimately had no choice because of measures taken by the distinguished former members and the chairman of the Committee on Commerce to remedy those abuses. They were left with absolutely no choice at all. They recognized that they spent too much in Medicaid. The previous administration of Governor Edwards's found out that the abuse of the program must end. It was cut off by the Federal Government at the response of the investigations by Chairman DINGELL, when he was chairman on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Now this new administration in Louisiana, that took office at the beginning of this year, has already made a billion dollars in cuts in their Medicaid Program. Only the State of Delaware and the State of Louisiana have made as many cuts in their optional Medicaid Programs. The provision in this bill would cap the Federal Medicaid payment to Louisiana at $2.6 billion, which is more severe and more austere than any other State in the Nation. This provision allows no growth beyond $2.6 billion, not even for inflation, this year, next year, and the following year. No other State in the Union is willing to take this kind of deal.

I have heard the two previous speakers say, oh, well, every State is going to jump up and get this kind of deal. The fact is they are not asking and they do not want this deal, they do not want this formula. Louisiana is acknowledging mistakes and saying that they are going to live up to their responsibilities with new Federal guidelines and meet the responsibilities that they have taken on. The Committee on Commerce Republican leadership has said that because Louisiana is willing to forgo the growth in their program in the funding for Medicaid in the outyears, they have been able to provide all the States with additional growth in Medicaid dollars.

So what we are doing in Louisiana is resulting in a template, a format for action that can be used with respect to other States. The Louisiana Medicaid provision we have included is similar to the provision that was included in the Balanced Budget Act and the Governors' Medicaid proposal.

So this is not new stuff, this was not late at night, this was not snuck in in some smoke-filled room. This actually was on the books in the past. The Louisiana situation is an emergency. If this funding does not go forward one-third, maybe as much as one-third of the medical personnel in Louisiana who provide services to the elderly and to the indigent simply will have to be laid off immediately, not next year or the year after that, immediately.

Now, this is an urgent situation, it is an emergency that is recognized by other Members, by both sides of the aisle and by both sides of this building in the Capitol of the United States as well as by the President of the United States, and that is why he is willing to sign the bill with this in it. He may not like every provision, but the fact is he has recognized that the State of Louisiana has acknowledged their problem, is willing to deal with it, and if other States were quite so forthright, they would adopt measures that parallel this.

To meet the Congressional Budget Office's concerns and the White House's initial objections to the provision, the final Louisiana Medicaid provision in this conference agreement would only last through the State's fiscal year 1997, and then we have to go back and make appropriations if there is a cost to the United States of America.

□ 1500

In fact, in fiscal year 1996, the Congressional Budget Office says that what we have done costs the government absolutely nothing, absolutely zero, so all this talk about porkbusters is just fabrication. It does not cost the Government anything. Before we can go forward after fiscal year 1996, we have to begin to set out how we are going to pay for it.

I do not believe this provision is going to cost the Government anything in the outyears, because Louisiana is working with the people in the Congressional Budget Office to show how this arrangement will actually save the American taxpayer money, and that they are willing to cap their Medicaid payment at a very much lower level than they have previously received, in order to get themselves over the hump.

Had they cut themselves off cold turkey there would be a devastating shortfall that would have resulted in a reduction in services, medical services to the indigent in Louisiana, that simply would be unsustainable.

What we are doing is smoothing the playing field and giving them the opportunity to get out from under what I acknowledge was a bad situation in the years past, but we are correcting it. And I commend the leadership of the State of Louisiana for stepping up to the plate, and I commend, frankly, the good people on both sides of the aisle, both Chambers of Congress, and the administration, for acknowledging that what we have here is the best solution to an abuse that took place long ago.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, it is always good for us to talk about the cuts. Everybody likes to have cuts and to get spending under control. But I am happy to see that we reinstated some of the real vital programs in education that were so sorely needed.

However, there is one area of this budget that very much disturbs me. That is our veterans' facilities, our health care facilities. To me, I think what we are doing in this bill is absolutely, totally disgraceful. We are $400 million under the President's request on medical facilities for our veterans. We are $400 million short on construction.

Let me just point out a couple things. My dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia, talked about the emergency in Medicare, that we had to do something. I visited these hospitals when the Government shut down. These people were literally working for nothing.

To this day, some of them have not been reimbursed for the money that they had coming from the Government shutdown. Some of the nurses there are working two nurses a shift for 37 people in our VA hospital. It is an absolute disgrace what we are doing in this budget for the care of our American veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the American people ought to know from where some of these cuts are coming. Sometimes we need to put a human face on cuts. It is good to stand here and talk about how much we have cut and how much we are cutting back and all these things that we are doing, but we have to put a human face to it. It comes from somewhere, and it is coming from the veterans' $400 million in the medical facilities for our veterans who laid it on the line for this country. I think it is absolutely disgraceful the way we are doing the cuts on the veterans of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that sometime in the near future we can rectify this, because we are paying an inordinately bad price for the veterans who served this country so well and for the folks who labor in these hospitals. They were diligent, they were there when the doors opened, they were there when the patients needed them. Now, when it comes to ante up and get the money, we are going to cut. I think it is an absolute disgrace what we are doing to the veterans of this country.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the statements from the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, about the plight of the State of Louisiana. Louisiana is trying to handle its own State budget, but so is every other State in this country. What Louisiana is getting is a very sweet deal. It is a special treatment. It is pork barrel money. They are getting Federal dollars without doing what they are required under Federal law to put up for their own citizens who receive Medicaid benefits.

The reason they are in this fix has nothing to do with the Federal Government. It has to do with the abuse by the State of Louisiana in the 1980's when they leveraged Federal dollars into the Medicaid Program and then did not even use it for health care. They used it for roads and they used it for prisons. They used it to balance their budget and they became addicted to that money. Now, because they have one of their own in a very powerful position, they are being singled out; they and New Hampshire, to get Federal dollars to help them meet their fiscal requirements.

The State of California has a problem. Every State has a problem to make their budgets match income and outgo. Medicaid is a big cost. But the Federal Government should not be standing in the place of those State governments to take on their responsibilities.

Put this in the context of what Republicans wanted earlier this year. What they wanted was a block grant with cuts in Federal and State dollars under the Medicaid Program, and the public that is to be served by those programs be damned. They could go without care under the provisions of what is substituted for the existing Medicaid Program under the Republican proposal. This is an outrage. It is unfair. It should not have happened.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the record. First of all, Mr. Speaker, Louisiana has a law on its books, has had a law on its books since well into the 1970's, that Medicaid receipts and Medicare moneys cannot be spent on anything but health care in that State. It was not spent on roads and bridges, as the gentleman in the well previously alluded to. I am sure that gentleman in the well previously alluded to. I am sure that gentleman voted against the earthquake relief to California when that State needed help from this Federal Government.

However, the provisions in this bill do not add a dime to the Federal deficit, do not increase spending in Louisiana one dime. It simply allows Louisiana to do something it has to do, and that is to correct the formula by which the State applied for and received its Federal funding all these years.

The State used a system whereby Federal and State dollars were accumulated in its Medicaid accounts and then matched to make its Medicaid formula. That is no longer allowed. That was a system the Federal Government allowed to happen over these years, and now we are going to face a $1.5 billion shortfall for the most needy people in our State if this provision is not adopted.

If any other State wants to freeze its accounts the way Louisiana is freezing them, come forward. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to another gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, there were more displaced workers in the State of Louisiana when the oil industry collapsed than there are in the automobile industry, but when a vote was held on this Chamber and across the hall, unemployment compensation was extended to those who had been, unfortunately, adversely affected in the downturn in the automobile industry. It is something I would vote for again, but when the request was made for the oil and gas industry, it was turned down in both Chambers.

The point I am making is simple. The State of Louisiana has held its head up proud and, by the way, done something some of these folks should have thought about: Delivered good quality medical care at under the Federal reimbursement rate, not taking a dime from anyone that any other State was not getting per capita. And instead of sending a committee down to learn how they did it better, we said, ''Let us punish them for not spending every dime in the Federal Treasury.''

Now we have CBO saying, ''You are not costing the taxpayer and another State a nickel.'' Maybe that is what has offended the other side in this debate, that another taxpayer is not having to pay another dime to bail out an automobile company or a big city.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want the record to be very clear about the Louisiana situation. They did take Federal dollars on the claim that this was supposed to go to hospitals that served a disproportionate share of low-income patients. They put up some phony State dollars which were in fact Federal dollars, leveraged the Federal dollars to match it, and then used the additional Federal dollars for their own budget balancing, paying for roads and prisons.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I want the record to be clear that the State of Louisiana has not underspent because they were more efficient and gave better care than other States in the rest of the Nation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana is going to increase the budget deficit in the following fiscal year, the next fiscal year, and the year after that by $300 million each year, and God knows how much more after that.

Mr. WAXMAN. They are not being rewarded for their good deeds, Mr. Speaker, they are being rewarded for their bad deeds, by the power of those in their delegation that have been able to exact this special pork barrel treatment for the State of Louisiana.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think I have a better understanding now why the Republicans did not want to have the line-item veto apply this year. It was this type of provision, this type of provision that allows the State of Louisiana and the State of New Hampshire to benefit at the expenses of taxpayers throughout this country. It should not be in this bill, it should never have been put in this bill, and it is a disgrace that we have this in a bill at a time when we are trying to work together to bridge the gap between the two sides of this House. I am ashamed that we have this in this bill, and I am sorry it is here. This was a good faith attempt by Members on our side of the aisle to reach a compromise.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out first that a previous speaker had talked about cuts in this budget on the floor here right now to the veterans hospital medical care delivery system. Let me assure the gentleman that this advocate for veterans will guarantee the gentleman that there is $400 million more in this budget than there was last year. It is the only increase in the entire part of this budget.

Mr. Speaker, second, let me just say this. I introduced a balanced budget on this floor a number of years ago which called for a balanced budget in 5 years. I had one on the floor last year that did the same thing. One Member said to me, ''JERRY, how can you vote for this, when it does not really cut as much as you wanted it to?''

I am voting for it because it truly does put us on the road to a balanced budget. We are within this glide path. That is why JERRY SOLOMON is going to vote for this bill today. It shrinks the size and the power and the role of this Federal Government. It returns it to the States. It puts us on an irreversible path towards that philosophy.

I urge all of the Members to come over here, vote for this bill right now; vote for the rule, and then vote for the bill. The American people want you to do it.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that another Member may be permitted to speak.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Objection is heard.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 415, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 415, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see prior proceedings of the House of today, Thursday, April 25, 1996.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

□ 1515

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3019, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman form Louisiana?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this conference report on H.R. 3019 wraps up all the appropriations matters for fiscal year 1996. I hope that this is lucky No. 14, because that is the number of temporary funding bills that we have had to get to this final measure. It is well past time to closeout all matters and move on to fiscal year 1997. Its budget debate will begin next week. In fact, it is 6 months past time.

This conference agreement honors the commitment of the Committee on Appropriations to reduce discretionary spending and put this country on a path to a balanced budget. It contains $163.7 billion in gross spending, lest anybody says there is not enough money in this bill, with $4.34 billion in offsets, for a net spending total of $159.37 billion in total spending.

This amount will cause overall appropriations to be $30 billion below the President's request and $23 billion below last year. When we add the $11 billion net savings from our rescission bill last year, actually $20 billion aggregate savings, we have cut discretionary spending by a net total of roughly $34 billion in 16 months. In the aggregate, it is about $43 billion.

These numbers represent the termination of more than 200, two-zero-zero, 200 wasteful programs and bureaucracies. They represent a slowing down of increases in other programs. They represent a realignment of priorities, and they respect the funding priorities of the White House, the Senate, and the minority party as well.

For our part, we went into conference with the Senate determined to pay for all increases in spending, and I am pleased to tell the members that all increases proposed by the Senate are paid for. I am pleased to tell the members that $1.3 billion in disaster assistance supplementals are fully paid for; funding for Bosnia, for the floods in the Northwest, for anti-terrorism, and for additional assistance toward peace in the Middle East, are all paid for, not borrowed against the future, not added to last year's bill, but paid for.

By law we did not have to do this, but that has been our policy, and we have continuously for the last 16 months abided by that policy.

I am pleased to tell the Members that we provided $1 billion to national security priorities for our 40,000 troops in the Bosnia theater and $120 million to support the Mideast peace activities, again all paid for.

In summary, by paying for all increases in spending, we have produced a bill that is still below our budget caps and, for a $163 billion bill, that is a significant achievement.

Much of the controversy in this bill surrounds the environmental issues. It was the area of intense compromise, with roughly 7 issues on the table. Each represented a unique problem.

First, we retained the House language regarding the Mt. Graham red squirrel. We gave the President waiver authority we do not believe he will need in the contentious Tongass and Mojave and endangered species issues. We modified the Columbia River Basin language. We dropped the timber provision that the Clinton administration originally indicated they wanted, and we dropped wetlands language which we thought addressed a redundancy in the EPA/Corps wetland permitting process.

These were compromises, I stress, compromises. They were done in conjunction with the demands by the White House, but they were not everything that the White House wanted. They were compromises. They make everyone and no one happy, and in truth, most of these issues will be revisited again in a few short weeks as we commence the fiscal year 1997 bills.

I might add this bill reflects a number of priorities critical to Members on my side of the aisle. The Senate population language is dropped, underscore, dropped, and the medical school accreditation provision which has been so objectionable to those in the right-to-life community, again, was made permanent law for the first time, satisfying in both instances the people who are totally opposed to the concept of abortion.

I also regret that the cap on the student loan volume was dropped. Again, that was in a matter of compromise, and I would hope that the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities would be able to address that condition and correct that anomaly as soon as possible.

I would call our Members' attention to the reaffirmation of our commitment to our active veterans by increasing—I heard the word cut, that is absurd—increasing the medical care programs for veterans by $400 million above what was provided last year. The President in his budget, which was not altogether realistic, might have said that he wanted more money than that. This is a $400 million increase above last year.

And we funded NASA and the Space Shuttle Program, and we made a tremendous investment in our Nation's fight against crime.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that this was a compromise. We could not have this finished product without the dedicated work and steadfast assistance—although he adhered to his own philosophical and deep-seated feelings that our side of the aisle is wrong and his side of the aisle is right—we could not have succeeded in reaching a conclusion without my colleague and friend,

the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the former chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. By all measurements, we are indeed an interesting team, but we have respected each other's priorities. We have communicated. We have worked well, separately and together.

I also want to say that it has been a joy to work not only with Mr. OBEY at the table but with Senator HATFIELD, whom I will miss greatly when he retires, and to acknowledge the support and leadership and steadfast dedication to conclusion of this effort by Senator Robert Byrd.

As well, I would say that frankly Mr. Panetta was a tough opponent in these negotiations, but it was a pleasure to work with him. I am glad for that because he came to the table with the intent to conclude this affair. We did reach a conclusion and I think one that all Americans can be satisfied with.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years from now when the American people look back on this, when our children and our grandchildren look back at this point in history, they will not remember what happened to these issues that I have touched on, not one of them. They will not remember what they were. They will not give a darn.

But they are going to look to those charts that show Government growing incessantly year after year after year up until 1995, and all of a sudden see it start to decline. That is what we have contributed to, $43 billion in savings in aggregating fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996. We have started the trend to follow up on the words of the President of the United States when he stood right where you sit, Mr. Speaker, and he said, ''The era of big government is now over.''

We are taking him at his word. The world has changed. We are headed in the right direction with this bill, which is a compromise. It is the best compromise we can get. It is supported by our leadership in the House and Senate as well as the White House, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert several tables showing the details of the amounts in this conference agreement.

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Salaries and expense: 1/						
Direct appropriation	119,643,000	73,229,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	-45,361,000
Crime trust fund	17,400,000	15,500,000	.....	.....	.....	-17,400,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	137,043,000	88,729,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	74,282,000	-62,761,000
Working capital fund (rescission)	-5,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+5,500,000
Counterterrorism fund	34,220,000	26,398,000	16,898,000	16,898,000	16,898,000	-17,322,000
Administrative review and appeals: 1/						
Direct appropriation	.....	54,336,000	38,886,000	38,886,000	38,886,000	+38,886,000
Crime trust fund	.....	33,180,000	47,780,000	47,780,000	47,780,000	+47,780,000
Total, Administrative review and appeals	.....	87,516,000	86,666,000	86,666,000	86,666,000	+86,666,000
Office of Inspector General	30,484,000	36,744,000	28,960,000	28,960,000	28,960,000	-1,524,000
Total, General administration	196,247,000	239,387,000	206,806,000	206,806,000	206,806,000	+10,559,000
Appropriations	(184,347,000)	(190,707,000)	(159,026,000)	(159,026,000)	(159,026,000)	(-25,321,000)
Crime trust fund	(17,400,000)	(48,680,000)	(47,780,000)	(47,780,000)	(47,780,000)	(+30,380,000)
United States Parole Commission						
Salaries and expenses	7,450,000	6,781,000	5,446,000	5,446,000	5,446,000	-2,004,000
Legal Activities						
General legal activities:						
Direct appropriation	416,834,000	437,060,000	401,929,000	401,929,000	401,929,000	-14,905,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(12,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(12,000,000)	(+12,000,000)
Crime trust fund	4,600,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	7,591,000	+2,991,000
Total, General legal activities	(421,434,000)	(444,651,000)	(421,520,000)	(421,520,000)	(421,520,000)	(+86,000)
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund	2,500,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	4,028,000	+1,528,000
Independent counsel (permanent, indefinite)	4,000,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	2,884,000	-1,116,000
Civil liberties public education fund	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-5,000,000
Antitrust Division	85,143,000	91,752,000	85,143,000	85,143,000	85,143,000	.....
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-4,500,000	.....	-19,360,000	-19,360,000	-19,360,000	-14,860,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-39,640,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,622,000
Direct appropriation	41,003,000	43,490,000	17,521,000	17,521,000	17,521,000	-23,482,000
United States Attorneys:						
Direct appropriation	828,024,000	909,463,000	895,509,000	895,509,000	895,509,000	+66,485,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19)	2,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-2,000,000
Violent crime task force	15,000,000	15,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-15,000,000
Crime trust fund	6,600,000	14,731,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+23,200,000
Total, United States Attorneys	852,624,000	939,194,000	925,509,000	925,509,000	925,509,000	+72,885,000
United States Trustee System Fund	103,183,000	109,245,000	102,390,000	102,390,000	102,390,000	-793,000
Offsetting fee collections	-40,597,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-44,191,000	-3,594,000
Direct appropriation	62,586,000	65,054,000	58,199,000	58,199,000	58,199,000	-4,387,000
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	830,000	905,000	830,000	830,000	830,000	.....
United States Marshals Service:						
Direct appropriation	396,782,000	446,887,000	423,248,000	423,248,000	423,248,000	+26,466,000
Crime trust fund	.....	16,500,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	+25,000,000
Total, United States Marshals Service	396,782,000	463,387,000	448,248,000	448,248,000	448,248,000	+51,466,000
Federal Prisoner Detention	296,753,000	295,331,000	252,820,000	252,820,000	252,820,000	-43,933,000
(Prior year carryover)	.....	.....	(33,511,000)	(33,511,000)	(33,511,000)	(+33,511,000)
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,000,000)	(+9,000,000)
Total, Federal prisoner detention	(296,753,000)	(295,331,000)	(295,331,000)	(295,331,000)	(295,331,000)	(-1,422,000)
Fees and expenses of witnesses	77,982,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	+7,018,000
Community Relations Service 2/	20,379,000	20,695,000	5,319,000	5,319,000	5,319,000	-15,060,000
Assets forfeiture fund	50,000,000	55,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-20,000,000
Total, Legal activities	2,232,673,000	2,424,619,000	2,239,878,000	2,239,878,000	2,239,878,000	+7,605,000
Appropriations	(2,220,673,000)	(2,385,797,000)	(2,177,287,000)	(2,177,287,000)	(2,177,287,000)	(-43,386,000)
Crime trust fund	(11,400,000)	(38,822,000)	(62,591,000)	(62,591,000)	(62,591,000)	(+51,191,000)

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Radiation Exposure Compensation						
Administrative expenses	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	2,655,000	.....
Advance appropriation	.....	2,655,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	.....	16,264,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Advance appropriation	.....	30,000,000	16,264,000	16,264,000	16,264,000	+16,264,000
Total, Radiation Exposure Compensation	2,655,000	51,574,000	18,919,000	18,919,000	18,919,000	+16,264,000
Interagency Law Enforcement						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement	374,943,000	378,473,000	359,843,000	359,843,000	359,843,000	-15,100,000
Federal Bureau of Investigation						
Salaries and expenses	2,038,774,000	2,305,387,000	2,002,438,000	2,002,438,000	2,002,438,000	-36,336,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(22,000,000)	(+22,000,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19)	77,140,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-77,140,000
Counterintelligence and national security	80,421,000	82,224,000	102,345,000	102,345,000	102,345,000	+21,924,000
FBI Fingerprint identification	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	84,400,000	.....
Digital telephony (crime trust fund)	.....	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000	33,400,000	+33,400,000
Other initiatives (crime trust fund)	.....	13,100,000	184,900,000	184,900,000	184,900,000	+184,900,000
Construction	.....	99,259,000	97,589,000	97,589,000	97,589,000	+97,589,000
FBI State compatibility	.....	.....	.....	11,800,000	.....	.....
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	2,280,735,000	2,617,770,000	2,505,072,000	2,516,872,000	2,505,072,000	+224,337,000
Appropriations	(2,280,735,000)	(2,571,270,000)	(2,286,772,000)	(2,298,572,000)	(2,286,772,000)	(+6,037,000)
Crime trust fund	.....	(46,500,000)	(218,300,000)	(218,300,000)	(218,300,000)	(+218,300,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses	799,944,000	845,409,000	792,909,000	797,409,000	797,409,000	-2,535,000
Diversion control fund	-43,431,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000	-3,810,000
Direct appropriation	756,513,000	798,168,000	745,668,000	750,168,000	750,168,000	-6,345,000
Crime trust fund	.....	12,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+60,000,000
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	756,513,000	810,168,000	805,668,000	810,168,000	810,168,000	+53,655,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service						
Salaries and expenses:						
Direct appropriation	1,101,475,000	1,453,471,000	1,394,825,000	1,394,825,000	1,394,825,000	+293,350,000
Border Patrol:						
Direct appropriation (earmark)	.....	.....	(506,800,000)	(506,800,000)	(506,800,000)	(+506,800,000)
Crime trust fund (earmark)	.....	.....	(75,765,000)	(75,765,000)	(75,765,000)	(+75,765,000)
New offsetting fees	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Subtotal, Border patrol	.....	.....	(582,565,000)	(582,565,000)	(582,565,000)	(+582,565,000)
Immigration initiative (crime trust fund)	100,600,000	335,498,000	162,628,000	162,628,000	162,628,000	+62,028,000
Border control system modernization (crime trust fund)	154,600,000	.....	153,570,000	153,570,000	153,570,000	-1,030,000
Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund	(1,356,675,000)	(1,788,969,000)	(1,711,023,000)	(1,711,023,000)	(1,711,023,000)	(+354,348,000)
Fee accounts:						
Immigration legalization fund	(3,482,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(-1,659,000)
Immigration user fee	(330,952,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(+26,132,000)
Land border inspection fund	(1,584,000)	(5,965,000)	(5,965,000)	(5,965,000)	(5,965,000)	(+4,381,000)
Immigration examinations fund	(291,097,000)	(304,572,000)	(440,160,000)	(440,160,000)	(440,160,000)	(+149,063,000)
Cuban/Haitian resettlement (examinations fund)	.....	.....	(10,057,000)	(10,057,000)	(10,057,000)	(+10,057,000)
Breached bond fund	(6,200,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(+158,000)
Subtotal, Fee accounts	(633,315,000)	(675,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(+188,132,000)
Construction	50,000,000	.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-25,000,000
Immigration Emergency Fund	30,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-30,000,000
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service	(2,069,990,000)	(2,464,771,000)	(2,557,470,000)	(2,557,470,000)	(2,557,470,000)	(+487,480,000)
Appropriations	(1,161,475,000)	(1,453,471,000)	(1,419,825,000)	(1,419,825,000)	(1,419,825,000)	(+238,350,000)
Crime trust fund	(255,200,000)	(335,498,000)	(316,198,000)	(316,198,000)	(316,198,000)	(+60,998,000)
(Fee accounts)	(633,315,000)	(675,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(821,447,000)	(+188,132,000)
Federal Prison System						
Salaries and expenses	2,353,597,000	2,630,259,000	2,614,578,000	2,614,578,000	2,614,578,000	+260,981,000
Prior year carryover	-30,000,000	.....	-47,000,000	-47,000,000	-47,000,000	-17,000,000
Direct appropriation	2,323,597,000	2,630,259,000	2,567,578,000	2,567,578,000	2,567,578,000	+243,981,000
Crime trust fund	.....	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	13,500,000	+13,500,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,323,597,000	2,643,759,000	2,581,078,000	2,581,078,000	2,581,078,000	+257,481,000
National Institute of Corrections	10,302,000	10,158,000	.....	.....	.....	-10,302,000
Buildings and facilities	276,301,000	323,728,000	334,728,000	334,728,000	334,728,000	+58,427,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
Total, Federal Prison System	2,610,200,000	2,977,645,000	2,915,806,000	2,915,806,000	2,915,806,000	+305,606,000
Office of Justice Programs						
Justice Assistance:						
Direct appropriation	97,977,000	102,345,000	99,977,000	99,977,000	99,977,000	+2,000,000
Crime trust fund:						
Violence Against Women Grants	26,000,000	174,900,000	174,500,000	174,500,000	174,500,000	+148,500,000
Rural law enforcement		10,252,000				
Model intensive prevention		48,216,000				
State prison drug treatment		27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	27,000,000	+27,000,000
Other crime control programs		4,426,000	900,000	900,000	900,000	+900,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	26,000,000	264,794,000	202,400,000	202,400,000	202,400,000	+176,400,000
Total, Justice Assistance	123,977,000	367,139,000	302,377,000	302,377,000	302,377,000	+178,400,000
State and local law enforcement assistance:						
Direct appropriations:						
Byrne grants (discretionary)	62,000,000	50,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	-2,000,000
Byrne grants (formula)		190,000,000	328,000,000	328,000,000	328,000,000	+328,000,000
Weed and seed fund (direct)	13,456,000	5,000,000				-13,456,000
Weed and seed fund (earmarked)			(28,500,000)	(28,500,000)	(28,500,000)	(+28,500,000)
Subtotal, Direct appropriations	75,456,000	245,000,000	388,000,000	388,000,000	388,000,000	+312,544,000
Crime trust fund:						
Byrne grants (formula)	450,000,000	260,000,000	147,000,000	147,000,000	147,000,000	-303,000,000
Community policing (direct)	1,300,000,000	1,902,964,000			1,400,000,000	+100,000,000
Community policing (earmark)				(975,000,000)		
Police corps (earmark)				(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(+10,000,000)
Local law enforcement block grant			1,903,000,000	1,903,000,000	503,000,000	+503,000,000
Drug Courts (earmark)				(25,000,000)	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)				(20,000,000)	(11,000,000)	(+11,000,000)
D.C. Police (earmark)				(20,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
Crime prevention (earmark)				(80,000,000)		
Subtotal, State and local block grants	1,750,000,000	2,162,964,000	2,050,000,000	2,050,000,000	2,050,000,000	+300,000,000
Upgrade criminal history records	100,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-75,000,000
State prison grants	24,500,000	500,000,000	617,500,000	617,500,000	617,500,000	+593,000,000
State criminal alien assistance program	130,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+170,000,000
Youthful offender incarceration		9,643,000				
Drug Courts (direct)	11,900,000	150,000,000				-11,900,000
Ounce of Prevention Council	1,500,000					-1,500,000
Crime prevention (direct)		30,000,000				
Other crime control programs		26,799,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	12,700,000	+12,700,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund	2,017,900,000	3,204,406,000	3,005,200,000	3,005,200,000	3,005,200,000	+987,300,000
Total, State and local law enforcement	2,093,356,000	3,449,406,000	3,393,200,000	3,393,200,000	3,393,200,000	+1,299,844,000
Juvenile justice programs	155,250,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	-6,750,000
Public safety officers benefits program:						
Death benefits	27,645,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	+829,000
Disability benefits	2,072,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	+62,000
Total, Office of Justice Programs	2,402,300,000	3,995,653,000	3,874,685,000	3,874,685,000	3,874,685,000	+1,472,385,000
Appropriations	(358,400,000)	(526,453,000)	(667,085,000)	(667,085,000)	(667,085,000)	(+308,685,000)
Crime trust fund	(2,043,900,000)	(3,469,200,000)	(3,207,600,000)	(3,207,600,000)	(3,207,600,000)	(+1,163,700,000)
Total, title I, Department of Justice	12,299,791,000	15,291,039,000	14,668,146,000	14,684,446,000	14,672,646,000	+2,372,855,000
Appropriations	(9,977,391,000)	(11,326,839,000)	(10,742,177,000)	(10,758,477,000)	(10,746,677,000)	(+769,286,000)
Crime trust fund	(2,327,900,000)	(3,964,200,000)	(3,925,969,000)	(3,925,969,000)	(3,925,969,000)	(+1,598,069,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES						
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT						
Office of the United States Trade Representative						
Salaries and expenses	20,949,000	20,949,000	20,889,000	20,889,000	20,889,000	-60,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
International Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	42,500,000	47,177,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-2,500,000
Total, Related agencies	63,449,000	68,126,000	60,889,000	60,889,000	60,889,000	-2,560,000
International Trade Administration						
Operations and administration	266,093,000	279,558,000	264,885,000	264,885,000	264,885,000	-1,208,000
Export Administration						
Operations and administration	38,644,000	48,441,000	38,604,000	38,604,000	38,604,000	-40,000
Economic Development Administration						
Economic development assistance programs	382,783,000	407,783,000	328,500,000	328,500,000	328,500,000	-54,283,000
Emergency rescission (P.L. 104-19)	-5,250,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+5,250,000
Salaries and expenses	32,144,000	31,183,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	-12,144,000
Total, Economic Development Administration	409,677,000	438,966,000	348,500,000	348,500,000	348,500,000	-61,177,000
Minority Business Development Agency						
Minority business development	43,789,000	47,921,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	-11,789,000
United States Travel and Tourism Administration						
Salaries and expenses (P.L. 104-99)	16,328,000	16,303,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-14,328,000
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	837,980,000	899,315,000	746,878,000	746,878,000	746,878,000	-91,102,000
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE						
Economic and Statistical Analysis						
Salaries and expenses	46,896,000	57,220,000	45,900,000	45,900,000	45,900,000	-996,000
Economics and statistics administration revolving fund	1,677,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,677,000
Bureau of the Census						
Salaries and expenses	136,000,000	144,812,000	133,812,000	133,812,000	133,812,000	-2,188,000
Periodic censuses and programs	142,083,000	193,450,000	150,300,000	150,300,000	150,300,000	+8,217,000
Total, Bureau of the Census	278,083,000	338,262,000	284,112,000	284,112,000	284,112,000	+6,029,000
National Telecommunications and Information Administration						
Salaries and expenses	20,961,000	22,932,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	-3,961,000
Public broadcasting facilities, planning and construction	28,983,000	7,959,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	15,500,000	-13,483,000
Endowment for Children's Educational Television	2,499,000	2,502,000	.....	.....	.....	-2,499,000
Information infrastructure grants	44,962,000	99,912,000	21,500,000	21,500,000	21,500,000	-23,462,000
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	97,405,000	133,305,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	54,000,000	-43,405,000
Patent and Trademark Office						
Salaries and expenses	82,324,000	110,868,000	82,324,000	82,324,000	82,324,000	.....
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	506,385,000	639,655,000	466,336,000	466,336,000	466,336,000	-40,049,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY						
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Scientific and technical research and services	247,486,000	310,679,000	259,000,000	259,000,000	259,000,000	+11,514,000
Industrial technology services	418,373,000	642,458,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	301,000,000	-117,373,000
Construction of research facilities	34,639,000	69,913,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+25,361,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	700,498,000	1,023,050,000	399,000,000	399,000,000	620,000,000	-80,498,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
Operations, research and facilities 3/	1,805,092,000	2,021,135,000	1,795,677,000	1,802,677,000	1,795,677,000	-9,415,000
Offsetting collections - fees	-6,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+3,000,000
Direct appropriation	1,799,092,000	2,018,135,000	1,792,677,000	1,799,677,000	1,792,677,000	-6,415,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(63,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(+7,500,000)
(By transfer from Damage assessment & restoration revolving fund, permanent)	8,500,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	-4,600,000
(Damage assessment & restoration revolving fund)	-1,500,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-2,400,000
Total, Operations, research and facilities	1,806,092,000	2,018,135,000	1,792,677,000	1,799,677,000	1,792,677,000	-13,415,000
Coastal zone management fund	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	.....
Mandatory offset	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	(-7,800,000)	.....

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Construction	82,254,000	52,299,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	-32,254,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion	22,936,000	23,347,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	-14,936,000
GOES satellite contingency fund (rescission)	-2,500,000					+2,500,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund	1,273,000	1,282,000	1,032,000	1,032,000	1,032,000	-241,000
Fishermen's contingency fund	999,000	1,000,000	999,000	999,000	999,000	
Foreign fishing observer fund	400,000	396,000	196,000	196,000	196,000	-204,000
Fishing vessel obligations guarantees	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	1,911,704,000	2,096,709,000	1,853,154,000	1,860,154,000	1,853,154,000	-58,550,000
Technology Administration						
Salaries and expenses	8,242,000	13,906,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	7,000,000	-1,242,000
National Technical Information Service						
NTIS revolving fund	7,000,000					-7,000,000
Total, Science and Technology	2,627,444,000	3,133,665,000	2,257,154,000	2,264,154,000	2,480,154,000	-147,290,000
General Administration						
Salaries and expenses	36,471,000	35,826,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	29,100,000	-7,371,000
Office of Inspector General	16,887,000	22,249,000	19,849,000	19,849,000	19,849,000	+2,962,000
Total, General administration	53,358,000	58,075,000	48,949,000	48,949,000	48,949,000	-4,409,000
National Institute of Standards and Technology						
Construction of research facilities (rescission)			-75,000,000	-75,000,000	-75,000,000	-75,000,000
Total, Department of Commerce	3,961,718,000	4,662,584,000	3,383,428,000	3,390,428,000	3,606,428,000	-355,290,000
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	4,025,167,000	4,730,710,000	3,444,317,000	3,451,317,000	3,667,317,000	-357,850,000
(By transfer)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(63,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(63,000,000)	(+7,500,000)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY						
Supreme Court of the United States						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of justices	1,657,000	1,662,000	1,662,000	1,662,000	1,662,000	+5,000
Other salaries and expenses	22,583,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	+1,589,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	24,240,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	+1,594,000
Care of the building and grounds	3,000,000	4,003,000	3,313,000	3,313,000	3,313,000	+313,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States	27,240,000	29,837,000	29,147,000	29,147,000	29,147,000	+1,907,000
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,758,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	+134,000
Other salaries and expenses	11,680,000	13,603,000	12,396,000	12,396,000	12,396,000	+716,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	13,438,000	15,495,000	14,288,000	14,288,000	14,288,000	+850,000
United States Court of International Trade						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges	1,385,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	+28,000
Other salaries and expenses	9,300,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	+146,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	10,685,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	+174,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services						
Salaries and expenses:						
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	220,428,000	226,024,000	226,024,000	226,024,000	226,024,000	+5,596,000
Other salaries and expenses	2,119,699,000	2,419,941,000	2,207,117,000	2,207,117,000	2,207,117,000	+87,418,000
Direct appropriation	2,340,127,000	2,645,965,000	2,433,141,000	2,433,141,000	2,433,141,000	+93,014,000
Crime trust fund		30,700,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,340,127,000	2,676,665,000	2,463,141,000	2,463,141,000	2,463,141,000	+123,014,000
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,250,000	2,320,000	2,318,000	2,318,000	2,318,000	+68,000
Defender services	240,500,000	295,761,000	267,217,000	267,217,000	267,217,000	+26,717,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	54,346,000	72,008,000	59,028,000	59,028,000	59,028,000	+4,682,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Court security	97,000,000	116,433,000	102,000,000	102,000,000	102,000,000	+5,000,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 104-19)	16,640,000					-16,640,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	2,750,863,000	3,163,187,000	2,893,704,000	2,893,704,000	2,893,704,000	+142,841,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts						
Salaries and expenses	47,500,000	53,445,000	47,500,000	47,500,000	47,500,000	
Federal Judicial Center						
Salaries and expenses	18,828,000	20,771,000	17,914,000	17,914,000	17,914,000	-914,000
Judicial Retirement Funds						
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	28,475,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	+4,425,000
United States Sentencing Commission						
Salaries and expenses	8,800,000	9,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	-300,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	2,905,829,000	3,335,994,000	3,054,812,000	3,054,812,000	3,054,812,000	+148,983,000
Appropriations	(2,905,829,000)	(3,305,294,000)	(3,024,812,000)	(3,024,812,000)	(3,024,812,000)	(+118,983,000)
Crime trust fund		(30,700,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(30,000,000)	(+30,000,000)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Diplomatic and consular programs	1,724,628,000	1,748,438,000	1,708,800,000	1,708,800,000	1,708,800,000	-15,828,000
Security enhancements		9,720,000	9,720,000	9,720,000	9,720,000	+9,720,000
Registration fees	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	1,725,328,000	1,758,858,000	1,719,220,000	1,719,220,000	1,719,220,000	-6,108,000
Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	372,480,000	363,276,000	363,276,000	363,276,000	-20,696,000
Security enhancements		1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000	+1,870,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	374,350,000	365,146,000	365,146,000	365,146,000	-18,826,000
Capital investment fund		32,800,000	16,400,000	16,400,000	16,400,000	+16,400,000
Office of Inspector General	23,850,000	24,250,000	27,369,000	27,369,000	27,369,000	+3,519,000
Representation allowances	4,780,000	4,800,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	-280,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials	9,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	8,579,000	-1,000,000
Security and maintenance of United States missions	391,760,000	421,760,000	385,760,000	385,760,000	385,760,000	-6,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	6,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-500,000
Repatriation Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000	593,000	
(Limitation on direct loans)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	
Administrative expenses	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000	183,000	
Total, Repatriation loans program account	776,000	776,000	776,000	776,000	776,000	
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	15,465,000	15,465,000	15,165,000	15,165,000	15,165,000	-300,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	129,321,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	-3,919,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	2,691,331,000	2,773,040,000	2,674,317,000	2,674,317,000	2,674,317,000	-17,014,000
International Organizations and Conferences						
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	872,661,000	923,057,000	700,000,000	700,000,000	892,000,000	+19,339,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year assessment	518,687,000	445,000,000	225,000,000	225,000,000	359,000,000	-159,687,000
International conferences and contingencies	6,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	1,397,348,000	1,374,057,000	928,000,000	928,000,000	1,254,000,000	-143,348,000
International Commissions						
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:						
Salaries and expenses	12,858,000	13,858,000	12,058,000	12,058,000	12,058,000	-800,000
Construction	6,644,000	10,398,000	6,644,000	6,644,000	6,644,000	
American sections, international commissions	5,800,000	6,290,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	
International fisheries commissions	14,669,000	14,669,000	14,669,000	14,669,000	14,669,000	
Total, International commissions	39,971,000	45,215,000	39,171,000	39,171,000	39,171,000	-800,000
Other						
Payment to the Asia Foundation	10,000,000	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-5,000,000
Appropriation (FY 1995 Defense Bill, P.L. 103-335)	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Total, Department of State	4,143,650,000	4,202,312,000	3,646,488,000	3,646,488,000	3,972,488,000	-171,162,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
RELATED AGENCIES						
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency						
Arms control and disarmament activities	50,378,000	76,300,000	32,700,000	35,700,000	38,700,000	-11,678,000
Board for International Broadcasting						
Israel Relay Station (rescission)	-2,000,000					+2,000,000
United States Information Agency						
Salaries and expenses	475,645,000	496,002,000	445,645,000	445,645,000	445,645,000	-30,000,000
Technology fund		10,100,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	5,050,000	+5,050,000
Office of Inspector General	4,300,000	4,593,000				-4,300,000
Educational and cultural exchange programs	233,279,000	252,676,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-33,279,000
Transfer (FY 1995 Foreign Ops Bill, P.L. 103-336)	42,000,000					-42,000,000
Subtotal	275,279,000	252,676,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	200,000,000	-75,279,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund	2,800,000	300,000	509,000	509,000	509,000	-2,291,000
Israeli Arab scholarship program	397,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	397,000	
International Broadcasting Operations 4/	475,363,000	395,340,000	325,191,000	325,191,000	325,191,000	-150,172,000
Radio Free Asia:						
Operations (direct)	5,000,000					-5,000,000
Operations (earmarked)		(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(+5,000,000)
Broadcasting to Cuba (direct)	24,809,000		24,809,000	24,809,000	24,809,000	
Broadcasting to Cuba (earmarked)		(26,063,000)				
Radio construction	69,314,000	85,919,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-29,314,000
East-West Center	24,500,000	20,000,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	11,750,000	-12,750,000
North/South Center	4,000,000	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-2,000,000
National Endowment for Democracy	34,000,000	34,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-4,000,000
Total, United States Information Agency	1,395,407,000	1,300,327,000	1,085,351,000	1,085,351,000	1,085,351,000	-310,056,000
Total, related agencies	1,443,785,000	1,376,627,000	1,118,051,000	1,121,051,000	1,124,051,000	-319,734,000
Total, title IV, Department of State	5,587,435,000	5,578,939,000	4,764,539,000	4,767,539,000	5,096,539,000	-490,896,000
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
Maritime Administration						
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)
Maritime National Security Program		175,000,000				
Defense function			46,000,000	46,000,000	46,000,000	+46,000,000
Operations and training	76,087,000	81,650,000	66,600,000	66,600,000	66,600,000	-9,487,000
Ready reserve force:						
Maintenance, operations and facilities	149,653,000					-149,653,000
Rescission	-158,000,000					+158,000,000
Total, Ready reserve force	-8,347,000					+8,347,000
Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program Account:						
Guaranteed loans subsidy	25,000,000	48,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	+15,000,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(250,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(+750,000,000)
Administrative expenses	2,000,000	4,000,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	+1,500,000
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account	27,000,000	52,000,000	43,500,000	43,500,000	43,500,000	+16,500,000
Total, Maritime Administration	94,740,000	308,650,000	156,100,000	156,100,000	156,100,000	+61,360,000
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad						
Salaries and expenses	206,000	212,000	206,000	206,000	206,000	
Commission on Civil Rights						
Salaries and expenses	9,000,000	11,400,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	8,750,000	-250,000
Commission on Immigration Reform						
Salaries and expenses	1,894,000	2,877,000	1,894,000	1,894,000	1,894,000	
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe						
Salaries and expenses	1,090,000	1,122,000	1,090,000	1,090,000	1,090,000	
Competitiveness Policy Council						
Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	503,000		100,000	50,000	-950,000
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission						
Salaries and expenses	233,000,000	268,000,000	233,000,000	233,000,000	233,000,000	

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Communications Commission						
Salaries and expenses	185,232,000	223,600,000	175,709,000	195,709,000	185,709,000	+477,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-116,400,000	-136,400,000	-126,400,000	-10,000,000
Direct appropriation	68,832,000	107,200,000	59,309,000	59,309,000	59,309,000	-9,523,000
Federal Maritime Commission						
Salaries and expenses	18,569,000	18,947,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	-3,714,000
Offsetting fee collections		-2,228,000				
Direct appropriation	18,569,000	16,719,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	14,855,000	-3,714,000
Federal Trade Commission						
Salaries and expenses	98,928,000	107,873,000	98,928,000	98,928,000	98,928,000	
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-4,500,000		-19,360,000	-19,360,000	-19,360,000	-14,860,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-39,640,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-48,262,000	-8,622,000
Direct appropriation	54,788,000	59,611,000	31,306,000	31,306,000	31,306,000	-23,482,000
Japan - United States Friendship Commission						
Japan - United States Friendship Trust Fund	1,247,000	1,250,000	1,247,000	1,247,000	1,247,000	
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	
Legal Services Corporation						
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	400,000,000	440,000,000	278,000,000	300,000,000	278,000,000	-122,000,000
Marine Mammal Commission						
Salaries and expenses	1,384,000	1,425,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	1,190,000	-194,000
Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission						
Salaries and expenses	300,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	+50,000
National Bankruptcy Review Commission						
Salaries and expenses (by transfer)	(1,000,000)					(-1,000,000)
Ounce of Prevention Council						
Direct appropriation				1,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000
Crime trust fund 4/		14,700,000				
Total, Ounce of Prevention Council		14,700,000		1,500,000	1,500,000	+1,500,000
Securities and Exchange Commission						
Salaries and expenses	297,405,000	342,922,000	297,405,000	297,405,000	297,405,000	
Offsetting fee collections	-192,000,000		-184,293,000	-184,293,000	-184,293,000	+7,707,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover	-30,549,000		-9,667,000	-9,667,000	-9,667,000	+20,882,000
Investment adviser fee - offsetting collection	(-8,595,000)					(+8,595,000)
Direct appropriation	74,856,000	342,922,000	103,445,000	103,445,000	103,445,000	+28,589,000
Small Business Administration						
Salaries and expenses	251,504,000	242,831,000	222,490,000	222,490,000	222,490,000	-29,014,000
Offsetting fee collections	-9,350,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	+6,050,000
Direct appropriation	242,154,000	239,531,000	219,190,000	219,190,000	219,190,000	-22,964,000
Office of Inspector General	8,500,000	9,200,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Business Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy	3,596,000	12,428,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+904,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy 5/	274,439,000	50,835,000	155,010,000	155,010,000	155,010,000	-119,429,000
Micro loan guarantees	1,216,000	1,700,000	1,216,000	1,216,000	1,216,000	
Section 503. prepayment	30,000,000					-30,000,000
Administrative expenses	97,000,000	99,910,000	92,622,000	92,622,000	92,622,000	-4,378,000
Total, Business loans program account	406,251,000	164,873,000	253,348,000	253,348,000	253,348,000	-152,903,000
Disaster Loans Program Account:						
Direct loans subsidy 5/	52,153,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	-17,721,000
Administrative expenses	78,000,000	80,340,000	71,578,000	71,578,000	71,578,000	-6,422,000
Contingency fund (emergency)	125,000,000	100,000,000				-125,000,000
Total, Disaster loans program account	255,153,000	214,772,000	106,010,000	106,010,000	106,010,000	-149,143,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	5,369,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	2,530,000	-2,839,000
Total, Small Business Administration	917,427,000	630,906,000	589,578,000	589,578,000	589,578,000	-327,849,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
State Justice Institute						
Salaries and expenses 6/	13,550,000	13,550,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-8,550,000
Crime trust fund	.....	600,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, State Justice Institute	13,550,000	14,150,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-8,550,000
Total, title V, Related agencies	1,891,883,000	2,221,997,000	1,485,320,000	1,508,920,000	1,486,870,000	-405,013,000
Appropriations	(2,049,883,000)	(2,206,697,000)	(1,485,320,000)	(1,508,920,000)	(1,486,870,000)	(-563,013,000)
Rescission	(-158,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+158,000,000)
Crime trust fund	.....	(15,300,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Procurement: General provisions 7/	-11,769,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+11,769,000
Total, title VI, general provisions	-11,769,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+11,769,000
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS						
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
General Administration						
Working capital fund (rescission)	.....	.....	-65,000,000	-65,000,000	-65,000,000	-65,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
Administration of Foreign Affairs						
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad (rescission)	.....	.....	-60,000,000	-95,500,000	-64,500,000	-64,500,000
RELATED AGENCIES						
United States Information Agency						
Radio construction (rescission)	.....	.....	-7,400,000	-7,400,000	-7,400,000	-7,400,000
Total, title VII, Rescissions	.....	.....	-132,400,000	-167,900,000	-136,900,000	-136,900,000
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority	26,698,336,000	31,158,679,000	27,284,734,000	27,299,134,000	27,841,284,000	+1,142,948,000
Appropriations	(24,541,686,000)	(27,148,479,000)	(23,536,165,000)	(23,586,065,000)	(24,097,215,000)	(-444,471,000)
Rescissions	(-171,250,000)	.....	(-207,400,000)	(-242,900,000)	(-211,900,000)	(-40,650,000)
Crime trust fund	(2,327,900,000)	(4,010,200,000)	(3,955,969,000)	(3,955,969,000)	(3,955,969,000)	(+1,628,069,000)
(By transfer)	(56,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(106,000,000)	(106,000,000)	(106,000,000)	(+49,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)	.....
(Liquidation of contract authority)	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)
(Foreign currency appropriation)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	.....

1/ 1995 "Salaries and expenses" funds were used for "Administrative review and appeals".
2/ Doesn't reflect transfers to INS and GLA.
3/ Includes budget amendment of -$3,265,000 related to privatization of portions of the National Weather Service. Legislation will be proposed to offset this account from the Marine Navigation Trust Fund.
4/ Funding of $1,500,000 was provided under Office of Justice Programs in FY 1995.
5/ Assumes legislation to lower the subsidy for these accounts through new fees and increases in interest rates.
6/ The State Justice Institute is authorized to submit its budget directly to Congress. The President's request includes $7,000,000 for the Institute.
7/ The FY 1995 budget authority amount reflects the unspread balance.

FY 1996 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
FEDERAL FUNDS						
Federal payment to the District of Columbia	660,000,000	660,000,000	660,000,000	660,000,000	660,000,000	
Federal contribution to retirement funds	52,070,000	52,070,000	52,000,000	52,070,000	52,070,000	
Federal contribution for education reform				14,930,000		
Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia	712,070,000	712,070,000	712,000,000	727,000,000	712,070,000	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS						
Operating Expenses						
Governmental direction and support	(131,077,000)	(150,721,000)	(149,793,000)	(149,130,000)	(149,130,000)	(+18,053,000)
Economic development and regulation	(149,858,000)	(142,711,000)	(139,285,000)	(140,983,000)	(140,983,000)	(-8,875,000)
Human resources development	(87,752,000)					(-87,752,000)
Public safety and justice	(902,466,000)	(960,747,000)	(954,106,000)	(963,848,000)	(963,848,000)	(+61,382,000)
Public education system	(832,303,000)	(800,080,000)	(788,983,000)	(795,201,000)	(795,201,000)	(-37,102,000)
Education reform				(14,930,000)		
Human support services	(1,542,648,000)	(1,859,622,000)	(1,845,638,000)	(1,855,014,000)	(1,855,014,000)	(+312,366,000)
Public works	(279,627,000)	(297,568,000)	(297,326,000)	(297,568,000)	(297,568,000)	(+17,941,000)
Financing and other		(269,654,000)				
Washington Convention Center Fund	(12,850,000)		(5,400,000)	(5,400,000)	(5,400,000)	(-7,450,000)
Repayment of loans and interest	(306,766,000)		(327,787,000)	(327,787,000)	(327,787,000)	(+21,019,000)
Repayment of general fund recovery debt	(38,678,000)		(38,678,000)	(38,678,000)	(38,678,000)	
Short-term borrowing	(5,000,000)		(9,698,000)	(9,698,000)	(9,698,000)	(+4,698,000)
Pay renegotiation or reduction in compensation			(-46,409,000)	(-46,409,000)	(-46,409,000)	(-46,409,000)
Optical and dental benefits	(3,312,000)					(-3,312,000)
Pay adjustment	(106,095,000)					(-106,095,000)
D.C. General Hospital deficit payment	(10,000,000)					(-10,000,000)
Rainy day fund	(22,508,000)	(4,563,000)	(4,563,000)	(4,563,000)	(4,563,000)	(-17,945,000)
Job-producing economic development incentives	(22,600,000)					(-22,600,000)
Cash reserve fund	(3,957,000)					(-3,957,000)
Incentive buyout program			(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(+19,000,000)
Outplacement			(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(+1,500,000)
Boards and Commissions		(-500,000)	(-500,000)	(-500,000)	(-500,000)	(-500,000)
Government reengineering program			(-16,000,000)	(-16,000,000)	(-16,000,000)	(-16,000,000)
Personal and nonpersonal services adjustments	(-13,632,000)		(-148,411,000)	(-165,837,000)	(-150,907,000)	(-137,275,000)
Sec. 138(a) reduction in FY 1995 expenses	(-140,000,000)					(+140,000,000)
Total, operating expenses, general fund	(4,303,867,000)	(4,485,166,000)	(4,370,437,000)	(4,394,554,000)	(4,394,554,000)	(+90,687,000)
Capital Outlay						
General fund	(94,238,000)	(62,562,000)	(62,562,000)	(62,562,000)	(62,562,000)	(-31,676,000)
Enterprise Funds						
Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund:						
Operating expenses	(275,576,000)	(243,853,000)	(193,398,000)	(242,253,000)	(242,253,000)	(-33,323,000)
Capital outlay	(23,354,635)	(39,477,000)	(39,477,000)	(39,477,000)	(39,477,000)	(+16,122,365)
Total, Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund	(298,930,635)	(283,330,000)	(232,875,000)	(281,730,000)	(281,730,000)	(-17,200,635)
Lottery and Charitable Games Enterprise Fund	(192,068,000)	(229,950,000)	(229,907,000)	(229,950,000)	(229,950,000)	(+37,882,000)
Cable Television Enterprise Fund	(2,654,000)	(2,351,000)	(2,469,000)	(2,351,000)	(2,351,000)	(-303,000)
Sports Commission (STARPLEX)	(6,392,000)	(6,580,000)	(8,637,000)	(6,580,000)	(6,580,000)	(+188,000)
D.C. General Hospital	(143,920,000)	(115,034,000)	(-2,487,000)	(58,299,000)	(58,299,000)	(-85,621,000)
D.C. Retirement Board		(13,440,000)	(13,417,000)	(13,440,000)	(13,440,000)	(+13,440,000)
Correctional Industries	(7,642,000)	(10,516,000)	(10,048,000)	(10,516,000)	(10,516,000)	(+2,874,000)
Washington Conventional Center Enterprise Fund	(19,541,000)	(37,957,000)	(37,957,000)	(32,557,000)	(32,557,000)	(+13,016,000)
D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority		(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(3,500,000)	(+3,500,000)
Total, Enterprise Funds	(671,147,635)	(702,658,000)	(536,323,000)	(638,923,000)	(638,923,000)	(-32,224,635)
Total, District of Columbia funds	(5,069,252,635)	(5,250,386,000)	(4,969,322,000)	(5,096,039,000)	(5,096,039,000)	(+26,786,365)
Total, title I, fiscal year 1996 appropriations:						
Federal Funds to the District of Columbia	712,070,000	712,070,000	712,000,000	727,000,000	712,070,000	
District of Columbia funds	(5,069,252,635)	(5,250,386,000)	(4,969,322,000)	(5,096,039,000)	(5,096,039,000)	(+26,786,365)

FY 1996 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	567,152,000	567,753,000	567,453,000	-29,783,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000				-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,482,000				-121,176,000
Wildland fire management			235,924,000	235,924,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazmat account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,068,000	3,019,000	3,115,000	3,115,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	101,500,000	101,500,000	113,500,000	+12,091,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	12,800,000	-1,957,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	93,379,000	97,452,000	97,452,000	+88,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, & forfeitures (indefinite)	8,883,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,049,581,000	1,054,255,000	1,065,955,000	-33,050,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,670,000	499,100,000	501,010,000	-10,324,000
Construction	53,768,000	34,095,000	37,655,000	37,655,000	37,655,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	6,687,000	6,700,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	45,400,000	36,900,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	38,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,159,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,983,000	12,000,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahonton Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund		152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund		400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	612,091,000	605,021,000	606,931,000	-64,107,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000				-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,086,014,000	1,084,755,000	1,082,481,000	+4,581,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	37,649,000	37,649,000	37,649,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	36,212,000	36,212,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	179,883,000	143,225,000	143,225,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
C&O Canal (P.L. 104-99)			2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+2,000,000
Urban park and recreation fund	6,000	2,300,000				-6,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	
Land acquisition and state assistance	87,373,000	82,696,000	57,500,000	49,100,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime trust fund		15,200,000				
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,332,700,000	1,322,941,000	1,320,667,000	-66,662,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,462,000	586,369,000	729,995,000	730,330,000	730,163,000	+158,701,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	186,181,000	193,348,000	182,339,000	182,771,000	182,555,000	-5,626,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	188,779,000	189,211,000	188,995,000	-5,626,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	173,887,000	173,887,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,857,000	269,857,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs	1,519,012,000	1,609,842,000	1,384,434,000	1,384,434,000	1,384,434,000	-134,578,000
Construction	120,450,000	125,424,000	100,833,000	100,833,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	77,096,000	151,025,000	80,645,000	80,645,000	80,645,000	+3,549,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund	1,996,000					-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises	1,966,000	1,966,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-1,466,000
Indian direct loan program account	779,000					-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,671,000	9,684,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-4,671,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	(35,914,000)	(35,914,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,571,412,000	1,571,412,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories	50,481,000	41,512,000	37,468,000	37,468,000	37,468,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	
Subtotal	78,201,000	69,232,000	65,188,000	65,188,000	65,188,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	19,800,000					-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association	13,574,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal	23,574,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	90,126,000	90,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management	62,479,000	64,772,000	55,801,000	57,117,000	56,912,000	-5,567,000
Office of the Solicitor	34,608,000	35,361,000	34,337,000	34,516,000	34,427,000	-181,000
Office of Inspector General	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	
Construction Management	1,996,000	2,000,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-1,496,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians			16,338,000	16,338,000	16,338,000	+16,338,000
Total, Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	131,915,000	133,410,000	133,116,000	+9,094,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,040,456,000	6,030,563,000	6,041,222,000	-466,675,000
Appropriations	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,070,456,000)	(6,060,563,000)	(6,071,222,000)	(-466,675,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,200,000)				
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	(35,914,000)	(35,914,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	193,748,000	203,796,000	178,000,000	177,757,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry	154,268,000	187,459,000	136,794,000	136,695,000	136,884,000	-17,384,000
Emergency pest suppression fund	17,000,000					-17,000,000
International forestry	4,987,000	10,000,000				-4,987,000
National forest system	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,256,253,000	1,255,004,999	1,257,057,000	-71,836,000
Forest Service fire protection	159,285,000	164,285,000				-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund	226,200,000	239,000,000				-226,200,000
Emergency appropriations	450,000,000					-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management			385,485,000	385,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction	199,215,000	192,338,000	163,500,000	163,384,000	163,600,000	-35,615,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Land acquisition	63,882,000	65,311,000	24,200,000	41,200,000	39,400,000	-24,482,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Southeast Alaska economic disaster fund					110,000,000	+110,000,000
Total, Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,149,579,000	2,164,872,999	2,275,773,000	-527,829,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology	-337,879,000	-155,019,000				+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development	423,701,000	436,508,000	416,943,000	417,082,000	417,018,000	-6,683,000
(By transfer)	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	187,048,000	101,026,000	148,786,000	148,786,000	148,786,000	-38,262,000
Energy conservation	755,751,000	923,561,000	553,137,000	553,240,000	553,189,000	-202,562,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer)		-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-15,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000
Economic regulation	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,297,000	6,297,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness	8,233,000	8,219,000				-8,233,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	135,954,000	25,689,000	.....	.....	.....	-135,954,000
(By transfer)	(90,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+96,236,000)
Energy Information Administration	84,566,000	84,689,000	72,266,000	72,266,000	72,266,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,179,029,000	1,179,281,000	1,179,156,000	-86,731,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,747,842,000	1,747,842,000	1,747,842,000	+38,062,000
Indian health facilities	253,282,000	242,672,000	238,958,000	238,958,000	238,958,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,986,800,000	1,986,800,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	24,888,000	26,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	313,853,000	329,800,000	308,188,000	308,188,000	311,188,000	-2,665,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings	23,954,000	34,000,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction	21,857,000	38,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	373,092,000	373,092,000	376,092,000	+13,386,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	52,902,000	54,566,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	4,016,000	9,885,000	6,442,000	6,442,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance	10,323,000	10,373,000	10,323,000	10,323,000	10,323,000	.....
Construction	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	.....
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,306,000	19,373,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	.....
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,259,000	82,259,000	82,259,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants	28,512,000	28,725,000	17,235,000	17,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	99,494,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration	146,131,000	156,087,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants	25,913,000	25,913,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	363,117,000	384,200,000	230,494,000	230,494,000	230,494,000	-132,623,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	.....
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	2,947,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000

FY 1996 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 3019) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,738,000	3,043,000				-2,738,000
Public development	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund		1,388,000				
Rescission of prior year funds				-2,172,000		
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000		-2,172,000		-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	6,124,049,000	6,137,422,999	6,253,370,000	-757,963,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	12,164,505,000	12,167,985,999	12,294,592,000	-1,224,638,000
Appropriations	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,194,505,000)	(12,200,157,999)	(12,324,592,000)	(-1,224,638,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-32,172,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,200,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer)	(107,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,049,581,000	1,054,255,000	1,065,955,000	-33,050,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	612,091,000	605,021,000	606,931,000	-64,107,000
National Biological Service	162,041,000	172,696,000				-162,041,000
National Park Service	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,332,700,000	1,322,941,000	1,320,667,000	-66,662,000
United States Geological Survey	571,462,000	586,369,000	729,995,000	730,330,000	730,163,000	+158,701,000
Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	188,779,000	189,211,000	188,995,000	-5,626,000
Bureau of Mines	152,427,000	132,507,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,857,000	269,857,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,571,412,000	1,571,412,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	90,126,000	90,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	131,915,000	133,410,000	133,116,000	+9,094,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,040,456,000	6,030,563,000	6,041,222,000	-466,675,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,149,579,000	2,164,872,999	2,275,773,000	-527,829,000
Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,179,029,000	1,179,281,000	1,179,156,000	-86,731,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,986,800,000	1,966,800,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	24,888,000	26,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	373,092,000	373,092,000	376,092,000	+13,386,000
National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,306,000	19,373,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	99,494,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,947,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	48,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000		-2,172,000		-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	6,124,049,000	6,137,422,999	6,253,370,000	-757,963,000
Grand total	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	12,164,505,000	12,167,985,999	12,294,592,000	-1,224,638,000

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I						
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
Veterans Benefits Administration						
Compensation and pensions	17,626,892,000	18,331,561,000	18,331,561,000	18,331,561,000	18,331,561,000	+704,669,000
Readjustment benefits	1,286,600,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	+58,700,000
Subtotal	1,286,600,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	+58,700,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities	24,760,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	+130,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite)	507,095,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	-2,973,000
Negative subsidy for guaranteed loans	.....	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000
Administrative expenses	65,226,000	78,085,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	.....
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite)	43,939,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	-20,989,000
Administrative expenses	59,371,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	-7,233,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(+6,000,000)
Direct loan program account (indefinite)	25,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	+3,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,000,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-700,000)
Administrative expenses	1,020,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	-561,000
(Loan level)	(97,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(+2,000)
Education loan fund program account	1,061	1,093	1,000	1,000	1,000	-61
(Limitation on direct loans)	(4,034)	(4,120)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(-34)
Administrative expenses	195,000	203,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	.....
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account	54,000	56,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,964,000)	(2,022,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	.....
Administrative expenses	767,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	-390,000
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account	218,000	455,000	205,000	205,000	205,000	-13,000
Total, Veterans Benefits Administration	19,616,163,061	20,175,125,093	20,162,006,000	20,162,006,000	20,162,006,000	+545,842,939
Veterans Health Administration						
Medical care	16,214,684,000	16,961,487,000	16,564,000,000	16,564,000,000	16,564,000,000	+349,316,000
(Transfer out)	.....	.....	(-4,500,000)	(-4,500,000)	(-4,500,000)	(-4,500,000)
Total	16,214,684,000	16,961,487,000	16,564,000,000	16,564,000,000	16,564,000,000	+349,316,000
Medical and prosthetic research	251,743,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	+5,257,000
Health professional scholarship program	10,386,000	10,386,000	.....	.....	.....	-10,386,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	69,789,000	72,262,000	63,602,000	63,602,000	63,602,000	-6,187,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(+4,500,000)
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-500,000
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	.....
Administrative expenses (by transfer)	(54,000)	(56,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	.....
General post fund (transfer out)	(-61,000)	(-63,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	.....
Total, Veterans Health Administration	16,547,102,000	17,301,135,000	16,884,602,000	16,884,602,000	16,884,602,000	+337,500,000
Departmental Administration						
General operating expenses	890,193,000	915,643,000	848,143,000	848,143,000	848,143,000	-42,050,000
Offsetting receipts	.....	.....	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(+32,000,000)
(Transfer out)	.....	.....	(-6,000,000)	(-6,000,000)	(-6,000,000)	(-6,000,000)
Total, Program Level	(890,193,000)	(915,643,000)	(874,143,000)	(874,143,000)	(874,143,000)	(-16,050,000)
National Cemetery System	72,604,000	75,308,000	72,604,000	72,604,000	72,604,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	31,815,000	33,500,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	-915,000
Construction, major projects	354,294,000	513,755,000	136,155,000	136,155,000	136,155,000	-218,139,000
(Transfer out)	.....	.....	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)
Construction, minor projects	152,934,000	229,145,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+37,066,000
Parking revolving fund	16,300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-16,300,000
(By transfer)	.....	.....	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(+7,000,000)
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities	47,397,000	43,740,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	.....
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries	5,378,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-4,378,000
Total, Departmental Administration	1,570,915,000	1,812,091,000	1,326,199,000	1,326,199,000	1,326,199,000	-244,716,000
Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs	37,734,180,061	39,268,351,093	38,372,807,000	38,372,807,000	38,372,807,000	+638,626,939
(By transfer)	(61,000)	(63,000)	(17,561,000)	(17,561,000)	(17,561,000)	(+17,500,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(3,135,034)	(2,495,120)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(-698,034)
Consisting of:						
Mandatory	(19,489,311,000)	(20,043,351,000)	(20,043,351,000)	(20,043,351,000)	(20,043,351,000)	(+554,040,000)
Discretionary	(18,244,869,061)	(19,245,000,093)	(18,329,456,000)	(18,329,456,000)	(18,329,456,000)	(+84,586,939)

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE II						
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
Selected Housing Programs						
Housing certificates for families and individuals performance funds		6,509,955,000				
Public and Indian housing capital performance funds		4,884,000,000				
Annual contributions for assisted housing	11,083,000,000		10,155,795,000	10,086,795,000	9,818,795,000	-1,264,205,000
Prepayment authority			4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+4,000,000
Transfer from UDAG	(100,000,000)					(-100,000,000)
Severely distressed public housing	500,000,000		280,000,000	380,000,000	480,000,000	-20,000,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts	2,536,000,000					-2,536,000,000
Flexible subsidy fund	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS		186,000,000				
Congregate services	25,000,000					-25,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	-38,000,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	+2,881,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Rescission of prepayment recaptures	-66,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-97,000,000
Homeownership assistance	6,875,000					-6,875,000
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite	-184,000,000					+184,000,000
Public and Indian housing operation performance funds		3,220,000,000				
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects	2,900,000,000		2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	-100,000,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing	290,000,000		290,000,000	290,000,000	290,000,000	
Affordable housing performance funds		3,339,000,000				
HOME investment partnerships program	1,400,000,000		1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants)	50,000,000					-50,000,000
National homeownership trust demonstration program	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Youthbuild program	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing counseling assistance	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	
(Limitation on guarantee loans)	(22,388,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(+14,512,000)
Violent crime reduction program		3,000,000				
Total, Selected housing programs (net)	18,705,875,000	17,946,836,000	14,734,676,000	14,765,676,000	14,597,676,000	-4,108,199,000
Homeless Assistance						
Homeless assistance fund		1,120,000,000				
Homeless assistance grants	1,120,000,000		823,000,000	823,000,000	823,000,000	-297,000,000
Community Planning and Development						
Community opportunity fund		4,850,000,000				
Community opportunity performance program account		21,000,000				
Administrative expenses		900,000				
Community development grants	4,600,000,000		4,600,000,000	4,600,000,000	4,600,000,000	
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(2,054,000,000)		(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(-554,000,000)
Credit subsidy			31,750,000	31,750,000	31,750,000	+31,750,000
Administrative expenses			675,000	675,000	675,000	+675,000
Policy Development and Research						
Research and technology	42,000,000	42,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	-8,000,000
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity						
Fair housing activities	33,375,000	45,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	-3,375,000
Management and Administration						
Salaries and expenses	451,219,000	479,479,000	420,000,000	420,000,000	420,000,000	-31,219,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(495,355,000)	(527,782,000)	(532,782,000)	(532,782,000)	(532,782,000)	(+37,427,000)
(By transfer, GNMA)	(8,824,000)	(9,101,000)	(9,101,000)	(9,101,000)	(9,101,000)	(+277,000)
(By transfer, Community Planning & Development)		(900,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(+675,000)
Total, Salaries and expenses	(955,398,000)	(1,017,262,000)	(962,558,000)	(962,558,000)	(962,558,000)	(+7,160,000)
Office of Inspector General	36,427,000	36,968,000	36,567,000	36,567,000	36,567,000	+140,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)	(10,961,000)	(11,283,000)	(11,283,000)	(11,283,000)	(11,283,000)	(+322,000)
Total, Office of Inspector General	(47,388,000)	(48,251,000)	(47,850,000)	(47,850,000)	(47,850,000)	(+462,000)
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight	15,451,000	14,895,000	14,895,000	14,895,000	14,895,000	-556,000
Offsetting receipts	-15,451,000	-14,895,000	-14,895,000	-14,895,000	-14,895,000	+556,000

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Federal Housing Administration						
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(100,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(+10,000,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(180,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Administrative expenses	308,846,000	341,595,000	341,595,000	341,595,000	341,595,000	+32,749,000
Offsetting receipts	-308,846,000	-341,595,000	-341,595,000	-341,595,000	-341,595,000	-32,749,000
FHA - General and special risk program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(20,885,072,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(-3,485,072,000)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(220,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Administrative expenses	197,470,000	197,470,000	202,470,000	202,470,000	202,470,000	+5,000,000
Program costs	188,395,000	188,395,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	-103,395,000
Subsidy - multifamily	-134,096,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	+96,100,000
Subsidy - single family	-81,673,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	+54,629,000
Subsidy - Title I	-24,460,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	+683,000
Total, Federal Housing Administration	145,636,000	297,048,000	198,653,000	198,653,000	198,653,000	+53,017,000
Government National Mortgage Association						
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(142,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(-32,000,000,000)
Administrative expenses	8,824,000	9,101,000	9,101,000	9,101,000	9,101,000	+277,000
Offsetting receipts	-262,700,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-245,600,000
Administrative Provisions						
Procurement savings	-3,538,000					+3,538,000
Debt forgiveness			10,000,000			
FHA mortgage insurance limits	-3,000,000					+3,000,000
GNMA REMICs	-180,000,000					+180,000,000
GNMA REMICs II	-30,600,000					+30,600,000
1-year extension of HECM's demonstration			-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000	-7,000,000
FHA Assignment Reform			-1,066,000,000	-1,066,000,000	-1,066,000,000	-1,066,000,000
FHA Assignment Reform, 1996					-96,000,000	-96,000,000
Non-judicial foreclosure	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
Multi-family property disposition - FHA fund			-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Sec. 213 - demonstration			30,000,000	15,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000
Sec. 224 - FHA fund			33,000,000	33,000,000	33,000,000	+33,000,000
Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net)	24,653,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,370,122,000	19,376,122,000	19,127,122,000	-5,526,396,000
Appropriations	(24,941,518,000)	(24,538,151,000)	(19,568,241,000)	(19,574,241,000)	(19,325,241,000)	(-5,616,277,000)
Rescissions	(-288,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+89,881,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(264,939,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(-26,039,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(515,140,000)	(549,066,000)	(553,841,000)	(553,841,000)	(553,841,000)	(+38,701,000)
Consisting of:						
Advance appropriation available	800,000,000					-800,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill	24,653,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,370,122,000	19,376,122,000	19,127,122,000	-5,526,396,000
Total, title II	25,453,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,370,122,000	19,376,122,000	19,127,122,000	-6,326,396,000
TITLE III						
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
American Battle Monuments Commission						
Salaries and expenses	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	
Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board						
Salaries and expenses	500,000					-500,000
Community Development Financial Institutions						
Community development financial institutions fund program account	125,000,000	123,650,000		50,000,000	45,000,000	-80,000,000
Loan subsidy		20,000,000				
Office of Inspector General		350,000				
Consumer Product Safety Commission						
Salaries and expenses	42,509,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-2,509,000
Corporation for National and Community Service						
National and community service programs operating expenses	575,000,000	817,476,000	15,000,000	400,500,000	400,500,000	-174,500,000
Office of Inspector General	2,000,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	
Total	577,000,000	819,476,000	15,000,000	402,500,000	402,500,000	-174,500,000

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Court of Veterans Appeals						
Salaries and expenses	9,429,000	9,820,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-429,000
Department of Defense - Civil						
Cemeterial Expenses, Army						
Salaries and expenses	12,017,000	14,134,000	11,946,000	11,946,000	11,946,000	-71,000
Environmental Protection Agency						
Research and development	350,000,000	428,661,000	.....	.....	.....	-350,000,000
Science and Technology	.....	.....	525,000,000	525,000,000	525,000,000	+525,000,000
Abatement, control, and compliance	1,417,000,000	1,748,823,000	.....	.....	.....	-1,417,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(296,722,500)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-296,722,500)
Program and research operations	922,000,000	1,017,298,000	.....	.....	.....	-922,000,000
Environmental Programs and Management	.....	.....	1,550,300,000	1,590,300,000	1,677,300,000	+1,677,300,000
Office of Inspector General	28,542,000	33,050,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	28,500,000	-42,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund	15,384,000	14,078,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	-4,384,000
Transfer from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	669,000	710,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-169,000
Subtotal, OIG	44,595,000	47,838,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-4,595,000
Buildings and facilities	43,870,000	112,820,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	110,000,000	+66,130,000
Hazardous substance superfund	1,435,000,000	1,507,937,000	1,163,400,000	1,163,400,000	1,213,400,000	-221,600,000
Legislative proposals - reforms	.....	55,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Delay of obligation	.....	.....	.....	100,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000
Transfer to OIG	-15,384,000	-14,078,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-11,000,000	+4,384,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(308,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-308,000,000)
Subtotal, Hazardous substance superfund	1,419,616,000	1,548,859,000	1,152,400,000	1,252,400,000	1,302,400,000	-117,216,000
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund	70,000,000	77,273,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	-24,173,000
Transfer to OIG	-669,000	-710,000	-500,000	-500,000	-500,000	+169,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,150,000)	.....	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(-1,150,000)
Subtotal, LUST	69,331,000	76,563,000	45,327,000	45,327,000	45,327,000	-24,004,000
Oil spill response	20,000,000	23,047,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-5,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,420,000)	.....	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(-420,000)
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund	2,262,000,000	1,865,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-2,262,000,000
Safe drinking water State revolving fund	700,000,000	500,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-700,000,000
State and Tribal Assistance Grants	.....	.....	2,323,000,000	2,423,000,000	2,813,000,000	+2,813,000,000
Environmental services - user fees	.....	-7,500,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Procurement savings	-7,525,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+7,525,000
Total, EPA	7,240,887,000	7,359,409,000	5,711,027,000	5,951,027,000	6,528,027,000	-712,860,000
Executive Office of the President						
Office of Science and Technology Policy	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	.....
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality	997,000	2,188,000	1,500,000	2,180,000	2,150,000	+1,153,000
Total	5,978,000	7,169,000	6,481,000	7,161,000	7,131,000	+1,153,000
Federal Emergency Management Agency						
Disaster relief	320,000,000	320,000,000	222,000,000	222,000,000	222,000,000	-98,000,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan	2,418,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	-263,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(175,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-150,000,000)
Administrative expenses	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	.....
Salaries and expenses	162,000,000	172,331,000	168,900,000	168,900,000	168,900,000	+6,900,000
Office of the Inspector General	4,400,000	4,673,000	4,673,000	4,673,000	4,673,000	+273,000
Emergency management planning and assistance	215,960,000	210,122,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	-12,916,000
Emergency food and shelter program	130,000,000	130,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-30,000,000
Administrative provision REP savings	-11,525,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-732,000
Procurement savings	-1,441,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+1,441,000
Equipment sales (sec. 519)	.....	-30,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000
National Flood Insurance:						
Salaries and expenses	.....	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(+20,562,000)
Flood mitigation	.....	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(+70,464,000)
Premium increase	.....	-21,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency	821,907,000	776,119,000	678,610,000	678,610,000	678,610,000	-143,297,000
General Services Administration						
Consumer Information Center	2,004,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	+57,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,454,000)	(2,502,000)	(2,602,000)	(2,602,000)	(2,602,000)	(+148,000)

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Department of Health and Human Services						
Office of Consumer Affairs	2,166,000	1,811,000	.....	.....	1,800,000	-366,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
Human space flight	5,514,897,000	5,509,600,000	5,456,600,000	5,456,600,000	5,456,600,000	-58,297,000
Science, aeronautics and technology	5,901,200,000	6,006,900,000	5,845,900,000	5,845,900,000	5,928,900,000	+27,700,000
Rescission	-10,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+10,000,000
National aeronautical facilities	400,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-400,000,000
Mission support	2,554,587,000	2,726,200,000	2,502,200,000	2,502,200,000	2,502,200,000	-52,387,000
Office of Inspector General	16,000,000	17,300,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	.....
Administrative provision: Transfer authority	.....	.....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
Total, NASA (net)	14,376,684,000	14,260,000,000	13,820,700,000	13,820,700,000	13,903,700,000	-472,984,000
National Credit Union Administration						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds)	(901,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(-341,000)
National Science Foundation						
Research and related activities	2,280,000,000	2,454,000,000	2,274,000,000	2,274,000,000	2,314,000,000	+34,000,000
Rescission	-35,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+35,000,000
Major research equipment	126,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	-56,000,000
Academic research infrastructure	250,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-150,000,000
Education and human resources	605,974,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	-6,974,000
Salaries and expenses	123,966,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	+3,344,000
Office of Inspector General	4,380,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	+110,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	.....
Total, NSF (net)	3,360,520,000	3,360,000,000	3,180,000,000	3,180,000,000	3,220,000,000	-140,520,000
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation	38,667,000	55,000,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	.....
Selective Service System						
Salaries and expenses	22,930,000	23,304,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	.....
Total, title III, Independent agencies (net)	26,658,463,000	26,896,568,000	23,556,687,000	24,234,867,000	24,931,637,000	-1,726,826,000
Appropriations	(26,710,988,000)	(26,896,568,000)	(23,556,687,000)	(24,234,867,000)	(24,931,637,000)	(-1,779,351,000)
Rescissions	(-45,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(+45,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(623,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(17,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(-606,144,500)
(Limitation on direct loans)	(775,000,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(-58,974,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(901,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(-341,000)
TITLE IV						
CORPORATIONS						
Federal Deposit insurance Corporation:						
FSLIC Resolution Fund	827,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-827,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program	15,000,000	15,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-15,000,000
Total	842,000,000	15,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-842,000,000
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General	32,000,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	-20,600,000
Total, title IV, Corporations	874,000,000	26,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	-862,600,000
Grand total (net)	89,920,161,061	90,551,351,093	81,311,016,000	81,995,196,000	82,442,966,000	-7,477,195,061
Appropriations	(90,260,686,061)	(90,749,470,093)	(81,509,135,000)	(82,193,315,000)	(82,641,085,000)	(-7,619,601,061)
Rescissions	(-333,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+134,881,000)
(By transfer)	(100,061,000)	(63,000)	(17,561,000)	(17,561,000)	(17,561,000)	(-82,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(623,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(17,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(-606,144,500)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(1,200,523,034)	(1,075,421,120)	(1,075,363,000)	(1,075,363,000)	(1,075,363,000)	(-125,160,034)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(264,939,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(-26,039,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds)	(516,041,000)	(549,626,000)	(554,401,000)	(554,401,000)	(554,401,000)	(+38,360,000)

H.R. 3019 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP						
Total appropriations in this bill (net)	89,920,161,061	90,551,351,093	81,311,016,000	81,995,196,000	82,442,966,000	-7,477,195,061
Scorekeeping adjustments	-7,987,944,000		22,000,000	3,000,000	2,000,000	+7,989,944,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	81,932,217,061	90,551,351,093	81,333,016,000	81,998,196,000	82,444,966,000	+512,748,939
Mandatory	20,316,311,000	20,043,351,000	20,043,351,000	20,043,351,000	20,043,351,000	-272,960,000
Discretionary:						
Crime trust fund		3,000,000				
General purposes:						
Defense (Function 050):						
Federal Emergency Management Agency:						
Salaries and expenses	62,411,000	44,006,000	43,874,000	43,874,000	43,874,000	-18,537,000
Emergency management planning and assistance	137,147,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	-113,122,000
Selective Service System	22,930,000	23,304,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	
National Science Foundation:						
Research and related activities		62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	+62,600,000
Total, Defense	222,488,000	153,935,000	153,429,000	153,429,000	153,429,000	-69,059,000
Nondefense discretionary	61,393,418,061	70,351,065,093	61,136,236,000	61,801,416,000	62,248,186,000	+854,769,939
Total, General purposes	61,615,906,061	70,505,000,093	61,289,665,000	61,954,845,000	62,401,615,000	+785,708,939
Total, Discretionary	61,615,906,061	70,508,000,093	61,289,665,000	61,954,845,000	62,401,615,000	+785,708,939

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III)

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	TITLE II - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Natural Resources Conservation Service						
	Watershed and flood prevention operations						
104-183	(emergency appropriations)	60,000,000	73,200,000	.....	.....	-73,200,000	.....
104-183	Contingent emergency appropriations	40,000,000	.....	107,514,000	80,514,000	+80,514,000	-27,000,000
	Consolidated Farm Service Agency						
	Emergency conservation program (emergency						
104-183	appropriations)	30,000,000	24,800,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+5,200,000	.....
	Commodity Credit Corporation						
	Emergency livestock feed assistance program						
.....	(emergency appropriations)	.....	7,500,000	.....	.....	-7,500,000	.....
.....	(1997 carryover)	.....	(2,500,000)	.....	.....	(-2,500,000)	.....
	Rural Housing and Community Development Service						
	Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:						
	Low-income housing (sec. 502):						
104-183	Loan subsidy (emergency appropriations)	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....
104-183	Loan authorization	(34,965,000)	(34,965,000)	(34,965,000)	(34,965,000)	.....	.....
	Housing repair (sec. 504):						
104-183	Loan subsidy (emergency appropriations)	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	.....	.....
104-183	Loan authorization	(3,995,000)	(3,995,000)	(3,995,000)	(3,995,000)	.....	.....
	Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	6,500,000	.....	.....
	Very low-income housing repair grants (emergency						
104-183	appropriations)	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,100,000	.....	.....
	Total, Rural Housing and Community Development Service	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	7,600,000	.....	.....
	Rural Utilities Service						
	Emergency community water assistance program						
104-183	(emergency appropriations)	5,000,000	5,000,000	.....	.....	-5,000,000	.....
	Rural utilities assistance program (emergency						
104-183	appropriations)	6,000,000	6,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	+5,000,000	.....
	Total, Rural Utilities Service	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Chapter I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	148,600,000	126,600,000	156,114,000	129,114,000	+2,514,000	-27,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(108,600,000)	(126,600,000)	(48,600,000)	(48,600,000)	(-78,000,000)	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(40,000,000)	.....	(107,514,000)	(80,514,000)	(+80,514,000)	(-27,000,000)
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	Federal Bureau of Investigation						
	Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency						
.....	appropriations)	.....	.....	7,000,000	.....	.....	-7,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	Economic Development Administration						
	Economic development assistance programs						
.....	(contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	27,500,000	18,000,000	+18,000,000	-9,500,000
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration						
104-183	Construction (emergency appropriations)	10,000,000	.....	10,000,000	7,500,000	+7,500,000	-2,500,000
	Total, Department of Commerce	10,000,000	.....	37,500,000	25,500,000	+25,500,000	-12,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
	Diplomatic and consular program (emergency						
.....	appropriations)	.....	2,000,000	.....	.....	-2,000,000	.....
	RELATED AGENCIES						
	United States Information Agency						
.....	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	-1,000,000	.....

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) -- continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Small Business Administration						
	Disaster Loans Program Account:						
104-183	Direct loans subsidy (emergency appropriations)	69,700,000	72,300,000	69,700,000	71,000,000	-1,300,000	+1,300,000
104-183	Administrative expenses (emergency appropriations)	30,300,000	27,700,000	30,300,000	29,000,000	+1,300,000	-1,300,000
	Total, Small Business Administration	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000		
	Total, Chapter II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	110,000,000	103,000,000	144,500,000	125,500,000	+22,500,000	-19,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(110,000,000)	(103,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(107,500,000)	(+4,500,000)	(-2,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations			(34,500,000)	(18,000,000)	(+18,000,000)	(-16,500,000)
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - CIVIL						
	Corps of Engineers - Civil						
104-183	Operation and maintenance, general (emergency appropriations)	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000		
104-183	Flood control and coastal emergencies (emergency appropriations)	135,000,000	135,000,000	135,000,000	135,000,000		
	Total, Department of Defense - Civil	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000	165,000,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Reclamation						
104-183	Construction program (emergency appropriations)	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000		
104-183	Contingent emergency appropriations	9,000,000		9,000,000			-9,000,000
	Total, Department of the Interior	18,000,000	9,000,000	18,000,000	9,000,000		-9,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities						
	Other Defense Activities				15,000,000	+15,000,000	+15,000,000
	Power Marketing Administrations						
104-183	Operation and maintenance, Alaska Power Administration (by transfer)	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)		(5,500,000)		(+5,500,000)
	Total, Chapter III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	183,000,000	174,000,000	183,000,000	189,000,000	+15,000,000	+6,000,000
	Appropriations				(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(174,000,000)	(174,000,000)	(174,000,000)	(174,000,000)		
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(9,000,000)		(9,000,000)			(-9,000,000)
	(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)		(5,500,000)		(+5,500,000)
	CHAPTER IV						
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
104-187	Unanticipated needs for Defense of Israel against terrorism (emergency appropriations)	50,000,000		50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE						
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
104-178	Foreign Military Assistance Program: Grants	140,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000		
	Total, Chapter IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	190,000,000	70,000,000	120,000,000	120,000,000	+50,000,000	
	Appropriations	(140,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)	(70,000,000)		
	Emergency appropriations	(50,000,000)		(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)	
	CHAPTER V						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
104-183	Construction and access (emergency appropriations)	4,242,000	4,242,000	4,242,000	4,242,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			758,000	758,000	+758,000	
104-183	Oregon and California grant lands (emergency appropriations)	19,548,000	19,548,000	19,548,000	19,548,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			15,452,000	15,452,000	+15,452,000	
	Total, Bureau of Land Management	23,790,000	23,790,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	+16,210,000	
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
	Resource management (contingent emergency appropriations)			1,600,000	1,600,000	+1,600,000	

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
104-183	Construction (emergency appropriations)	20,505,000	20,505,000	20,505,000	20,505,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			16,795,000	16,795,000	+16,795,000	
	Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	20,505,000	20,505,000	38,900,000	38,900,000	+18,395,000	
	National Park Service						
104-183	Construction (emergency appropriations)	33,601,000	33,601,000	33,601,000	33,601,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			13,399,000	13,399,000	+13,399,000	
	Total, National Park Service	33,601,000	33,601,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	+13,399,000	
	United States Geological Survey						
104-183	Surveys, investigations, and research (emergency appropriations)	1,176,000	1,176,000	1,176,000	1,176,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			824,000	824,000	+824,000	
	Total, United States Geological Survey	1,176,000	1,176,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+824,000	
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
104-183	Operation of Indian programs (emergency appropriations)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000		
104-183	Construction (emergency appropriations)	9,428,000	9,428,000	9,428,000	9,428,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			7,072,000	7,072,000	+7,072,000	
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	9,928,000	9,928,000	17,000,000	17,000,000	+7,072,000	
	Territorial and International Affairs						
104-183	Assistance to territories (emergency appropriations)	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			11,000,000	11,000,000	+11,000,000	
	Total, Department of the Interior	91,000,000	91,000,000	157,900,000	157,900,000	+66,900,000	
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
	Forest Service						
104-183	National forest system (emergency appropriations)	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000		
	Contingent emergency appropriations			6,600,000	6,600,000	+6,600,000	
104-183	Construction (emergency appropriations)	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000		
104-183	Contingent emergency appropriations	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,800,000	20,800,000	+800,000	
	Total, Forest Service	80,000,000	80,000,000	87,400,000	87,400,000	+7,400,000	
	Total, Chapter V:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	171,000,000	171,000,000	245,300,000	245,300,000	+74,300,000	
	Emergency appropriations	(151,000,000)	(151,000,000)	(151,000,000)	(151,000,000)		
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(94,300,000)	(94,300,000)	(+74,300,000)	
	CHAPTER VI						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
104-179	North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure (emergency appropriations)	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000		
	CHAPTER VII						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
	Military Personnel						
	Military Personnel, Army			244,400,000			-244,400,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	244,400,000	262,200,000		257,200,000	-5,000,000	+257,200,000
	Military Personnel, Navy			11,700,000			-11,700,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	11,700,000	11,800,000		11,700,000	-100,000	+11,700,000
	Military Personnel, Marine Corps			2,600,000			-2,600,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	2,600,000	2,700,000		2,600,000	-100,000	+2,600,000
	Military Personnel, Air Force			27,300,000			-27,300,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	27,300,000	33,700,000		27,300,000	-6,400,000	+27,300,000
	Total, Military Personnel	286,000,000	310,400,000	286,000,000	298,800,000	-11,600,000	+12,800,000
	Operation and Maintenance						
	Operation and Maintenance, Army			195,000,000			-195,000,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	48,200,000	235,200,000		241,500,000	+6,300,000	+241,500,000
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps			900,000			-900,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	900,000	900,000		900,000		+900,000
	Operation and Maintenance, Air Force			190,000,000	44,900,000	+44,900,000	-145,100,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	141,500,000	130,200,000		173,000,000	+42,800,000	+173,000,000
	(By transfer)			(44,900,000)			(-44,900,000)

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
.....	Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	.....	.....	79,800,000	.....	.....	-79,800,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	79,800,000	79,800,000	.....	79,800,000	.....	+79,800,000
.....	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	.....
	Total, Operation and Maintenance	270,500,000	446,100,000	465,700,000	540,100,000	+94,000,000	+74,400,000
	Procurement						
.....	Other Procurement, Air Force	.....	.....	26,000,000	.....	.....	-26,000,000
104-179	Emergency appropriations	26,000,000	26,000,000	.....	26,000,000	.....	+26,000,000
	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
.....	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army (by transfer)	.....	.....	.....	(8,000,000)	(+8,000,000)	(+8,000,000)
.....	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	.....	.....	.....	10,000,000	+10,000,000	+10,000,000
.....	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	.....	.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	.....
	Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	.....	.....	50,000,000	60,000,000	+60,000,000	+10,000,000
	General Provisions						
104-179	Additional transfer authority (sec. 8001)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
	Total, Chapter VII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	582,500,000	782,500,000	827,700,000	924,900,000	+142,400,000	+97,200,000
	Appropriations	.....	.....	(827,700,000)	(104,900,000)	(+104,900,000)	(-722,800,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(582,500,000)	(782,500,000)	.....	(820,000,000)	(+37,500,000)	(+820,000,000)
	(Transfer authority)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
	(By transfer)	.....	.....	(59,900,000)	(23,000,000)	(+23,000,000)	(-36,900,000)
	CHAPTER VIII						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Federal Highway Administration						
104-183	Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund) (emergency appropriations)	267,000,000	267,000,000	267,000,000	267,000,000	.....	.....
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	33,000,000	33,000,000	+33,000,000	.....
	Federal Railroad Administration						
.....	Local rail freight assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	10,000,000	.....	.....	-10,000,000
	Federal Transit Administration						
104-183	Mass transit capital fund (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	(375,000,000)	.....	.....
	Total, Department of Transportation	267,000,000	267,000,000	310,000,000	300,000,000	+33,000,000	-10,000,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	Panama Canal Commission						
104-183	Panama Canal revolving fund (administrative expenses)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	.....	(2,000,000)	.....	(+2,000,000)
	Total, Chapter VIII:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	267,000,000	267,000,000	310,000,000	300,000,000	+33,000,000	-10,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(267,000,000)	(267,000,000)	(267,000,000)	(267,000,000)	.....	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	(43,000,000)	(33,000,000)	(+33,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
	CHAPTER IX						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
	Departmental Offices						
.....	Salaries and expenses (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	3,000,000	.....	.....	-3,000,000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
104-183	Office of National Drug Control Policy	3,400,000	.....	3,900,000	3,400,000	+3,400,000	-500,000
	Total, Chapter IX:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	3,400,000	.....	6,900,000	3,400,000	+3,400,000	-3,500,000
	Appropriations	(3,400,000)	.....	(3,900,000)	(3,400,000)	(+3,400,000)	(-500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	(3,000,000)	.....	.....	(-3,000,000)

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	CHAPTER X						
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Community Planning and Development						
.....	Community development grants (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	.....	100,000,000	50,000,000	+50,000,000	-50,000,000
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Federal Emergency Management Agency						
.....	Disaster relief (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	150,000,000	150,000,000	.....	-150,000,000	-150,000,000
	Disaster Assistance Direct Loan Program Account:						
104-183	Loan subsidy (emergency appropriations)	103,729,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
104-183	(Loan authorization)	(118,874,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	.....	(103,729,000)	(103,729,000)	(104,000,000)	(+271,000)	(+271,000)
	Total, Chapter X:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	103,729,000	150,000,000	250,000,000	50,000,000	-100,000,000	-200,000,000
	Emergency appropriations	(103,729,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(150,000,000)	(250,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(-100,000,000)	(-200,000,000)
	Total, title II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,796,729,000	1,881,600,000	2,281,014,000	2,124,714,000	+243,114,000	-156,300,000
	Appropriations	(143,400,000)	(70,000,000)	(901,600,000)	(193,300,000)	(+123,300,000)	(-708,300,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(1,584,329,000)	(1,641,600,000)	(838,100,000)	(1,655,600,000)	(+14,000,000)	(+817,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(69,000,000)	(170,000,000)	(541,314,000)	(275,814,000)	(+105,814,000)	(-265,500,000)
	(Transfer authority)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	.....	(103,729,000)	(103,729,000)	(104,000,000)	(+271,000)	(+271,000)
	(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(59,900,000)	(28,500,000)	(+23,000,000)	(-31,400,000)
	TITLE III - RESCISSIONS AND OFFSETS						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	U.S. Enrichment Corporation privatization	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
.....	Bonneville Power Administration refinancing	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	CHAPTER II						
	EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
.....	Limitation of program activity (rescission)	.....	-41,000,000	-25,000,000	-42,000,000	-1,000,000	-17,000,000
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
.....	Strategic Petroleum Reserve (offset)	.....	.....	-227,000,000	-227,000,000	-227,000,000	.....
	CHAPTER IV						
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Administration for Children and Families						
.....	Job opportunities and basic skills (JOBS) (offset)	.....	.....	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	-10,000,000	.....
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
.....	Student financial assistance (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-53,446,000	-53,446,000	-53,446,000
	Total, Chapter IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	-10,000,000	-63,446,000	-63,446,000	-53,446,000
	Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	(-53,446,000)	(-53,446,000)	(-53,446,000)
	Offsets	.....	.....	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)	.....
	CHAPTER V						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
.....	Military construction, Army (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-8,385,000	-8,385,000	-8,385,000
.....	Military construction, Navy (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-6,385,000	-6,385,000	-6,385,000
.....	Military construction, Air Force (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-6,385,000	-6,385,000	-6,385,000
.....	Military construction, Defense-Wide (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-18,345,000	-18,345,000	-18,345,000
	Total, Chapter V:						
	Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	-37,500,000	-37,500,000	-37,500,000
	CHAPTER VI						
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE						
	Procurement						
104-162	Missile Procurement, Air Force (rescission)	-310,000,000	-310,000,000	-310,000,000	-310,000,000	.....	.....
104-162	Other Procurement, Air Force (rescission)	-265,000,000	-265,000,000	-265,000,000	-265,000,000	.....	.....
	Total, Procurement	-575,000,000	-575,000,000	-575,000,000	-575,000,000	.....	.....

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation						
104-180	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army (rescission)	-19,500,000	-9,750,000	-7,000,000	-19,500,000	-9,750,000	-12,500,000
104-180	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (rescission)	-35,000,000	-17,500,000	-12,500,000	-45,000,000	-27,500,000	-32,500,000
104-180 104-162	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force (rescission)	-289,900,000	-267,450,000	-261,000,000	-314,800,000	-47,350,000	-53,800,000
104-180	Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide (rescission)	-40,600,000	-20,300,000	-14,500,000	-40,600,000	-20,300,000	-26,100,000
	Total, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	-385,000,000	-315,000,000	-295,000,000	-419,900,000	-104,900,000	-124,900,000
	Total, Chapter VI: Rescissions	-960,000,000	-890,000,000	-870,000,000	-994,900,000	-104,900,000	-124,900,000
	CHAPTER VII						
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION						
	Federal Aviation Administration						
.....	Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund): Rescission of contract authority	.....	.....	-664,000,000	-664,000,000	-664,000,000	.....
	Federal Highway Administration						
.....	Highway-related safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	.....	-9,000,000	-9,000,000	-9,000,000
.....	Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	.....	-33,000,000	-33,000,000	-33,000,000
	Total, Federal Highway Administration	.....	.....	.....	-42,000,000	-42,000,000	-42,000,000
	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration						
.....	Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authority)	.....	.....	.....	-56,000,000	-56,000,000	-56,000,000
	Total, Chapter VII: Rescissions of contract authority	.....	.....	-664,000,000	-762,000,000	-762,000,000	-98,000,000
	CHAPTER VIII						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	General Services Administration						
	Federal Buildings Fund: Limitations on availability of revenue:						
.....	Installment acquisition payments (rescission)	.....	.....	-3,500,000	-3,400,000	-3,400,000	+100,000
104-182	Repairs and alterations (rescission)	-3,500,000	.....	-200,000	.....	.....	+200,000
	Total, Federal Buildings Fund: Rescissions	-3,500,000	.....	-3,700,000	-3,400,000	-3,400,000	+300,000
.....	United States Tax Court (rescission)	.....	.....	-200,000	.....	.....	+200,000
	Total, Chapter VIII: Rescissions	-3,500,000	.....	-3,900,000	-3,400,000	-3,400,000	+500,000
	CHAPTER IX						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY						
	Federal Emergency Management Agency						
.....	Disaster relief (emergency rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-1,000,000,000	-1,000,000,000	-1,000,000,000
	CHAPTER X						
	DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY						
	Financial Management Service						
.....	Debt collection initiatives (offset)	.....	.....	-440,000,000	-540,000,000	-540,000,000	-100,000,000
	GENERAL PROVISIONS						
.....	Federal administrative and personal services expenses (rescission)	.....	.....	.....	-500,000,000	-500,000,000	-500,000,000
	Total, Chapter X:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	.....	-440,000,000	-1,040,000,000	-1,040,000,000	-600,000,000
	Rescissions	.....	.....	.....	(-500,000,000)	(-500,000,000)	(-500,000,000)
	Offsets	.....	.....	(-440,000,000)	(-540,000,000)	(-540,000,000)	(-100,000,000)

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Total, title III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	-963,500,000	-931,000,000	-2,239,900,000	-4,170,246,000	-3,239,246,000	-1,930,346,000
	Rescissions	(-963,500,000)	(-931,000,000)	(-898,900,000)	(-1,631,246,000)	(-700,246,000)	(-732,346,000)
	Offsets			(-677,000,000)	(-777,000,000)	(-777,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
	Rescissions of contract authority			(-664,000,000)	(-762,000,000)	(-762,000,000)	(-98,000,000)
	Emergency rescission				(-1,000,000,000)	(-1,000,000,000)	(-1,000,000,000)
	TITLE IV - CONTINGENT SUPPLEMENTAL						
	CHAPTER I						
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
	National Institute of Standards and Technology						
	Industrial technology services		100,000,000	235,000,000		-100,000,000	-235,000,000
	Technology Administration						
	Salaries and expenses			2,500,000			-2,500,000
	Total, Department of Commerce		100,000,000	237,500,000		-100,000,000	-237,500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE						
	Administration of Foreign Affairs						
	Security and maintenance of United States Missions			8,500,000			-8,500,000
	International Organizations and Conferences						
	Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment		158,000,000	223,000,000		-158,000,000	-223,000,000
	Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year assessment		200,000,000	215,000,000		-200,000,000	-215,000,000
	Total, Department of State		358,000,000	446,500,000		-358,000,000	-446,500,000
	RELATED AGENCY						
	Legal Services Corporation						
	Payment to the Legal Services Corporation			9,000,000			-9,000,000
	Total, Chapter I:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		458,000,000	693,000,000		-458,000,000	-693,000,000
	CHAPTER II						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
	Bureau of Land Management						
	Payment in lieu of taxes			12,500,000			-12,500,000
	National Park Service						
	Operation of the national park system			35,000,000			-35,000,000
	Bureau of Indian Affairs						
	Operation of Indian programs			35,000,000			-35,000,000
	Total, Department of the Interior			82,500,000			-82,500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
	Energy conservation			35,000,000			-35,000,000
	Total, Chapter II:						
	New budget (obligational) authority			117,500,000			-117,500,000
	CHAPTER III						
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR						
	Employment and Training Administration						
	Training and employment services		111,800,000			-111,800,000	
	Regular appropriations			1,213,300,000			-1,213,300,000
	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations		33,000,000			-33,000,000	
	Regular appropriations			18,000,000			-18,000,000
	Total, Employment and Training Administration		144,800,000	1,231,300,000		-144,800,000	-1,231,300,000
	Departmental Management						
	Salaries and expenses			12,000,000			-12,000,000
	Total, Department of Labor		144,800,000	1,243,300,000		-144,800,000	-1,243,300,000

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration						
	Substance abuse and mental health services		100,000,000	134,107,000		-100,000,000	-134,107,000
	Administration for Children and Families						
	Children and families services program (regular appropriations)			136,700,000			-136,700,000
	Health Resources and Services Administration						
	Program operations			55,256,000			-55,256,000
	Total, Department of Health and Human Services.		100,000,000	326,063,000		-100,000,000	-326,063,000
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
	Education reform		389,500,000			-389,500,000	
	(Advance appropriations, FY 1997)			151,000,000			-151,000,000
	Compensation education for the disadvantaged		961,000,000			-961,000,000	
	(Advance appropriations, FY 1997)			814,489,000			-814,489,000
	Vocational and adult education						
	(Advance appropriations, FY 1997)			82,750,000			-82,750,000
	School improvement programs		12,000,000			-12,000,000	
	(Advance appropriations, FY 1997)			208,000,000			-208,000,000
	Student financial assistance (regular appropriations)			90,000,000			-90,000,000
	Education research, statistics, and improvement		23,000,000			-23,000,000	
	(Advance appropriations, FY 1997)			10,000,000			-10,000,000
	Total, Department of Education		1,385,500,000	1,356,239,000		-1,385,500,000	-1,356,239,000
	Total, Chapter III:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		1,630,300,000	2,925,602,000		-1,630,300,000	-2,925,602,000
	Appropriations			(1,458,000,000)			(-1,458,000,000)
	Advance appropriations, FY 1997			(1,266,239,000)			(-1,266,239,000)
	Contingent appropriations		(1,630,300,000)	(201,363,000)		(-1,630,300,000)	(-201,363,000)
	CHAPTER IV						
	DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS						
	Departmental Administration						
	Construction, major projects		70,100,000	16,000,000		-70,100,000	-16,000,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
	Selected Housing Programs						
	Annual contributions for assisted housing		150,000,000	200,000,000		-150,000,000	-200,000,000
	Severely distressed public housing		220,000,000	120,000,000		-220,000,000	-120,000,000
	Payments for operation of low-income housing		50,000,000	50,000,000		-50,000,000	-50,000,000
	Total, Selected Housing Programs		420,000,000	370,000,000		-420,000,000	-370,000,000
	Management and Administration						
	Departmental restructuring fund			20,000,000			-20,000,000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development		420,000,000	390,000,000		-420,000,000	-390,000,000
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Community Development Financial Institutions						
	Community development financial institutions fund program account		25,000,000			-25,000,000	
	Corporation for National and Community Service						
	National and community service programs operating expenses		383,500,000			-383,500,000	
	Office of Inspector General		2,000,000			-2,000,000	
	Total, Corporation for National and Community Service		385,500,000			-385,500,000	
	Environmental Protection Agency						
	Environmental programs and management		150,000,000			-150,000,000	
	Buildings and facilities		50,000,000			-50,000,000	
	Hazardous substance superfund		100,000,000			-100,000,000	
	State and tribal assistance grants		3,500,000			-3,500,000	
	Total, Environmental Protection Agency		303,500,000			-303,500,000	

FY 1996 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS BILL, (H.R. 3019, TITLES II & III) — continued

Doc No.		Supplemental Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with House	Conference compared with Senate
	Executive Office of the President						
	Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality		500,000			-500,000	
	National Aeronautics and Space Administration						
	Space, aeronautics and technology			83,000,000			-83,000,000
	National Science Foundation						
	Research and related activities		40,000,000	40,000,000		-40,000,000	-40,000,000
	Total, Chapter IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		1,244,600,000	529,000,000		-1,244,600,000	-529,000,000
	Total, title IV:						
	New budget (obligational) authority		3,332,900,000	4,265,102,000		-3,332,900,000	-4,265,102,000
	Appropriations			(1,458,000,000)			(-1,458,000,000)
	Advance appropriations, FY 1997			(1,266,239,000)			(-1,266,239,000)
	Contingent appropriations		(3,332,900,000)	(1,540,863,000)		(-3,332,900,000)	(-1,540,863,000)
	TITLE V - ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES						
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
	Environmental Protection Agency						
	Environmental programs and management			87,000,000			-87,000,000
	Buildings and facilities			50,000,000			-50,000,000
	State and tribal assistance grants			300,000,000			-300,000,000
	Hazardous substance superfund			50,000,000			-50,000,000
	Total, title V:						
	New budget (obligational) authority			487,000,000			-487,000,000
	Grand total, all titles:						
	New budget (obligational) authority	833,229,000	4,283,500,000	4,793,216,000	-2,045,532,000	-6,329,032,000	-6,838,748,000
	Appropriations	(143,400,000)	(70,000,000)	(2,846,600,000)	(193,300,000)	(+123,300,000)	(-2,653,300,000)
	Rescissions	(-963,500,000)	(-931,000,000)	(-898,900,000)	(-1,631,246,000)	(-700,246,000)	(-732,346,000)
	Rescissions of contract authority			(-664,000,000)	(-762,000,000)	(-762,000,000)	(-98,000,000)
	Offsets			(-677,000,000)	(-777,000,000)	(-777,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
	Contingent appropriations		(3,332,900,000)	(1,540,863,000)		(-3,332,900,000)	(-1,540,863,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(1,584,329,000)	(1,641,600,000)	(838,100,000)	(1,655,600,000)	(+14,000,000)	(+817,500,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(69,000,000)	(170,000,000)	(541,314,000)	(275,814,000)	(+105,814,000)	(-265,500,000)
	Emergency rescission				(-1,000,000,000)	(-1,000,000,000)	(-1,000,000,000)
	Advance appropriations, FY 1997			(1,266,239,000)			(-1,266,239,000)
	(Transfer authority)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(700,000,000)	(-300,000,000)	(+400,000,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)		(103,729,000)	(103,729,000)	(104,000,000)	(+271,000)	(+271,000)
	(By transfer)	(5,500,000)	(5,500,000)	(59,900,000)	(28,500,000)	(+23,000,000)	(-31,400,000)

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this really is a very good day for this institution, and in my view it marks the end of a very dark period.

The House does not run the Government. We do not execute the laws or administer the programs of this Government, but we do play a central role in funding the activities and responsibilities of the Federal Government. That in fact is the core of the responsibility given to this institution by the Constitution.

I would say over the past year this House has failed to meet that responsibility to a degree that has no precedence in the history of the Republic. For more than 7 months, this House held most of the departments and agencies of this Government in a state of suspended animation. On two separate occasions it sent Federal workers—who by and large wanted to show up and do their jobs—it sent them home for what amounted to 27 days of forced vacations paid for at taxpayers expense.

This Congress drove numerous hardworking small businessmen to near the brink of bankruptcy because they had the misfortune of having significant contracts with the Federal Government that were screwed up by the mismanagement of this place. As a result, there have been significantly increased costs to the taxpayer for purchasing services from those vendors in the future.

This House, during that process, also denied services to millions of Americans who wanted passports or who wanted to visit national parks or who had become eligible for veterans' benefits that they were not permitted to receive.

Today, finally, we can say that that nonsense for the remainder of this year is over, and for that I am very grateful. There will be a lot of people who want to claim credit for that, but in my view the people who really deserve the credit are the American people, because they turned in to what were some very complex measures.

They began to realize that the budget that this Congress was insisting on was going to eliminate 40,000 title I teachers in school districts all across the country, teachers who would provide services to nearly a million kids, to help those kids learn to read and help those kids learn to deal with mathematics. The American people also came to realize that this Congress was trying to turn its back on the commitment that had been made to increase the number of cops on the beat by 100,000. They also found out that this Congress was trying to gut many enforcement rules to clean up the environment, and that these bills were being loaded up with special riders to help commercial interests to denigrate our environmental heritage for personal gain.

And they sent a loud and clear message to this body that that is not what we were sent here to do. So today finally we have before us a funding proposal for the Federal Government that is not a great proposal. There are many flaws in it, many defects, but I would point out nonetheless it is a reasonable proposal, in contrast to the appropriation bills which worked their way through here previously. It is one that in major respects is consistent with the direction in which the American people want to go.

It does save money. It saves the same $23 billion that were saved originally when the bills went through this House, but it saves that money in a far more fair way, in a far more balanced way. It protects the basic important activities that the public wants, the activities for which we in the minority have fought.

It is time to pass this plan and move on. Surely everyone by now should recognize this fact. What this bill does today, in contrast to the prior appropriation bills, is to demonstrate that we not only know the value of a tax dollar but we also understand the value of human beings.

This chart demonstrates that since January 1993 we have steadily been reducing the deficit. When President Bush left office, the deficit for that year was projected to be $327 billion. That dropped to $255 billion; to $202 billion for the following fiscal year; to $162 billion last year, and the process continues under the passage of this bill.

Two years ago, the last year that I chaired this committee, we cut 408 programs. We eliminated 40 programs. That was the first year in post-war history when discretionary outlays of the Federal Government actually went down.

That process is continuing, and we applaud that. But in the process, we have also been able to restore 92 percent of the money that was cut by this House originally for education. We have fully restored title I. We have fully restored Head Start. We have fully restored Safe and Drug-Free Schools. We have made healthy again the School-to-Work Program. We have increased the maximum Pell grant.

□ 1530

On the job training front, we have restored 90 percent of the cuts originally made by this House. In the area of worker protection, the 30-percent cut below 1995 which was originally provided for worker protections at the National Labor Relations Board has been reduced to a 3-percent cut. The cut of 15 percent for the enforcement of worker safety in OSHA has been cut to 2 percent. We have restored half of the reductions for the senior citizen job programs, like Green Thumb and Senior Aides. The Low Income Heating Assistance Program, which was eliminated by this House, has been restored to $900 million, plus $420 million in carry-over funds. Six of the seven environmental riders added by this Congress are gone. Fourteen of the seventeen riders that were attached to Education and Labor provisions in the bill are now gone, and the other three have been modified to suit the objections of the President and the minority. So this is a decent product.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], for having helped to finally achieve a bipartisan solution to this problem. He worked very hard and worked in a very bipartisan way, and I very much appreciate that.

I want to express my deep thanks to Senator BYRD and Senator HATFIELD. When you deal with those two gentlemen, as one member of my staff said, you know you are truly in the presence of people who are U.S. Senators and deserve to be thought of that way.

I would simply say in closing also that I hope that we will pass this legislation and move on with the passage of our appropriation bills for the next year in a way which will never again shut down the U.S. Government. That does not have to happen.

This legislation shows you can save money without ignoring the value of human beings, without ignoring the necessity to invest in human beings. It is a far less savage and far more civilized approach. I would urge support for the package.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by congratulating the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget for their great effort here. We have hit every target. A year ago the freshmen had some doubts as to whether we would get to all of these numbers. We have tracked them for over a year, and you have literally hit every target or are ahead of schedule. You deserve congratulations for that.

When we arrived here a year ago, 73 freshmen came in here, and what we found is this. We found a deficit line, this red line on the chart, that was at $200 billion and growing every year indefinitely into the future.

We took action. We passed a rescission bill, took $11 billion out. The appropriators went to work. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] gave them a number, and said $23 billion has to go. You have to come in $23 billion under the previous year, the first time in a generation this has been done. The appropriations did their job.

This is where we were by December, but we dared to dream. We dared to dream that we could restore the future of this Nation and get us on track. This green line is the track, the glidepath to a balanced budget. We dared to dream about balancing the budget to preserve our Nation for our children.

So we set a target for fiscal year 1996. That target was $157 billion. What happened? The markets looked at this and saw the struggles we went through, and the markets reacted. Exactly as Alan Greenspan predicted they would, the interest rates stayed down. When the interest rates stayed down, it left this picture. It left the graph and went into real life. Because when the interest rates stayed down, our young people could afford to buy houses and cars, and when our young people can afford to buy houses and cars, the logical next thing that happens is somebody has to build those houses and build those cars, and that is jobs and job opportunities for our young people. Folks, this is exactly how America is supposed to work.

But that was not the end of the story. When the markets reacted in that way and the appropriators fulfilled their commitment to our Nation, not only did we hit this target, you see, they were afraid, it was an election year, and other Congresses have been here, and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and Gramm-Rudman-Hollings II. But in this election year, this Congress not only did not fail, they hit their work, and they are actually $13 billion under what the projected deficit had to be in order for us to be on that glidepath.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for the future of this great Nation of ours.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Interior.

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

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I was a conferee on this conference. I did not sign the conference agreement because I am very strongly opposed to the bill. It is true that in many respects after the negotiations that have taken place over these last few days the bill is better than it was before the negotiations. But in my opinion, the bill is so bad it is not susceptible to correction.

For example, it badly hurts the Indian people, their health, their education. It hurts the national parks by taking money from essential construction and moving it over to operations. It hurts the national forests by increasing the timber cut, by building timber roads in ancient forests and jeopardizing habitat, wetlands, and environment. It sounds the death knell for the Endowments for the Acts and the Humanities. And by its use of sufficiency language in various paragraphs of the bill, it deprives the public from participating in the decisions that it would want to make in connection with the environment.

There are many other deficiencies in the bill. Time does not permit going into them.

A new tool has been added for legislation. There is a compromise that is based upon a phrase called the waiver. It is asserted that by exercising the waiver, the President can kill provisions that he finds unacceptable; for example, the provisions relating to the Tongass National Forest to which he had objected. This is a very strange provision. In effect, is it supposed to be a repealer of other provisions? Are the provisions supposed to stay in effect, even though they have been waived? To what extent is the waiver applicable? In whole or in part? Is it to be temporary or permanent? That is not clear.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the President makes it clear, makes it very clear, that he will use the waiver immediately to clear up all questions, and that when he signs the bill, he will also have documents present which waive the provisions to which he objects and lets it be known that this is his purpose.

At any rate, the President will have at hand the documents. I hope he uses them.

There is much more one may say against the bill. I oppose it, Mr. Speaker, and I will not vote for it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], a gentleman who has worked very long and very hard on one of the toughest subcommittee bills in the appropriations, perhaps the toughest, chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the chairman has done yeoman work on this bill. If a person could live one day in his shoes, they would understand how hard Members of this body work to carry out the responsibilities of their office. The chairman has done an absolutely marvelous job.

Under the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies portion of the bill, we began with spending for fiscal year 1995 of $70 billion in discretionary funds. We cut $28 billion in the rescission package last year and we cut an additional $2.6 billion in this package, for a total overall reduction of about $5.4 billion. This reduction represents an 8-percent reduction from the previous year.

That amount is less, Mr. Speaker, than the reduction in the original House passed version of H.R. 2127 which cut spending by 13 percent. This conference report, however, still represents one-quarter of all the savings in the nondefense discretionary accounts.

My section of the bill terminates 110 programs from the fiscal 1995 appropriation, not the 170 programs that the House passed version of H.R. 2127 terminated. Yet this conference report represents a substantial down payment on the elimination of wasteful, unnecessary, and high overhead programs. These services can be provided much more effectively and efficiently in broader State grant programs.

The bill also provides increases in some programs because our job, Mr. Speaker, is to set priorities. The conference agreement provides increases for biomedical research, for public health, for the Job Corps, for school-to-work, for AIDS health services, for childhood immunizations, for Head Start, for breast and cervical cancer screening, for infectious and sexually transmitted diseases and for Social Security Administration costs.

Although the conference report cuts 8 percent overall, level funding was provided for family planning and AIDS prevention. All of the block grant programs including substance abuse, mental health, child care and community services, were level funded. For title I—education for the disadvantaged, impact aid programs, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and special aid State grants the conference agreement provides level funding. With respect to student financial assistance, Mr. Speaker, we also level funded the TRIO and SEOG programs, as well as college work study. For Pell grants we provided the highest maximum grant award in the history of the program: to $2,470.

Our job is not just making cuts though, Mr. Speaker. That is the message of this omnibus bill. Of course, our job is to control spending, but our job also is to examine every single program in government to see whether it can be done in the private sector or by State and local government and to set priorities.

What this process means, Mr. Speaker, is better services for people, while bringing Federal spending under control. I commend the chairman for doing such a marvelous job. We have made great progress.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. Make no mistake about it; this legislation is far from perfect. For the VA/HUD title alone, this report represents a reduction of nearly $8 billion from the amounts provided in 1995 by the 103d Congress. Most of that reduction, or $5.5 billion is in programs of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that help the poorest and neediest of our citizens.

A comparison of the VA/HUD amounts and provisions in this conference report with those in the original House-passed bill, however, does reveal vast improvements. For example:

This conference report contains $1.6 billion more for the Environmental Protection Agency than the House bill, including $300 million more for the Superfund to clean up hazardous and

toxic wastes in our communities, and $1.2 billion more for wastewater and drinking water grants, money that will be used by local communities to build and improve their water purification; H.R. 3019 contains $200 million more for HUD's program to replace severely distressed public housing with smaller, more viable developments; it adds an additional $75 million to section 202 elderly and section 811 disabled housing programs; the report contains $400 million for the President's successful, Americorps Program, rather than termination as recommended by the House; it contains funding at or near the levels wanted by the administration for community development financial institutions [CDFI], the council on environmental quality [CEQ], and the Office of Consumer Affairs.

Virtually all of the environmentally damaging limitations on EPA's funding have been deleted, including a provision which would have removed EPA's ability to review and veto development permits which would be injurious to our fragile wetlands; the provision transferring enforcement of our Nation's fair housing laws from HUD to the Department of Justice has also been deleted.

Further, because of the Democrats' steadfast commitment to protecting children, hard working families and seniors, the bill contains a number of restorations in critical Labor-HHS-ED appropriations subcommittee budget accounts. The bill restores $625 million in funding for the summer jobs program. This means that over 500,000 low-income youth who want and need to work will have a job this summer. The summer jobs program had been proposed for elimination.

The restoration of $1.2 billion in title I means that teaching assistance in basic reading and math will be restored to over 1 million disadvantaged children, who would have been denied the opportunity to learn under the earlier version of the Republican budget.

The restoration of $900 million for low-income home energy assistance means that heating and cooling assistance will be restored to 6 million households. Without this restoration, these low-income families would have been forced to go without heat in the cold of winter, or cooling in summer's extreme heat.

The restoration of $250 million to the Dislocated Workers Program means that assistance can be provided to workers who have been laid off through no fault of their own.

These changes and many others make this legislation palatable, and I urge my colleagues to support it. The beneficiaries of this act will be the American people. Their voices have been heard. Their concerns about unreasonable reductions in education, worker protection, and environmental protection programs have been addressed. This bill does not do everything we would have liked, but it is a vast improvement over the original bill. Some critically important steps have been made in order for us to meet our obligations to improve the quality of life for the American people.

□ 1545

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

The President said that the era of big government is over when he addressed the House not long ago, and yet in many cases the President has not been true to his word. One example is the student loan program. Right now 40 percent of the student loan program is administered by the Federal Government, the other 60 by private lending institutions. Now the President has said he is going to veto this bill if 100 percent is not taken over by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, what does that mean? It means the cost to the taxpayers by the year 2002 will be 1½ billion dollars' more, $1 thousand 500 million more for student loans than it would be if we let the private sector handle it. And yet the President said he is against big government. He cannot be against big government and be for this program.

In addition, thousands of jobs in the private sector are going to be lost and put into the Department of Education to administer these student loan programs. If the President really believes in less government, he should believe in turning these loans, these student loans over to the private sector. The President's words ring hollow when he says the era of big government is over and then go for a program like this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and I appreciate his yielding. I want to thank and salute the gentleman and the chairman of the full committee for their tremendous work on this bill, especially in his efforts in this bill and the conference report to prevent unnecessary regulation and unintended consequences under the Endangered Species Act. Of specific concern right now is the proposed designation by the U.S. Fish Wildlife Service of critical habitat for the marbled murrelet.

I understand that it is the intent of the conferees, in the event that the Fish and Wildlife Service is required by court order to finalize the regulation, the service is to consider fully all the comments submitted during the review period, including the comments by private individuals and State agencies. Further, if the service cannot consider fully these comments, the service should notify the appropriate court and petition for an extension. Am I correct?

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RIGGS. Am I also correct, Mr. Chairman, that Congress intends, under this legislation, that the Fish and Wildlife Service protect the private property rights of parties affected by critical habitat designations by using Federal lands to the maximum extent possible, or by taking other actions to ameliorate the impacts on private property, such as memoranda of understanding with State agencies? Specifically, the California Resources Agency has filed comments on the proposed critical habitat designation asking for revisions to reflect a 1991 memorandum of understanding it has signed with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. REGULA. The gentleman is correct. If the critical habitat designation goes forward, the Congress expects the Fish and Wildlife Service to protect the rights of private property owners. The service should seek to ameliorate adverse impacts on private property by actions such as using Federal lands and by complying with agreements negotiated with the States, including provisions for the use of other public lands in the State to the maximum extent possible before private lands are used. That includes the 1991 memorandum of understanding with California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for participating in this colloquy.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, just to correct some impressions, the moratorium on OCS drilling and the moratorium on the issuance of mining patents is still part of this omnibus bill. There has been some thought that these were removed, but they are very much a part of the bill. So I want anyone that is concerned to be aware of that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for their hard work, perseverance, and endurance.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in grudging support of this budget deal.

This is not a great bill. It is certainly not the bill I would have written. But it is the best bill that Congress can pass this year.

We are at the end of a very long process that began over a year ago. From the very beginning it was clear that the Republican majority was determined to cut funding for vital education and environmental programs.

The bills that passed this house last year cut funds to our local schools by 16 percent, eliminated the Summer Jobs Program, and slashed the EPA by a third. Those bills would have reduced funding to New York City by Almost $600 million—or 18 percent. And when Bill Clinton refused to accept these draconian cuts NEWT GINGRICH deliberately shut the Government down—not once, but twice—in order to get his way.

Thankfully, the President stood his ground and forced the Republicans to compromise. Cuts, confrontation and shut down have failed. The President remained firm and won.

Let us pass this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and, of course, Mr. GINGRICH did not shut down the Government, that was the President.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to H.R. 3019. This bill brings to an end the fiscal year 1996 budget and appropriations cycle and in doing so cuts $23 billion over last year's levels and stays within our budget caps. Although I supported greater cuts in some areas, I am pleased that Republicans stuck to their guns and insisted that the downpayment on the 7-year balanced budget be made.

I am especially pleased that the Mount Graham provision remained in the bill. The Kolbe amendment is quite simple and will not have any adverse impact on the environment. The provision reaffirms Ninth Circuit Court Judge Hall's and U.S. Attorney Janet Napolitano's contention that the alternative site chosen by the Forest Service for the Large Binocular Telescope is in compliance with the authorizing legislation passed by Congress in 1988. Now that this issue is behind us, I anxiously await the beginning of construction of the world's largest ground based telescope.

Nonetheless, I am frustrated by the inclusion of moneys for the Community Oriented Policing Services [COPS] Program—the administration's bald attempt to tell State and local governments what they need to fight violent crime. Additionally, I oppose the continued funding for Goals 2000 even though Opportunity to Learn Standards and the National Education Standards and Improvement Council were eliminated.

Even more frustrating is the continuation of the direct lending program that will transfer lending authority for college loans from the private sector to the bureaucratic Education Department.

We have learned important lessons about this administration throughout the course of negotiating this bill. First, it is the administration—not Congress—that doesn't understand the art of compromise. I liken their negotiating skills to those of the losing team in backyard football—when up against a crushing offensive, they simply move the goalpost back a few yards. Congressional negotiators were often told an agreement had been reached and by the next morning, the resolved issues were back on the table—always with new items of disagreement. I know my friend Chairman REGULA had this happen to him numerous times.

The second lesson we have learned is that the administration talks about a balanced budget, but in reality they are unwilling to take the necessary steps to actually achieve one. As difficult as they were to negotiate with on discretionary programs, I am very concerned that as long as Congress has to deal with this administration, there is no hope of ever tackling the big budgetary issues that must be resolved in our mandatory programs.

But this conference report does take an important step toward balancing the budget by cutting discretionary spending.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

With respect to the comments just made about the President's program of cops on the beat, the President was very clear about this, and Mr. Panetta was very clear about this since the beginning of the negotiations. They wanted to make certain that when all of the dust settled we had sufficient funding to guarantee to local communities that we would be able to put 100,000 new cops on the street. That is exactly what he asked for from the beginning. He moved no goal posts, and that is exactly what he got in the end.

The President was steadfast on that issue, Mr. Panetta was insistent on it, just as they were on the other issues in the conference. We would not have a bill of this quality today without the insistence of the President and Mr. Panetta.

I certainly want to suggest that anybody who suggests that the White House changed what it wanted is dead wrong. They made clear they wanted 100,000 cops and that is what they got.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. He has done a great job with a very difficult subcommittee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for his kind words. The Balanced Budget downpayment Act II includes the modified text of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for 1996.

Members will recall that the conference agreement was adopted by the House on January 31 but not voted on by the other body primarily because of their opposition to a low income scholarship program. I deeply regret because of the other body's objections we had to delete that program. We were able to retain most of the other school reforms.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the District's financial management, we have included, under section 152, language that clarifies the duties of the District's chief financial officer. That position was established under the legislation that created the financial board. The clarifying language places the directors of the financial management offices as well as all other District Government executive branch accounting, budget and financial management personnel under the CFO's authority. All these individuals will be appointed by, serve at the pleasure of, and at the direction and control of the CFO.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, all the Federal funds have gone to the District, they have had those in the past, and I would urge strong support for this bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, there are several problems that remain with this conference agreement, some provisions that I do not support.

I rise, however, to speak about the good and positive parts—those parts that would not be in this agreement if Democrats had not fought for them.

Under the conference report, education funding will be $2.8 billion more than in the House-passed bill.

Title I funding, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and the Summer Jobs Program will be restored to 1995 levels. We have those programs, because Democrats fought for them.

The COPS Program will get $1.4 billion in funding, and we will have 100,000 new police officers on the street by the year 2000, because Democrats made the difference.

And, the Environmental Protection Agency is funded at $1.6 billion above the House-passed amount, because Democrats did not back down.

This conference agreement is 6 months late, and that is unfortunate, but the restoration of funding is right on time.

This conference agreement does not provide for the modest increase in the minimum wage that we have called for, but we will not quit until we reach that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a Democrat who stands up for the average American.

I am especially proud of the role that Democrats played, as the loyal opposition—keeping the faith, remaining true and constant, ever steady in insisting that we preserve and protect those programs and policies designed to keep America's priorities in balance as we balance our budget.

This conference report, which provides funding for the remainder of this fiscal year for the nine cabinet level departments, agencies and programs whose fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill have not yet been enacted into law, recognizes and respect our seniors, our young and working families in America.

The conference report provides a total of $382.6 billion—some $4.6 billion more than the House-passed bill.

Under the conference report, education funding will be $2.8 billion more than in the House-passed bill.

That additional funding will allow this Nation to concentrate more directly on preparing our children to compete in an increasingly competitive global market.

Title I funding, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and the Summer Jobs Program will be restored to 1995 levels.

That is good and positive.

LIHEAP, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, is funded by $900 million in 1996 and $420 million in 1997. Senior citizens will have comfortable homes because we did not waiver.

The COPS Program will get $1.4 billion in funding, and we will have 100,000 new police officers on the street by the year 2000, because Democrats made the difference.

And, the Environmental Protection Agency is funded at $1.6 billion above the House-passed amount.

In addition, all of the environmental riders, except one, have been dropped from the conference report or, at the very least, the President has been given waiver authority.

Thus, the air we breathe, the water we drink and the land upon which we live—God's most precious creations—have a better chance of being protected because we did not shrink from the budget battle.

Because many of the deepest cuts have been restored, it is my understanding that the President will sign this conference agreement.

Mr. Speaker, It is not easy to make noise while those who have the votes make policy.

But, the genius of the first amendment allows those of us in the Minority to challenge, to question and to offer alternative thought.

We did that, and because we did that, America will be a better place.

This conference agreement is 6 months late, and that is unfortunate, but the restoration of funding is right on time.

I intend to vote for this conference agreement.

I am proud to be a Democrat, and I am proud to be an American.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG] the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the conference committee that presents this conference report today, and one who participated in a lot of the activities, but who observed, even more than that, the activities of the leadership of the full committee, I want to first compliment the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman BOB LIVINGSTON, for the tremendous effort and the great amounts of time and the give and take that he had to work with, and the staff that worked with him during this whole process.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking Minority Member on the full committee. This is an honest compromise. It is a true compromise. Everybody is claiming victory. That is good. When everybody claims victory, it must be something pretty decent here.

I want to speak specifically to a very significant part of this conference report, and that is the provision of funding for the deployment of the American forces serving with such distinction in Bosnia.

In the beginning, we can all recall, there was a lot of difference of opinion as to whether or not we should send Americans to Bosnia, but that decision was made by the President and American troops went to Bosnia, and they have and they are continuing to conduct themselves in an extremely efficient and effective manner. In this bill is part of the funding to pay for that deployment, to pay for those troops being there.

So for those of us who really believe that we ought to support our troops no matter where they are, no matter what their mission is, this is the time to do it. Voting for this conference report is a vote to provide for the support and the funding for the American troops who have been sent to Bosnia on this mission.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

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

□ 1600

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the Omnibus Appropriations Act. Included in this measure is a bill I have worked on for more than a year now, the Debt Collection Improvement Act, which was introduced on August 4, 1995. This measure was drafted with the assistance and support of the administration, particularly the chief financial officers and the inspectors general.

As the bill proceeded through committee, it commanded widespread bipartisan support. The gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] and professional staff member Mark Guiton were also helpful. Among the majority staff of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, professional staff member Mark Brasher and staff director Russell George were the key staff on this legislation. My thanks go to all of the leadership staff and those on the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight who have been helpful.

This measure marks a long overdue beginning of our efforts to collect delinquent debts which now are in the tens off billions—over $100 billion to be precise. This is a victory for the taxpayers of America. When this bill is implemented by the agencies, the Federal Government will find that its rising tide of delinquent debts can be stemmed.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following statement in report format which clarifies the legislative intent:

DEBT COLLECTION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1995

This bill enhances Government-wide debt collection activities by adding a new offset authority to 31 U.S.C. 3716; by creating a new exception to the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a); by revising the salary offset authority at 5 U.S.C. 5514; by requiring agencies to obtain taxpayer identifying numbers; by permitting the reporting of non-delinquent consumer debt to credit bureaus; by adding a new subsection to 31 U.S.C. 3711 that allows the Department of the Treasury and other agencies to cross-service the debts of other agencies; by extending the authority of agencies to compromise claims; by permitting agencies to garnish the wages of delinquent debtors; by permitting agencies additional authority to sell delinquent debts; by revising the Federal Civil Monetary Penalties Act of 1990 to require adjustments for inflation every four years; by adding a new section to title 31, United States Code, that allows agencies to retain a portion of annual collections of delinquent debts; by expanding tax refund offset authority; by requiring that disbursements are conducted electronically; by requiring that disbursements are associated with a taxpayer identification number; by revising definitions at 31 U.S.C. 3701 to broaden the scope of the general debt collection procedures; by providing for monitoring and reporting on debt collection centers; and by giving the Attorney General permanent authority to contract with private counsel to collect delinquent non-tax civil debt.

The debt collection authorities created under this bill will enhance the cooperation of Federal agencies in collecting Federal debt, by providing centralized administrative offset and cross-servicing authority. It is intended that the Department of the Treasury will act as the coordinator of Government-wide debt collection activities, providing a mechanism for effective administrative offset and acting as a clearinghouse to assure that Federal debts are collected in a timely and efficient manner.

PART I—GENERAL DEBT COLLECTION INITIATIVES

General offset authority

Short Title:

Effective Date:

Purposes:

Expansion of Administrative Offset Authority:

This section amends various sections in chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code, to cover judicial agencies and instrumentalities. Currently, these sections only apply to executive and legislative departments, agencies, and instrumentalities.

Enhancement of Administrative Offset Authority

This section would create additional authority for conducting Government-wide Administrative Offset at the Financial Management Service of the Department of the Treasury. Under this authority, Federal payment files would be matched against Federal debtor files to determine whether any debtors were receiving payments. Those payments would be subject to offset to satisfy any Federal non-tax debt or claim owed by the debtor.

Subsection (a) amends the application of administrative offset authority under 31 U.S.C. 3716 and the requirements for charging interest and penalties on claims pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3717 to include debts owed to the United States by States and units of general local government.

Subsection (b)(1) amends 31 U.S.C. 3716 to allow Federal agencies to choose between adopting, without change, regulations promulgated by the Department of Justice, the General Accounting Office or the Department of The Treasury or promulgating their own administrative offset regulations consistent with those regulations.

Subsection (b)(2) expands the application of administrative offset to every instance except where a statute explicitly prohibits the use of administrative ''offset'' or ''setoff'' for collection purposes. This should increase the funds available for offset from which delinquent claims may be offset.

Subsection (b)(3), renumbers certain sections.

Subsection (b)(4), amends 31 U.S.C. 3716 by adding a new subsection (c). This paragraph statutorily requires disbursing officials of the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Defense, the United States Postal Service or disbursing officials designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to offset payments made by the United States to pay delinquent claims certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by creditor agencies in accordance with requirements issued by the Secretary. This paragraph enhances administrative offset authority contained in 31 U.S.C. 3716 by providing for centralized administrative offset at the disbursing official level. Currently, administrative offset is not conducted centrally within the Federal Government and is not effectively used. Disbursing officials of the Department of Defense and the United States Postal Service and other disbursing officials at any other Federal agencies will match their certification records with the debtor records reported to the Secretary of the Treasury by creditor agencies, in order to avoid duplicative reporting by creditor agencies to disbursing agencies, and assure that payments are intercepted.

Congress intends to include all eligible government payments in this centralized offset program, including the payments of all government corporations. Congress is concerned at the growing trend of fragmentation of disbursing authority, and support centralized coordination for the purpose of collecting debts and conducting offsets. Congress notes that because debt has been referred to the Department of the Treasury for offset does not necessarily mean that other debt collection tools (such as the use of private collection agencies or wage garnishment) should not be employed. The use of private collection agencies is long overdue. Agencies should use all cost-effective tools available to them to maximize the collection of delinquent debts.

Under subsection 3716(c)(4), the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to charge a fee to cover the cost of conducting administrative offsets under this subsection, and to deposit fees collected to a fund to be determined by the Secretary. It is the intent of Congress that the fee will be collected from the proceeds recovered through offset and the amount charged to each agency be apportioned according to actual offsets. See fees should be considered costs of collections and should be borne by the debtor.

Section 3716(a)(5), authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with affected agencies, to issue regulations and procedures to implement the administrative offset authority. These regulations will include a provision for dealing with the potential of simultaneous offsets involving tax refunds under 31 U.S.C. 3720A and salary offsets under 5 U.S.C. 5514.

Section 3716(c)(6) provides that any Federal agency which is owed a legally enforceable past due debt more than 180 days shall notify the Secretary of the Treasury of the debt for the purpose of conducting administrative offset.

Section 3716(c)(7) requires that the payee receive the applicable offset notification.

Section 3716(c)(8) makes it clear that tax levies shall have a priority in collection from disbursements to be made over requests for offset received from other agencies.

Section 3716(d) clarifies that the Debt Collection Improvement Act is not intended to prohibit the use of any existing authority to perform administrative offset under statute or common law.

Subsection (c) revises section 3701(a) of title 31, United States Code, to define ''non-tax debt or claim'' for the purposes of claims collection. The definition clarifies that claims arising under the tariff laws of the United States are considered non-tax claims.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to offset amounts payable by the Federal Reserve to banks which have wrongfully negotiated forged or fraudulent Treasury checks.

Exemption From Computer Matching Requirements Under the Privacy Act of 1974

This section exempts matches conducted for the purposes of administrative offset under 31 U.S.C. 3716 from certain provisions of the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988, as amended. This section would permit offsets, and eliminate duplicative due process notifications, as well as duplicative actions by agency Data Integrity Boards.

Use of Administrative Offset Authority for Debts to States

This section authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into agreements for conducting reciprocal offset agreements with a State. The Secretary has broad discretion with regards to the terms of any reciprocal offset agreement. Congress believes that intergovernmental cooperation is in the best interest of the United States, and that Treasury participation in a program of intergovernmental offset is very important. Congress intends that such agreements will allow States to report the debts of any State agency or instrumentality, and any legally constituted local subdivision or local government within the State.

Congress does not intend to apply Federal resources to the collection of debts with very small denominations, or to those where the debtor has not been given any applicable due process rights. In addition, the Secretary of the Treasury should ensure that the reciprocal offset agreements authorized by this section protect the financial interests of the United States. Congress anticipates that Federal agencies will offset State debts in which there is no Federal interest or Federal/State cost-sharing (such as State tax debts). Similarly, Congress anticipates that States will offset Federal debts in which there is no State financial interest or Federal/State cost-sharing (such as debts owed to the Customs Service). It is the intent of Congress that the agreement be broadly in the mutual interests of Federal, State and local government.

Technical and Conforming Amendments

Subsection (a) makes several technical changes to title 31, United States Code.

Subsection (b) amends 26 U.S.C. 6103 to allow disclosure of taxpayer information to the Financial Management Service for the purpose of conducting offsets of tax refunds. This change allows the tax refund offset program to be implemented at the time of disbursement, and permits the Secretary of the Treasury to consolidate its non-tax debt offset programs.

Enhancement of salary offset authority

Enhancement of Salary Offset Authority

This section enhances current Federal salary offset authority by expanding agency coverage and by establishing annual matching requirements. Congress believes that employees of the Federal Government should be held to an exemplary standard and pay debts owed to the Federal Government. This section makes Federal salary offset mandatory.

Section 5514(1)(A) amends 5 U.S.C. 5514(a)(1) by adding new language requiring all Federal agencies to participate in computer matches of delinquent debtor files against Federal employee records at least annually. This provision requires the Secretary of the Treasury to establish and maintain a consortium to implement centralized salary offset computer matching, and to promulgate regulations for that purpose.

Section 5514(1)(B) and (C) facilitate the collection of debts by salary offset by exempting routine adjustments from the extensive and costly due process protections of section 5514.

Taxpayer identifying numbers

Access to Debtor Information

This section amends section 4 of the Debt Collection Act of 1982 by requiring agencies to obtain taxpayer identifying numbers from all individuals and entities doing business with the Federal Government to facilitate the collection of any receivables which arise as the result of that business relationship. This section defines what relationships are considered ''doing business with'' the Federal Government and requires agencies to disclose the purpose of their request for taxpayer identifying numbers. The taxpayer identifying numbers are needed to facilitate the collection of delinquent debts. Creditor agencies are authorized to verify the accuracy of their debtor records with records from the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Labor. It is the intent of Congress that creditor agencies have access to all relevant records at those agencies, including any delinquent parent locator service and unemployment insurance records.

Barring Delinquent Debtors From Obtaining Federal Loans or Loan Guarantees

This section would bar debtors who are delinquent on Federal non-tax claims from receiving financial assistance in the form of a Federal direct loan or a loan guarantee. The intent of this section is to provide authority to Federal agencies which administer credit programs to refuse to approve credit to parties who are delinquent on Federal claims to resolve their debts with the appropriate agency.

Congress also considered extending this debarment provision to other forms of assistance given to debtors. Agencies, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, should examine additional benefits, such as discretionary grants or non-mandatory benefits, which could feasibly be denied to debtors. Congress is pleased with the level of success attained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service's [INS] collection of inspection fees and the aggressiveness with which INS has pursued debtors by denying inspection services to airlines which are delinquent in the payment of certain fees owed to the INS. Congress is concerned with the growing delinquencies at the Customs Service, and note disapprovingly that the Customs Service has not responded to this situation by exercising authority to deny entry and inspection to vessels whose owners are also delinquent debtors. The Office of Management and Budget should direct the Customs Service to use these additional tools to collect debts owed to the Federal Government.

Expansion and enhancement of collection authorities

Disclosure to Consumer Reporting Agencies and Commercial Reporting Agencies

Congress notes the success that the Department of Education has achieved with the reporting of delinquent loans to consumer reporting agencies. This section would allow

agencies to conform to private sector practice by also reporting current loans to consumer reporting agencies. This will promote better credit information and good credit risks, and especially help recently-graduated students entering the workplace for the first time.

Subsection (1) amends the credit bureau reporting authority contained in 31 U.S.C. 3711(f) by requiring agencies to report delinquent debts.

Subsections (2) and (3) make conforming amendments to allow commercial debts to be reported to commercial reporting agencies.

Subsection (4) requires agencies to require that any participating lender in a guaranteed loan program provides information relating to the extension of credit to credit reporting bureaus. Congress is concerned that some agencies do not comply with the existing guidance in OMB Circular A–129. In particular, the Department of Housing and Urban Development does not refer claims for assigned multifamily mortgages to credit reporting bureaus; the Departments of Agriculture and Veterans Affairs does not report nor require lending institutions to report guaranteed loans to credit reporting bureaus. Congress intends this section to fix this deficiency, and that agencies will comply.

Subsection (4) also allows the head of an agency to report claims to a credit reporting agency which are current in payment. This change allows Federal credit reporting to be more consistent with private sector practice, and debtors whose accounts are current with the Federal Government shall receive the benefit of having favorable information provided to credit bureaus.

Contracts for Collection Services

This section permits agencies to contract with persons to locate and recover assets and pay for such services out of the proceeds that are recovered. The intent is to permit agencies to pay ''finders fees'' to persons who locate and recover assets of the United States the existence of or location of which is unknown to the applicable Federal Government agency.

Congress notes that the U.S. Marshals Service provides asset locator services for U.S. Attorneys in connection with debt litigation, and is very successful at this task. Congress further notes that this essential service is hampered by limits on Full-Time Equivalents imposed by the Federal Workforce Restructuring Act (FWRA) and a reliable funding source. In view of this essential service, Congress believes that the Director of the Office of Management and Budget should grant a waiver to the FWRA and associated Executive orders and that the Secretary of the Treasury should consider using the existing expertise in the U.S. Marshals Service in providing skip-tracing services to supplement any private persons obtaining contracts under this section.

Cross-Servicing Partnerships and Centralization of Debt Collection Activities in the Department of the Treasury

Subsection (a) amends 31 U.S.C. 3711 by creating new subsections (g) and (h).

Section 3711(g)(1) requires the heads of executive, legislative or judicial agencies to refer non-tax claims owed to the Department of the Treasury for servicing, collection, compromise or write off. The intent of this section is to improve the debt management performance of the United States by establishing a centralized cross-servicing mechanism wherein Federal agencies that do not have the expertise, personnel, or funding to implement effective claims collection policies on their own can use the services of Federal agencies that have effective claims collection processes. This section provides the referred to transferred non-tax claims will be administered by the debt collection centers consistent with existing statutory requirements and authorities.

The Debt Collection Improvement Act, through its cross-servicing provision, provides independent authority for all Federal non-tax debt to be collected by those Federal agencies that are proficient in debt collection and have been designated as debt collection centers. Agencies which currently run large debt collection operations and should be considered for designation as debt collection centers by the Secretary of the Treasury include the Department of Veterans' Affairs, the Small Business Administration, the Department of Education and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Each agency remains responsible for managing an effective debt collection program and to use effective debt collection tools, such as private collection contractors, debt collection centers, and litigation through the Department of Justice. Consistent with other initiatives in the Debt Collection Improvement Act, general oversight and operational responsibility for cross-servicing and effective debt collection has been delegated to the Department of the Treasury.

Section 3711(g)(2) describes exemptions to the requirement that agencies transfer debts to the Department of the Treasury under Section 3711(g)(1). Congress carefully structured these exemptions so that exemptions will only apply to those debts associated with a demonstrated repayment source. Congress believes the Secretary of the Treasury should exempt from transfer under this section collateralized obligations of the Government National Mortgage Association. Congress cautions the Secretary of the Treasury with liberal use of the Secretary's discretion in exemption claims from the transfer requirement, and note that the Secretary is responsible for government-wide debt collection. The exemption from this requirement should only be provided when it is demonstrated that an exemption is the best means to protect the Federal Government's financial interest in collecting the delinquent debt or claim.

Section 3711(g)(3) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to designate debt collection centers. It is anticipated that the Secretary of the Treasury shall monitor the performance of these centers, since ultimately, the Secretary is responsible for the work they perform. A debt collection center's degree of success, which is the basis of their designation as a debt collection center, may be dependent upon the type of claim referred to the center. In order to fairly establish a performance baseline, the Secretary should examine collection success of similar types and maturities of debts at private collection agencies and at other Federal agencies.

Section 3711(g)(4) authorizes the referral of debts by the Secretary of the Treasury to a debt collection center, a private collection agency, or to the Department of Justice. In referring debts to private collection agencies, the Congress has purposely given latitude to the Secretary of the Treasury to determine the most appropriate private collection agent. Debts may be referred to a private debt collector, collection agency or commercial attorney. This subsection does not authorize a commercial attorney to represent the Federal Government in a litigation action in the absence of supervision of the Department of Justice.

Section 3711(g)(5) describes the authorities and responsibilities of the Secretary of the Treasury with regards to debt collection. It is the intent of Congress to give contracting authority for the purposes of debt collection to the Secretary of the Treasury broadly similar to that given to the Department of Education. Congress commends the Department of Education for the steps it has taken to rely successfully on the expertise of private collection contractors, and would like to see similar success at the Department of the Treasury and at the Internal Revenue Service in particular.

Section 3711(g)(6) and (7) authorize the executive department or agency operating a debt collection center to charge a fee to cover costs of program implementation, and provide that fees may be collected from recoveries. Congress intends to give agencies authority to pay debt collection centers and contractors from collection proceeds, and that costs of recovery shall be borne by the debtor.

Section 3711(g)(8) requires that amounts collected as fees which are not needed for debt collection purposes in the fiscal year shall be deposited into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Section 3711(g)(9) requires that agencies take appropriate steps in the collection process to collect delinquent debts prior to write-off or discharge, including administrative offset, tax refund offset, Federal salary offset, referral to private collection contractors or agency debt collection centers, credit bureau reporting, wage garnishment and litigation or foreclosure.

Under Section 3711(g)(10) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue regulations and procedures to implement this subsection.

Section 3711(h) authorizes agencies to employ a consumer report to evaluate collection efforts with respect to an individual. Such data can be particularly helpful in evaluating whether to terminate collection action and determine repayment schedules. Agencies should develop policies on when the use of a credit report is appropriate based on its cost and potential benefit.

Subsection (b) creates a new procedure whereby agencies may, in lieu of filing a return required under Section 6050P of the Internal Revenue Code, provide to the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, the data necessary to accomplish this task. It is anticipated that the Financial Management Service will perform this task for the Secretary of the Treasury. Congress is concerned about the problem of inadequate reporting to the Internal Revenue Service related to discharges of indebtedness. The Office of Management and Budget, with the assistance of the Department of the Treasury, should monitor agencies to ensure compliance with the requirements of Section 6050P.

Compromise of Claims

This section clarifies that the increased authority of a head of an agency to compromise a claim under 31 U.S.C. 3711(a)(2) contained in the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act is a permanent authority and is not subject to the sunset provision contained in that Act.

Wage Garnishment Requirement

This section authorizes agencies to garnish administratively the wages of delinquent debtors. It is the intent of Congress that every debtor that has a job or income should be in a repayment schedule. The Congress considered making this a mandatory tool, and agencies should consider aggressive use of wage garnishment to compel repayment of delinquent debts. The section also describes the procedures that an agency must follow to administratively garnish a debtor's wages, including a description of the debtor's due process rights and limitations on agency authority.

Debt Sales by Agencies

This section amends 31 U.S.C. 3711 to include a new subsection (h)(1) authorizing

sales of debts delinquent for more than 90 days. It is the intent of Congress to increase debt sales where appropriate. Debt sales are an appropriate collection tool which results in the privatization of the liability for a debt and the costs of collection. Congress is impressed with the results of loan sales at the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This example should be followed by other Federal agencies which lack the administrative capacity to manage their large portfolio of distressed properties.

Section 3711(h)(2) requires that delinquent debts be sold if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that such sales would be in the best interest of the United States. It is the intent of Congress that, to the greatest extent possible, prior to terminating collection action, agencies should sell delinquent debts in order to realize at least some amount of the delinquent receivable.

Section 3711(h)(3) describes the conditions of sale for debts. It is the intent of Congress that agencies should be able to sell debts while retaining some portion of equity participation in the collection of the delinquent debt. This form of structured security (sometimes referred to as a joint venture between an agency and another person) allows agencies to obtain income as well as the possibly of future payments. Congress encourages agencies to employ the collection tool that maximizes repayments.

Section 3711(h)(4) requires agencies to develop an inventory of loan assets. Congress intends to use this information to evaluate the results of collections and loan sales. The successful loan sales at HUD resulted in receipts far in excess of the proceeds anticipated under the Federal Credit Reform Act. Agencies should consider the results of these valuations and compare them against collections.

To assure that agencies use the most economically effective means in collecting delinquent debt, agencies contemplating the sale of unsecured debt should prepare a cost-benefit analysis comparing the benefits of immediate sale to collection using other debt collection tools, including administrative offset, transfer to the Department of the Treasury and use of private collection agencies.

Adjustments of Administrative Debt

This section allows agencies to simplify the complicated series of fines, interest and penalties required under 31 U.S.C. 3717. Congress views the requirement to charge interest and penalties with great seriousness. The disappointing performance of nearly every agency, with the exception of the Department of Education, in assessing and collecting these amounts should be improved. Congress directs agencies to comply with the law, and for OMB to ensure that this requirement is met.

The intent of this section is to allow agencies option to combine these fines and penalties into a single, easy assess charge. Congress is aware of the inadequate systems agencies face in assessing these amounts. Agencies that lack the technical accounting expertise to comply with 31 U.S.C. 3717 should privatize the management of their credit portfolio. the Department of Agriculture should rely on the expertise of private contractors to improve the dismal collection performance of its portfolio of farmers' home loans.

Dissemination of Information Regarding Identity of Delinquent Debtors

This section authorizes agencies to publicize the identity of delinquent debtors to help collect debts. Congress notes the success of the Public Health Service's program regarding dissemination of the identity of doctors delinquent in the repayment of medical school loans. The head of other agencies should seek to replicate this success, and make this tool more widely known among the debtor population. Congress recognizes that this is a powerful enforcement tool and urges judicious use.

Federal civil monetary penalties

Adjusting Federal Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation

Subsection (a) amends section 4 of the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990 to require agencies to make an initial adjustment of such penalties within 180 days of the enactment of this bill, and also requires agencies to make additional adjustments at least once every four years.

Subsection (b) limits the amount of the initial adjustment to ten percent of the amount of the penalty prior to such adjustment.

Gain sharing

Debt Collecting Improvement Account

Subsection (a) of this section creates a new section 3720C in Title 31, United States Code.

Section 3720C(a) establishes an account in the Treasury entitled the ''Debt Collection Improvement Account'' (''Account''). The Department of the Treasury shall maintain and manage the Account.

Section 3720C(b) provides that agencies collecting delinquent claims may transfer into the Account five percent of the delinquent debt collected during any fiscal year beyond a baseline established for the prior fiscal year. The Office of Management and Budget shall determine the baseline from which increased collections are measured over the prior year, taking into account the recommendations made by the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with credit agencies.

Section 3720C(c) provides that the amount available for expenditure in any fiscal year will be available for certain purposes designed to improve debt collection, financial management or asset disposition. Section 3720C(c) also provides that the amount available to the agency will be in proportion to amounts transferred to the account.

Section 3720C(d) modifies the treatment of amounts credited to the Account that are subject to the requirements of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990. That Act requires that collections for direct loans and loan guarantees made since 1991 be credited to a financing account and included in the cash flows used to calculate the subsidy cost of the credit program. This section provides that collections that are credited to the Account will not be included in the subsidy cost calculation in order to avoid counting them both in the cost calculation and on a cash basis.

Section 3720C(e) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue regulations and procedures to implement this section.

Tax refund offset authority

Expanding Tax Refund Offset Authority

Subsections (a) and (b) change the exclusion of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) by authorizing the TVA to use tax refund offset.

Expanding Authority To Collect Past-Due Support

This section allows the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to choose between using the tax refund offset authorities of either 31 U.S.C. 3720A or 42 U.S.C. 664 to collect past-due child support. This change in Section 3720A of title 31 is not intended in any way to hinder, restrict, or add any additional requirements to the collection of past-due support under 42 U.S.C. 664.

Offset of Tax Refund Payments by Disbursing Officials

This section allows the Secretary of the Treasury to implement the tax refund offset program through the disbursing official of the Department of the Treasury (i.e., the Financial Management Service). This will allow for more efficient operations, as the Financial Management Service also operates the administrative offset program. By merging these two offset programs, the Department of the Treasury will streamline and improve its operations.

It is the intent of Congress that the Financial Management Service should perform both the tax refund offset and the administrative offset programs. This legislation makes changes in those two programs so that their administrative requirements are broadly similar, and can be performed by the same entity, the Financial Management Service. This change will allow the Internal Revenue Service to focus its efforts on other management problems identified by it and Congress. Congress intends that the Internal Revenue Service will transfer the operation of the tax refund offset program to the Financial Management Service.

Disbursements

Payments

Subsection (a) mandates that all Federal payments to individuals who become eligible for that type of payment after 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act shall be made by electronic funds transfer. Further, individuals already receiving payments will begin to receive those payments electronically after 1999. This section will facilitate offset and improve audits associated with counterfeit, stolen, forged and fraudulent checks.

Since this section will require participating beneficiaries to obtain a bank account, Congress expects the Secretary of the Treasury to work vigorously to accommodate the needs of the unbanked recipients through such means as: (1) the planned implementation of a national electronic benefits transfer system for Federal payments through the designation of depositaries and financial agents under the Secretary's existing authority. Under this program, recipients will receive all benefit payments under a single access card; (2) implement through the private sector consumer owned bank accounts where recipients access their funds by debit card or other means, rather than through traditional account features, such as checking. This product is known as Direct Deposit Too and is an extension of the Treasury's Direct Deposit Program; (3) intensive marketing of the Treasury's existing Direct Deposit Program for both individuals and businesses; and (4) other forms of electronic benefits transfer. The Financial Management Service should evaluate several recent pilots, including its Direct Deposit Too and various state pilots, to determine the best mechanism for benefit delivery.

The Secretary of the Treasury is given broad discretion to waive the requirements of this section to avoid imposing a hardship on a beneficiary. Congress expects the Department of the Treasury to promulgate regulations addressing such hardship waivers and to consider various factors in defining hardship. Congress recognizes that adherence to these provisions may be difficult for a variety of beneficiaries. We are concerned that individuals who have geographical, physical, mental, educational, or language barriers or as a result of natural or environmental disasters will not be able to receive benefits. Recipients in this category includes small businesses as well as individuals. Waivers should be provided in order to minimize disruptions to any beneficiary. Additionally,

the Secretary of the Treasury may waive this section for recipients who reside in a country where delivery of an electronic payment is impractical.

The Congress further directs the disbursing official to study the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of those who currently do not have direct deposit and determine how best to increase usage among all groups. The Congress further directs the disbursing official to study the adequacy of consumer protections available to individuals who are required to obtain a bank account under this section.

The exclusion of the application of this section to tax refunds is to allow time for development of the necessary infrastructure for making these electronic payments. However, the Secretary of the Treasury should, to the maximum extent possible, implement a system to disburse tax refunds electronically and conduct demonstrations of other electronic technologies to maximum outreach to recipients.

Subsections (b) and (c) allow the Secretary of the Treasury to issue substitute checks to repay Federal recipients whose checks have been stolen, forged or fraudulently cashed. The Check Forgery Insurance Fund provision would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a flexible procedure for facilitating the timely payment of forged Government checks by providing a permanent and indefinite appropriation which would ensure readily available funds to provide innocent payees with replacement checks in a timely manner. It enables the Department of the Treasury to comply with two decisions of the Comptroller General Decision B–242666, dated August 31, 1993 and B–243536, dated September 7, 1993. These decisions concluded that the Check Forgery Insurance Fund Act (31 U.S.C. 3343) requires that the Department of the Treasury certify all checks issued to replace those checks paid over forged endorsements and charged to the Fund.

The Congress recognizes that many payees rely on these payments for their basic subsistence and seeks assurance that claimants receive checks in a timely manner; the prospect of payees not receiving timely replacement payments is unacceptable to Congress. Congress notes the importance of the timely issuance of replacement checks, and that such replacement checks should not be contingent upon the Government's ability to recover the original forged check. Congress also notes that in the case of an innocent payee whose check has been forged, the Government's obligation to pay remains outstanding. This provisions would provide an equitable solution for payees and disbursing and program agencies, by resolving current inequities inherent in the current process of payment of checks bearing forged or unauthorized endorsements.

Requirement To Include Taxpayer Identifying Number With Payment Voucher

This section requires that Federal agencies include a taxpayer identifying number when a payment is made. This requirement will facilitate offset and increase collections. Congress directs the disbursing official of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Department of Defense to survey agency compliance with this section and include the results of this survey in the consolidated debt collection report to Congress required under Section 1692 of this Act.

Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous Amendments to Definitions

Subsection (1) revises the definitions for ''administrative offset'' and ''claim'' under 31 U.S.C. 3701 (a)(1) and (b). These changes permit offsets of payments for the collection of debts administered by States such as debts which contain a Federal monetary component (e.g., AFDC overpayments due to fraud) and delinquent child support obligations. The definition of ''claim'' also includes amounts which the United States collects for the benefit of any person under statutory authority.

In addition, the definition of debt has been amended to include deficiency payments. Federal authority to collect deficiencies has been upheld based on provisions of Federal law preempting State laws governing mortgage debt (in all but a few narrow circumstances). This authority has been upheld by numerous court decisions (including *Connelly v. Derwinski*, 961 F.2d 129, 131; *United States v. Shimer*, 367 U.S. 374, 387; and *Burris v. First Financial Corp.*, 928 F.2d 797, 800–801).

The Congress is concerned that agencies have not established deficiencies as debt consistently. The Federal Housing Administration uniformly establishes as debt and collects deficiencies only in its Title I program. Congress is concerned that debtors under FHA's other loan programs are receiving different treatment. Deficiencies should be established in all cases.

Congress is also concerned that agencies do not monitor the unpaid share of any non-Federal partner in a program involving a matching, or cost-sharing, payment by the non-Federal partner. According to the General Accounting Office, the non-payment of these types of matching payments has become more common. Congress is concerned about this trend, and wants to see those amounts collected.

This section also adds specific definitions applicable to administrative offsets under 31 U.S.C. 3716 for creditor agencies and payment certifying agencies.

Monitoring and Reporting

Subsection (a) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to provide guidelines to monitor the performance of debt collection activities, in consultation with debt collecting agencies.

Subsection (b) requires the Secretary to report to Congress on the progress of debt collection centers, defined under subsection (c) as those centers providing debt collection services for other agencies.

Subsection (c) provides that the Secretary of the Treasury will submit reports concerning the status of loans and accounts receivable to Congress in accordance with the Debt Collection Act of 1982. Formerly, reporting was performed by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Subsection (d) authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to consolidate all debt collection reports.

Review of Standards and Policies for Compromise of Write-Down of Delinquent Debts

This section requires the Office of Management and Budget to review agencies' standards and policies for compromising, writing-down, forgiving or discharging indebtedness and various reporting requirements. OMB should rely on the expertise and personnel of the Department of the Treasury in preparing this report, which should be consolidated with the annual consolidated debt collection report. However, OMB needs to be very involved in ensuring that each Federal agency complies with changes needed in their policies.

Congress is seriously concerned about dissimilar standards for discharging indebtedness at different agencies. This needs careful monitoring. Congress is concerned that the credibility of the Federal Government is undermined when similarly-situated beneficiaries under one program receive more generous treatment than those under another program.

In addition, Congress is very seriously concerned about the poor reporting of the discharge of indebtedness to the Internal Revenue Service on Form 1099. The Office of Management and Budget should ensure that agencies consistently report these amounts or allow the Secretary of the Treasury to report the data to the Internal Revenue Service.

Justice debt management

Expand Use of Private Attorneys

This section gives the Attorney General permanent authority to contract with private counsel to collect delinquent non-tax civil debt when deemed appropriate.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York and soon-to-be-mother [Ms. MOLINARI].

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Balanced Budget Downpayment Act and would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the entire Committee on Appropriations, and especially the gentleman from Kentucky [HAROLD ROGERS], for their cooperation in securing $175 million for the Violence Against Women block grant, an increase of 573 percent over last year's Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill.

In addition, thanks to support from the gentleman from Illinois [JOHN PORTER], this bill increases the Violence Against Women provisions from last year's Labor-HHS appropriations bill from $1 million to $53 million. The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act also provides for $32.6 million for family violence programs used to support battered women's shelters. When all is said and done, Violence Against Women programs will be increased by over 700 percent over last year's budget.

This funding is necessary, Mr. Speaker, and demonstrates that today we can show that we can achieve a balanced budget while also recognizing important priorities for our Nation's future.

Again, I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, the American people have won a great victory today. This bill represents the end of business as usual. We fought. We begged. We cajoled. And now we finally have convinced the President that fiscal responsibility is good politics. The gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, has done that, along with his staff, and for that reason I salute him.

This legislation is the right thing for this country at this moment with this President. It is not the perfect bill. I am disappointed that we did not get rid of more wasteful Washington programs. Goals 2000 funds bureaucrats instead of teachers. AmeriCorps pays people a healthy wage to be volunteers, and the NEA pays for controversial and

sometimes obscene art. But Rome was not built in a day and getting the perfect budget will take more than one term in the majority.

To my colleagues who would sacrifice the good in favor of the perfect, let me say, I admire your fidelity to principle, but let me also say that voting to cut $23 billion in spending, eliminating over 200 wasteful Washington programs and doing all of this without raising one dime in higher taxes does not represent a sacrifice of conservative principles. No one could call me a moderate, but I am voting for this bill. I am voting for this bill secure in the knowledge that it is the right thing to do now at this moment in history.

I give Chairman LIVINGSTON a great deal of credit for his determination and for his patience in negotiating this agreement. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this legislation. Send it up to the President and have him sign the bill that delivers the greatest savings to the taxpayer since the Second World War.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I should simply take this time, Mr. Speaker, to note, and I want to thank the conference for this, the conference agreed to add an additional 15 million for the Department of Energy's lab to lab program. Those funds can be used immediately to fund recently concluded cooperative agreements with six nuclear facilities in the former Soviet Union. The idea behind this is to prevent the surreptitious obtaining of nuclear material by potentially terrorist groups who might use it for nefarious purposes against any country, including our own. This program was set up to improve the security of nuclear materials, prevent leakage. The program is carried out through multiple channels, through governments, nuclear laboratories and institutes and Russian nuclear regulatory authorities. Anyone who has heard the recent reports about the danger of leakage of nuclear fissionable material from the NIS knows of the grave potential of the danger of such leakage. This will enable us to strengthen that program. I appreciate the cooperation of the conference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that from the very beginning when we were dealing with the appropriations spending bills this year, Democrats were making the point very vividly that it was possible to keep spending down, balance the budget and at the same time protect the priorities that we cared about, education, the environment, Medicare, Medicaid and some of the other concerns like the 100,000 cops program that President Clinton had supported and put together for the last couple years.

I think that today shows the vindication, if you will, of the Democratic point of view. We are moving an appropriation bill that will save significant amounts of money, billions of dollars, but at the same time it protects those priorities.

With respect to the environment, which is one of my major concerns, although the amount of money is less than what the President asked for and what the President thought was necessary, we are almost back to what we wanted. And most importantly, we have eliminated those terrible anti-environmental riders that the Republican leadership had been touting for so many months. So I think this is a good compromise, but it is a vindication of our Democratic principles.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 of my minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me. We have a number of speakers here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I simply rise to point out, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, that there are three contract with America crime bills that are incorporated in this today. The three that are in this bill that were contract with America bills are, one, a provision that would end the so-called prevention programs of Washington knows best that were in the 1994 crime act that many of us complained about. Instead in its place in this bill and in this legislation are a block grant to the cities and the counties of this country to spend as they see fit to fight crime to the tune of about $500 million for this coming year.

In addition we have the version in the contract with America of the prison grant program that will ensure an incentive for truth in sentencing for States to have laws passed that require the serving of 85 percent of their sentence of all felons.

And last but by no means least, we have a provision in this bill which will mean that the States get back control of their prisons, that Federal judges no longer will be able to have the rulings they have been having on overcrowding. We lift the caps. We change the consent decrees. We say in the future that you will not have in addition frivolous lawsuits from prisoners.

This is a monumental change in criminal law with regard to prisoners and frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished Democratic whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. OBEY, who I think has done a magnificent job. I also want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for his hard work over these 6 months on this particular bill.

I think the product that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and our colleague from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, have given us reflects well on the best of what this Congress can be about, had we put our minds to preserving the priorities of the country, the education priorities, the environmental priorities and the public safety priorities. I am particularly pleased that they took the time and devoted the attention and preserved the funding for the School-to-Work Program, the Safe and Drug-Free School Program, which, as we all know, encompasses the DARE program, teaches our kids to stay off drugs, be against gangs and gang violence.

With the Title I Program, 1.5 million kids in our country now will have the ability to have additional math and reading programs that will enhance their education and of course the direct loan program for those who are attending higher education at the collegiate level.

We are pleased at the amount of funding that we were able to save over what the House did. In the area of the environment, we are very pleased that there were rollbacks in some of the raids on environmental safety. We have had 25 years of bipartisan support for the environment in this country, and I am hopeful that this report will move us back in that direction because initially, as Members know, as this bill or pieces of this bill left the House of Representatives, there was a serious attack on the environment of this country. So I am happy to see that they have made correction in this area.

Also, in public safety, let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the 100,000 police officers on the beat are important additions. We thank both gentlemen for their inclusion in that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], the distinguished chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to first congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the conferees, people down at the White House and over on the Senate side for their work on this bill. It is a good bill. It is a bipartisan bill and, frankly, it is a compromise bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is really not a question of whether the President won in this compromise, whether the Republicans won, whether Democrats won. The question really is, do the American people win. I think that is an overwhelming and resounding yes. Forty-three billion dollars have been cut

back in this bill and in the rescission bill earlier last year. Two hundred programs have been eliminated. Significant cuts have been extracted from many of the other programs and agencies, $144 billion deficit, when it was projected by the President that it would be over $200 billion.

That is a huge turnaround for the American people. They are the ones that ought to rejoice in this. We ought to pass it overwhelmingly today. I am proud to vote for it. I am very grateful for the work that has been put into it by our leaders.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a victory for American values. It is a triumph of American's priorities in areas like education, the environment and Medicare, over the politics and the policies of government gridlock and shutdown. It shows the power of mainstream values in this Nation and the utter bankruptcy of the policy of extremism.

It proves and demonstrates that in fact we can cut spending in these difficult economic times with a lack of resources and at the same time hold on to and preserve those values of education and the environment that this Nation holds dear.

Mr. Speaker, we can remember the commentary in the past several months about a willingness to shut the Government down, not once but twice. We can remember the commentary about making the biggest cuts in education in this Nation's history. That failed. The proposal of disastrous environmental policies, they failed.

Mr. Speaker, because of the steadfastness, today we vote on appropriation bills that protect America's priorities.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I truly believe that liberals want to help in Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, just like conservatives do. Let us take the case where you tell one of your liberal constituents that you are going to have him give his money to a broker. That broker is going to take care of Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. But then tell him he is only going to get 50 cents of every dollar he gets back and the other 50 cents is going to go pay for his staff and his overhead. That guy will tell you that he does not support that kind of an issue.

That is what happens in this place. First place, it is not your dollar. You have to take it away from the constituent. Then you turn it around and give it back at a very low rate, for example, welfare. You only get about 30 cents on a dollar. Education, you get a very low percentage back on the dollar with 760 education programs.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is we are giving the money back, but we are doing it without raising a single tax, and we are cutting 200 programs and streamlining government.

Mr. Speaker, this is a monumental bill. It is $43 billion less than we would have had under Democratic control.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for yielding this time to me, and I also thank him for his leadership, for holding firm for the priorities for the American people. I also want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

If it had been left to our Chair and our ranking member, a long time ago this issue would have been resolved. We would not have had to have a Government shutdown.

But I commend the President of the United States for holding firm to his commitment to education, to protecting the environment, and for LIHEAP, and the list goes on of priorities which have been respected in this spending bill. It also has a large number of cuts, and I am dismayed to see that it still has $7 billion more in there for defense, as we subject all of our spending to such scrutiny.

But it is a good bill, it is a compromise, and best of all it eliminates the very mean-spirited, I say that advisedly, mean-spirited language in there for HIV-infected people in the military.

Today is a victory for democracy and for compromise, and I thank our chairman and ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman that set forth the guidelines which we are now currently following in the appropriations process.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and declare today a victory for the American people and a victory for the children whose future has been increasingly at risk, and I would like to say today that yesterday evening I was over in the committee that the gentleman chairs, and I got one of the older guys, one of the guys that has been around here for a long time, and I said, ''I understand that this is the most significant reduction in Washington spending since World War II.''

And he said, ''You know, I am not so sure about that.'' And he went into one of these big thick books, and he blew the dust off and he got the paper out, and we started looking in 1945, and from 1945 to 1996 they cannot touch us in any other year. This is unprecedented today since World War II. We have pried some of the money out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats, we have eliminated some absolutely absurd programs, including the program where we spent millions of dollars to eradicate ticks in Puerto Rico, where we spent millions of dollars to locate offices in Paris and all over Canada telling people, ''By the way, did you know there was a place called the United States? You ought to visit it sometime.''

There is a program that says to children, ''We will give you millions of dollars to measure rainfall by collecting it.''

Now, my colleagues, these programs have been going on forever, and we got in charge 17 months ago, and we told the American people we were here to change things, and we were here to strip power, money, and influence out of this city.

This does not do it all, this is discretionary spending, this is Washington spending. It is only a third of the budget, but it is the only thing in which the President was forced to sit down and achieve a result, and to our credit we did not buckle, we did not cave, we did not collapse. And we have been able to achieve the single largest reduction in Washington spending since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous accomplishment by this Congress, and I want to commend the chairman of the committee for his tenacity, and I want to commend all of my colleagues for their commitment to getting this job done. This is not the end all; this is just one very strong, first step in that long marathon of rescuing this country from economic anxiety, the fear that families have they will lose jobs, the problems of wage stagflation, wage stagnation, and at the same time it is a down payment that puts a little light at the end of that tunnel that our children will inherit a bountiful America.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest today that eliminating 200 programs, I would maintain that being able to pry some of the money out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats and eliminating 200 wasteful Washington programs that have gone on too long sucking dollars out of the pocketbooks of hard-working Americans, this is a great achievement, not just for this Congress but for the American people, and when we all leave here today to go home, we should be proud to stand up and tell our constituents that we finally have their message and that this Congress is going to continue to stand firm until we deliver the whole deal.

Congratulations. Vote for the bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The statement that the previous gentleman just made that this represented the largest deficit reduction since World War II is simply not true. The President's budget has brought down the deficit more than $100 billion. That is far larger than the reductions we see in this bill today. We welcome the add-

on, but I think we need to keep the facts straight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have to love the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. He is trying to snatch victory from the drum beat of retreat to cutting education, cutting the environment, cutting programs that the American public have communicated to my colleagues, ''Do not touch them. Do not take our cops off the beat, do not take our teachers out of school, do not take our chapter 1 students and put them without any kind of help, because that is not good for the country.''

And I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. He spins it as well as anybody in this House. But, my colleagues, I am pleased to see us abandon the CRs that I used to refer to as completely ridiculous to CRs that say completely, and perhaps that overstates it, but resolved the 1996 budget. Yes, it is 7 months late. Yes, it is after an unprecedented 25 days of shutdown. But, I say to my friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, he pointed out incorrectly, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has noted, that it was not since 1945, and I hear the complaints that Bill Clinton has stood in the door of progress and vetoed legislation.

Where was Ronald Reagan to accomplish this great objective of which the chairman speaks in 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987 and 1988, and our friend, Mr. Bush in 1989, 1990, 1991 and 1992? Where was he when it was profligate spending? Where were they to say ''no.'' We never overrode one of their vetoes on spending. Not once.

So, yes, now we have a bill that we are going to vote for; I hope everybody votes for this because it does, in fact, try to meet the needs of the American public, whether it is for education, public safety, health, or senior citizens health care. It tries to say we understand that we need to invest in the welfare of our people. This bill does it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and arduous process. Putting together the revised export provisions for drug and device exports would not have been possible without the help of my good friends and colleagues, the chairman of the Commerce Committee TOM BLILEY, and the ranking member on the committee, JOHN DINGELL. Their efforts have made our goal of allowing easier exporting of these important medical products a reality, and I thank them and their staffs for all of their hard work.

As many of you know, I introduced H.R. 1300 in May of last year. Mr. Rich Rakow, a constituent of mine in southwest Michigan, who works for one of the drug manufacturers in my district came to me during a town meeting about a problem his company was having exporting its products. It seems that under our current export restrictions, it is virtually impossible to ship drugs or medical devices out of this country for use in other countries, even if they meet the needs and requirements of the importing country. I found this, well, unbelievable, and directed Jeff Myers on my staff to look into the matter.

What they reported to me was troublesome, to say the least. Manufacturers of pharmaceuticals, medical devices, and other blood products were moving overseas, taking with them high paying, highly skilled manufacturing jobs. Part of the reason for this is the current inability of the FDA to quickly turn around products submitted to them for approval. The other part of the equation, however, is the export provisions that were put into the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in 1986.

The goal of those amendments were simple. They attempted to open the door to the export of drugs to our trading partners overseas. Unfortunately, this has not been the case. The regulated industries have made very clear to me that these provisions are strangling their ability to compete, and this is causing an alarming increase of medical manufactures moving overseas. The compromise language included in the bill before us today, H.R. 3019, seeks to change this pattern.

Senators HATCH, KENNEDY, and GREGG, Chairman BLILEY, Ranking Member DINGELL, and myself, along with the FDA, worked on the language included in this bill. We worked to reconcile the differing language passed by the respective chambers included in the omnibus funding bill for fiscal year 1996. There is broad agreement on what the language in the bill means. I would like to discuss some of the ideas in the bill where there may be some misunderstanding in the future.

It is very clear that the majority of the Members believe that the export provisions are a trade issue first and foremost. Restrictions on trade often mean the loss of jobs right here in the United States. However, Senator KENNEDY voiced a number of concerns with H.R. 1300, and its companion bill, S. 593. His major objection, as I understand it, was that the FDA would not have any control at all over the exporting of drugs and devices. With those objections in mind, the mini-conference set out to mete out a compromise.

The FD&C Act, under this amendment, is altered to make it easier to export drugs and devices, as I have said before. It is also amended to make it generally easier to import unapproved subassemblies of these medical products, for the manufacture and export of finished products. This is very important.

The plain meaning of amendments to section 801(e) of the FD&C Act as it relates to imports is that no subassembly which is brought into this country solely for the purpose of manufacturing products to be exported would be restricted, as long as the company keeps records of the imported product, and destroys any of the imported subassemblies that are not to be used for the manufacture of exported products. Furthermore, the importation of blood components, source plasma, or source leukocytes is permitted as long as the company importing these products follows the guidelines in Section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, or if the Secretary has set up appropriate guidelines for the importation of these products. It is my understanding that there are companies in the United States that process these products for other countries, and this provision is meant to allow this to continue.

The addition of new provisions in section 801(f)(1) and (2) have also raised some issues within the drug and device community, and I would like to address these concerns. This amendment is designed to allow the export of FDA-approved drugs and over-the-counter [OTC] products with labels that may differ from the labels approved in the United States. As all of the conferees are aware, the FDA approves not only the molecular entity that makes up the OTC, branded and generic products, but it also approves the label with indications and contraindications for usage. Traditionally, the FDA has taken the approval process for products which need approval under section 505 of the FD&C Act to mean that this includes the label, and have therefore read section 801(e) as meaning that the product must be labeled in accordance with U.S. law.

Furthermore, the language included in 802(b)(1)(A) has been reviewed by the FDA, which has given us complete assurance that this law will apply to the export of all OTC and prescription drugs, as long as the drugs are legally marketable in one of the countries mentioned in 802(b)(1)(A), subsections (i) and (ii). This legislation does not require drugs to receive affirmative marketing approval if the laws of one of the countries mentioned in the bill do not require it.

The framers of section 801(f)(1) and (2) mean this section to allow the export of FDA approved products, which are not approved in a country mentioned in 802(b)(1)(A)(i) and (ii), to be exported directly to a country with a label required by that country. With the importing country's label, the product being shipped will not be regarded as misbranded or unapproved, specifically in respect to section 505 of the FD&C Act. Section 801(e)(1) of the FD&C Act states that ''a food, drug, device, or cosmetic intended for export shall not be deemed to be adulterated or misbranded under this Act—''. Clearly, the framers of the amendments included in H.R. 3019 mean section (f)(1) and (2) to follow the language in 801(e)(1) and allow for the export of products from the United States with a label which accords to the specifications of the foreign manufacturer without becoming misbranded. Furthermore, it is definitely the intention of the framers of this amendment that section 801 and 802 are not additive. In other words, products being exported under 802 do not have to meet the requirements of 801, with the exception of 801(e)(1), subsection A through D.

The framers did not intend to limit or otherwise restrict the export of animal drugs, insulin, or antibiotics. It is my understanding that there is a possibility that 801(f) (1) and (2) can be read to limit the export of these products, and that was certainly not the intent of this Member, or other Members of this conference. It is my hope that the FDA will accommodate the concerns voiced on this section for these products. Before the end of this Congress, I have been told by the Commerce Committee that we will address this issue in a technical amendment.

I would also like to address the section dealing with products for the diagnosis, prevention, or treatment of a disease which is not of significant prevalence in the United States Section 802(e)(1) is clearly meant to be another avenue by which companies, can export

products. Products exported under this section need not meet the requirements of section 801.

Devices were also of major concern to the conferees. Devices were specifically not included in 802(b)(2), because the current FDA practice of allowing for the export of devices that have an approved IDE is acceptable to the conferees. It is important to note here that this section has to do only with drugs not approved in the United States, or in one of the countries mentioned in 802(b)(1)(A), subsections, (i) and (ii). As I understand the current procedure, devices can be shipped after being reviewed by the FDA to other nations if they have an IDE and not a general approval.

Last, I would like to address section 802(f)(5). Again, these are labeling requirements for exporting products approved in the so-called tier one countries mentioned in 802(b)(1)(A), subsections (i) and (ii) to countries not mentioned in that section. It is most certainly the understanding of the conferees that this section is to be interpreted as written only for those counties which are not tier one countries. Furthermore, it is the intention of the conferees that this section requires the Secretary to consult with the appropriate health official before making a finding which might necessitate the stopping of exporting these products.

I am sure that we will revisit this issue in the future. Frankly, if it were up to me, there would be almost no restrictions on the export of medical products to nations which allow them for sale. In my mind, the job of the FDA is to protect the health and safety of the United States, and it is not to play health product policeman to the rest of the world. If a product is manufactured in accordance with the requirements and specifications of a foreign government, then I believe that it is insane for this country to deny the opportunity to manufacture this product here. No other nation on the face of this earth restricts the manufacture of medical products for export, because they know the value of these manufacturing jobs. While I believe that this is a true compromise, and it is, I also believe that we can and should do more to liberalize the treatment of trade in health products.

It's about time we begin again to export products—not jobs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the final 3 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, my Democratic colleagues and I have come to this Congress for one single fundamental purpose: to fight for the working and middle-class families that are at the very heart of this country.

Throughout this very long and difficult budget process, we have held every policy and every proposal to a simple test: Does it make it easier for the lives of families that are working hard, trying to educate their children, trying to save for a decent retirement; or does it make that struggle even harder?

That is why Democrats fought so hard for a budget that does not cut education, student loans, or summer jobs, or roll back clean air or water standards or abandon the 100,000 police that we so desperately need on our streets.

This is not a perfect budget. This has been a difficult compromise on both sides. But I believe we have proven that we can cut the budget without cutting education or the environment, that we can rein in runaway spending without ravaging hard-working American families.

Mr. Speaker, while this is a day for both parties to come together, America must not forget that, without the Democratic Party, we would not have kept our commitment to educate America's children, to keep our environment safe and to insure basic health and safety standards in the workplace. Without the Democratic Party, we would not have kept our faith with working families in the middle class.

See, that is what the Democratic Party stands for. That is who we are. And that is why even after 2 Government shutdowns and 13 temporary spending bills, we would never ever give up the fight for education and health care and the environment and safe workplaces.

I will never forget visiting an elementary school in Houston with the gentleman from Texas, GENE GREEN, and the gentlewoman from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, seeing the young children playing with computers and learning to read in intensive after-hour classes sponsored by chapter 1, and seeing the hope and the joy of these youngsters in being able to learn. This budget is for those children and their families. Or being in New Orleans and seening the chapter 1 mothers and their children meeting, and hearing a young mother stand up and saying because of chapter 1 she was getting her high school degree and planned to go to college and said she wanted to get her masters degree because her children were enrolled in chapter 1 in an inner-city school in New Orleans.

So I commend my Republican colleagues for letting us save those commitments and making this budget work for working families.

□ 1630

Today we celebrate a victory, not of party or partisanship, but of America's most basic and important values. Vote for this budget, and let it be a model of the kind of bipartisanship and working together that I will hope will mark the rest of this Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, only to thank the minority leader for his last comments, and to thank the ranking minority member and all of the staff, Republican and Democrat alike, that have worked so hard in the House of Representatives to make this possible, along with all of the Members who have worked hard on the committee and off the committee. They made important contributions as did all of the participants in the Senate as well as in the administration.

There was a lot of work that went into these 16 months, while this effort has gone on. We have a bipartisan bill, and I think in the final analysis, the American people are going to look back and say that Congress did their job under the Constitution, and government is going to get smaller because of it, and the people of America are going to be glad of it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the very distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] is recognized for 2¼ minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. The time has come for us to complete this work and have our vote. I would like to take a moment, though, and express my sincere congratulations and appreciation to the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and to all the members of the Committee on Appropriations from both sides of the aisle. This has been a long and arduous task.

I could say, parenthetically, there was a time when I thought I might want to be on the Committee on Appropriations. I never had that honor. But I did have the honor this year of working very closely with the Committee on Appropriations throughout all of these 15 months of writing these bills, negotiating these bills, going through all of the discussions at the White House and with the other body, and for whatever it is worth, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Members, I thank the Lord that I will never be on the Committee on Appropriations, while I express, again, my appreciation for those Members who stayed with the task.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill for America. I just enjoyed listening to the minority leader, my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], speak, as he does, for his vision for what is good for the American people; express again, as he does, his belief that what is good for the American people can be found in more government programs.

We, too, express our vision for what is good for the American people, and this expression of vision is that the American people need relief from the burdens of the excessive size of government programs, so we bring forward here a bill that represents $30 billion less than the President's request, $23 billion less than what was spent last year; a bill that conforms with the budget that we all voted on just a few short months ago, and settles itself within the discretionary limits imposed and accepted by that budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is good work, it is good work that reflects a commitment to the American people. We, too, love the future of our children and your children, and we love that future within the discipline and the responsibility of a Federal Government that is determined to live within its means, bring

itself to balance, and give relief from the burden of excessive government taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the committee again, and I ask all my Members, appreciate the good work, appreciate the victory for the American people, appreciate the future it promises for the American children: Vote ''yes.''

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the language in the omnibus appropriations bill that would repeal section 415 of the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1988, also known as the Frost-Leland amendment.

Introduced by the late Congressman Mickey Leland, the provision specifically prohibits the use of Federal funds to demolish public housing units at Allen Parkway Village, a public housing project in my congressional district of Houston, TX.

The language contained in the 1996 omnibus appropriations bill repeals this provision and states that the Housing Authority of the city of Houston may proceed with the demolition and rehabilitation of Allen Parkway Village, which according to the conferees is being delayed by the section 106 process under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. While the conferees do not amend the section 106 process, they do state that ''the conferees do not believe that it is good policy to require the preservation of buildings unsuitable for modern life at the expense of low income families in dire need of safe, decent, and affordable housing.'' I agree, however, the determination should be made through an inclusive community process which has not yet occurred in Houston fully.

I am very concerned about the fact that no hearings were held on this issue nor was I consulted about this language which affects my congressional district. I have spent a great deal of time working on this issue together with the residents of Allen Parkway Village, the mayor of the city of Houston, the housing authority of the city of Houston, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I believe that it is necessary to clarify the issue of the importance of historic preservation to the cultural heritage of our Nation. Allen Parkway Village was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1988 and I can assure you that its historic significance is recognized in Houston. Historic preservation guidelines and regulations contained in current law have not delayed the process of rehabilitating facilities such as Allen Parkway Village in Houston. Indeed, the section 106 historic preservation process was completed in December of last year. I agree with preservation and demolition with planning. This sneak attack repeal doesn't bring the community together, it only divides it.

I can assure you that in no way has the importance of historic preservation stood in the way of the need to provide affordable housing for low-income families. That is our goal and it is one that all parties in this debate agree upon. We can provide affordable, quality, and public housing for the citizens of Houston and we can do so while respecting the traditions and history of Houston's past and by respecting an inclusive community planning process.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the omnibus appropriations agreement before us. I am gratified that many of the deepest cuts proposed by the Republican leadership have been eliminated and the environmental riders have been dropped from the conference report. The conference report also overturns a recently-enacted law that requires that HIV-positive personnel serving in the armed forces be discharged. While not perfect, this compromise bill goes a long way toward meeting the policy goals of the President and negotiators on both sides.

In spite of the fact that this bill is 7 months overdue, H.R. 3019 contains some provisions that are worthy of our support. The bill's funding levels for these provisions reflect the bipartisan support of many millions of Americans.

I am particularly happy to vote for an omnibus package that funds vital education programs such as Title I and the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. The conference report provides $2.8 billion more for education funding than the House bill, which included a 17-percent reduction for the 1995 levels.

Title I, which provides extra academic assistance to help schools with large numbers of poor and disadvantaged children, would have been cut by more than $1 billion. In my State, this would have meant reductions of almost $130 million. In Sacramento, the school district would have been forced to eliminate as much as $65,000 for some of the neediest schools. Seven to eight schools and approximately 100 teachers positions would have been eliminated.

Reading tutorial sites would have been closed and educational technology programs would have been eliminated affecting almost 3,300 students.

I am thankful that these essential programs will continue to serve the children of the Sacramento school district for another school year.

I am also glad to see that my colleagues recognized the importance of the Cops-on-the-Beat Program. Rural communities and small towns like the ones that I represent, receive about half of the grants awarded in the COPS Program. Cities like Williams, Yuba City, and Red Bluff have all received the funds to hire more law enforcement officers. Rural crime is a serious, but often overlooked, issue. Our citizens want to reel safe from the threat of crime and COPS is the best way to achieve that.

In addition, towns like Vacaville and Dixon have been able to purchase computers and the related technology necessary to deploy additional officers.

New officers are able to walk local beats, get to know small business people and neighborhood residents, and gain the respect of the communities where they work.

Had the majority succeeded in turning the COPS Program into a large and potentially wasteful block-grant program, small communities in my district would still be waiting for reinforcements. I believe that a vote for the omnibus package is a vote for more police officers and less crime.

There are also several environmental provisions in this bill that are worth mentioning.

H.R. 3019 preserves the congressional intent of the California Desert Protection Act passed in the last Congress by allowing continued protection of the Mojave Desert.

Both in the Appropriations Committee and on the House floor, I offered amendments to the Interior appropriations measure to make sure that the Mojave was properly managed so that this valuable resource would be adequately maintained for future generations to enjoy. With significant bipartisan support, Congress passed the California Desert Protection Act which gave the National Park Service and not the Bureau of Land Management jurisdiction over the desert.

The back-door attempt to repeal this part of the Desert Protection Act was short-sighted and ran counter to Congress's commitment to environmental protection. The original act was subject to open and prolonged debate. If the Republican majority in this new Congress sees fit to change that, it should follow the same process, and not attempt to short-cut the legislative process through an appropriations measure.

I urged President Clinton not to sign the Interior appropriations bill unless this environmental rider was removed. While the bill still includes the rider, it allows the President to waive its implementation if he so desires. President Clinton has assured me that he is committed to doing so. I want to commend him for standing firm on this issue and to commend the conferees for acknowledging its significance.

The Park Service is ready and willing to work with affected interest groups to insure the Mojave Desert is properly managed. The Park Service, and not the Bureau of Land Management, is the appropriate guardian to insure that in years to come, the fragile ecosystem in the desert is not unbalanced by unbridled abuse of this precious resource.

I'm glad to say that the omnibus bill that we are voting for today settles the debate for another fiscal year in favor of America's children and teachers, safety in our communities, and our environment.

But ultimately, these last 7 months have been an unnecessary political exercise.

These last 7 months have really been more about partisan grand-standing and ideological purity than about seeking bipartisan compromise on behalf of all Americans.

I believe that as this compromise shows, we can make our Government a leaner and more effective one without balancing the budget on the backs of America's working families, senior citizens, the environment, and particularly, our children.

This is a good agreement but it is one that we could have and should have passed 7 months ago. I urge my colleagues to support this omnibus appropriations bill.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. This bill is a fair compromise that reduces Government spending and keeps us on course to a balanced budget, while also providing adequate funding for education, environmental and other important programs. I applaud Chairman LIVINGSTON and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their hard work in forging this important compromise that allows our Government to perform its necessary duties within the limits we need to achieve a balanced budget.

With the completion of this bill, we will save the taxpayers $23 billion from the 1995 funding levels. Equally as important, the reductions in this bill are more fairly distributed to allow for improved funding for education, housing, environmental and other important programs.

I want to thank the Appropriations Committee for addressing a number of concerns that

I and other Members had expressed about the funding levels for title I education support for disadvantaged students, antidrug education through safe and drug-free schools; fighting drugs in public housing; and funding for the Environmental Protection Agency. These programs will receive solid funding levels in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the top priority of this Congress must continue to be achieving a balanced budget. Balancing the budget requires limiting spending for virtually every program. Tough decisions have to be made. I have not always agreed with the priorities and allocations made for various programs. But this bill is a truly fair compromise that meets our most important criteria—balancing the budget—but in a fair and equitable manner.

Again, I applaud the work of the negotiators and the Appropriations Committee and staff. I urge passage of the 1996 omnibus appropriations bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my sincere thanks to my Democratic colleagues from both Chambers of this Congress who were members of the conference committee. I know their work hours were long and the task difficult. I congratulate each of them for their contribution to this victory of people and good balanced policy over narrow-minded extremism. Each of them fought for and won an addition $5 billion for education, Head Start, the EPA, and other important programs. I thank you and I am sure this Nation's work force, children, and students thank you.

I would also like to thank President Clinton for holding firm to his principles and the fundamental beliefs of this Democratic party. Though some would have you believe otherwise, the President has shown that it is possible to hold to these beliefs and balance the budget. It encourages me to see the President stand firm and not allow the destruction of our environment and to fight the Republicans' antienvironmental proposals. Thanks to him there will be no increased logging in the Tongass National Forest. There will be no moratorium on listing additional endangered species and there will be sufficient money for the EPA to successfully protect the environment that we all live in.

In spite of this, Mr. Speaker, with the school year quickly approaching its conclusion, this Congress has not done all that it could to promote summer employment for our Nation's disadvantaged youth who are most in need.

In H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations for fiscal year 1996's reconciliation package before us, the funding allocations agreed upon will only allow a paltry $625 million for the youth summer employment portion of the Job Training Partnership Act [JTPA] appropriations for 1996. This is a $242 million cut when compared to last year's funding level of $867 million.

Had the summer jobs portion of the JTPA appropriations been held to last year's levels, Houston would have received $9.1 million. This level of funding would have resulted in over 6,000 jobs for Houston youth.

These are our children. They are not a world away but only a few blocks from where I am standing. They live in the very neighborhoods that surround this Capitol Building. They are in the streets of the cities and towns each of us represents. They are from all races, religions, and cultures. They are the faces of young, bright, creative, optimistic people who we see every day. They share only one thing in common. They are unfortunate enough to have been born into the families of our Nation's poor.

I know from personal experience that a summer job for those young people enrolled by JTPA-sponsored projects around this country is more than just an opportunity to save money for the next school year, it is an opportunity to learn and gain valuable experience which is outside of their limited life experiences.

The stinginess of this Congress was by no means limited to our Nation's youth, it extends into the other areas: the funding for training dislocated workers was reduced $129 million from last year's funding levels, funds for adult training programs were cut by $147 million in the conference reconciliation package before us today.

The only positive that I can speak on regarding the labor portion of this bill is the $16 million increase in the funding for the Jobs Corps.

With regards to education, I am pleased that once again, because of the President's leadership, this conference report provides $2.8 billion more for education funding than the House-passed bill, and provides full or close to full funding for the President's National Service Program, the Goals 2000 educational initiatives, and title I funding for disadvantaged children in local school districts. In spite of the attempts by bean-counting Republicans, the Drug-Free School Program and Head Start will be funded at fiscal year 1995 levels.

I am disturbed, however, by the cuts in student financial assistance. The conference report provides $6.26 billion for student financial aid, which is a cut of $1.36 billion from fiscal year 1995. For Pell Grants, the conference report provides $4.9 billion, which is $1.26 billion less than fiscal year 1995. Obviously my Republican colleagues have forgotten what it costs to send children to college. The cost of college tuition are rising higher than ever before, and the number of people requesting aide are higher too. Just when the future leaders, scientists and artists of the next generation, this country's very future, need our help more than ever, my Republican colleagues want to deny them that assistance.

LEGAL SERVICES

This conference report would provide $278 million for legal services, which is a $122 million reduction from fiscal year 1995. The Legal Services Corporation provides an invaluable service to the indigent in this country, and I am concerned that this cut will compromise the ability of the poor to obtain good decent legal counsel. The sixth amendment of the Constitution guarantees every individual the right to legal counsel, but by brutally cutting the LCS budget, we are effectively denying this constitutional right to those who are served by it. In addition, this conference report contains the same prohibition as in the December conference report, prohibiting the use of funds, either public or private, for attorneys to participate in abortion litigation, redistricting, welfare reform, union organizing and strikes, and any class action suits.

TITLE X

I am pleased that the this conference report provides the title X family Planning Program with the same level of funding as fiscal year 1995. The title X Family Planning Program provides a valuable service for low-income clients by offering funding for contraceptive health services, pregnancy prevention, abstinence, and STD screening. Prevention costs a lot less than cure, and the money spent on this program saves this country not only money, but the social capital of our youth and low-income citizens as well.

HIV SERVICEMEMBER DISCHARGE

I am very pleased that the conference report overturns the recently enacted law that requires the discharge or retirement of military personnel who test positive for the HIV virus.

This unnecessary measure was neither sought nor supported by the Department of Defense. Both the Assistant Secretary for Force Management Policy and the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel have stated that the provision would do nothing to improve military readiness while depriving the Armed Forces of experienced individuals who are ready and able to perform their assigned duties. I am thankful that the conferees had the wisdom to overturn this unwise and unjust provision.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote in favor of this package, not because I believe it to be the very best that we could do for our Nation, but because it is the best that the 104th Congress could accomplish. In a recent interview of Lester Thurow, the well renowned economist at MIT, he ably points out the folly of what this Congress has been doing. He argues that the biggest threat to the long-term economic health of this Nation is not Japan nor is it regulation, but rather the lack of investment we are making in the basic elements of this Nation's social system: infrastructure, education, R&D, and most importantly—people. It is these things which will secure the future of our Nation's economic and global status. We Democrats understand this and so does the President. I can only hope that Republican Members eventually do to.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 3019, omnibus appropriations for fiscal year 1996. I am pleased that the conference report includes over $1.2 billion in emergency disaster relief funding. These funds will go a long way toward helping communities in my region recover from the devastating flooding earlier this year.

In February, when the serious flooding began in Oregon, I returned from Washington, DC, to tour the flooded areas with the National Guard. It was my goal to do everything in my power to assist people in need and I am very proud of my staff's efforts to help the thousands of Oregonians who were suffering.

The first few days of the flooding were a flurry of activity. I contacted each house in my congressional district with vital information on where to get help, secured a Federal disaster declaration for each county, held special briefings for local officials on where to obtain emergency assistance, and established a mobile operations center. My office worked emergency extended hours to ensure that people got the help they needed, when they needed it. I toured the flooded areas a second time—this time accompanied by James Lee Witt, the Director of FEMA, and Rodney Slater, the Federal Highway Administration Director—and personally urged them to get assistance to Oregon as quickly as possible.

In the aftermath of the flooding, I held emergency mobile offices in 13 cities to reach out

and help Oregonians in need. I conducted four formal town meetings and toured the flooded areas for a third time. It was so heartening to see Oregonians joining together, neighbor to neighbor, to deal with the flooding. Today, my office remains intimately involved in damage assessment and recovery efforts at the local level.

Earlier this year, I was one of the two Democrats in the House to support a bill which included nearly $1 billion in disaster relief funding primarily for Oregon and the Pacific Northwest. Getting aid to my district is of paramount importance, and I originally supported this bill despite my serious reservations with other provisions unrelated to disaster assistance. My main goal was to help people recover as soon as possible from the devastation caused by the floods.

I am pleased that the final bill before the House includes over $1.2 billion in disaster assistance. These funds will go a long way toward helping restore our communities in Oregon. I would like to highlight a few programs which will benefit my constituents:

Over $100 million for watershed, flood control, and emergency conservation efforts; $300 million for highways and roads; $165 million for dikes and other Army Corps of Engineer projects; $150 million in FEMA disaster assistance programs; and $100 million in SBA assistance, as well as CDBG funds to help communities meet their local match requirements for FEMA programs.

Even with these funds, many communities still have a long way to go before people are back on their feet. I will continue to work closely with citizen groups and local officials to help Oregon recover from its worst flood in 30 years. I appreciate the hard work of the entire Oregon delegation in making this disaster relief package a reality, and urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report on H.R. 3019 today.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the omnibus appropriations for fiscal year 1996 (H.R. 3019) represents a partial victory for common sense and the Democratic Party. We have forced the Republican Majority to cancel devastating cuts in programs such as Title I; Head Start; Drug-Free and Safe Schools; the Summer Youth Jobs Program and the School-To-Work Program. The children of America have won a temporary victory and vital funding will now flow smoothly.

We applaud this incomplete but positive step forward; however, the fact that the Appropriations Committee has usurped the power of the authorizing Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee and promulgated reactionary setbacks for educational reform must be exposed. If the closed door, secretive actions of the Appropriations Committee are not curbed we will soon be confronted with a situation where all authorizing committees are rendered irrelevant and obsolete.

The scenario which began with the irresponsible campaign to abolish the Department of Education has now reached a backdoor climax through the appropriations process. By gutting the authorizing education reform legislation passed in the 103d Congress, the powerful Appropriations Committee has removed the reason for the continued existence of the DOE.

The results of all existing public opinion polls indicate that an explosion of public indignation is likely to greet this monstrous result of Republican blackmail at the negotiating table. Voters have consistently ranked education as one of the top three priorities for public funding.

The following is a summary of the scarred and mangled education reform program left after the illegal actions of the Appropriations Committee:

The conference agreement amends the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Specifically, the agreement includes language: Which permits school districts, in States that elect not to participate in the Goals 2000 program, to apply directly to the Secretary of Education for Goals 2000 funding, if the State education agency approves; eliminates the requirement that States submit their improvement plans to the Secretary of Education for approval; deletes the requirement for the composition of State and local panels that develop State and local improvement plans; eliminates the National Education Standards and Improvement Council; removes the requirement for States to develop opportunity-to-learn standards; and clarifies that no State, local education agency, or school shall be required, as a condition of receiving assistance under the title to provide outcomes-based education, or school-based health clinics.

A special and particular target of this arrogant usurpation of the powers of the authorizing Education Committee was the requirement for States to develop opportunity-to-learn standards. Like all standards this was a voluntary one and merely called for the inclusion of a discussion of the steps being taken to provide adequate resources for learning to the students being required to take tests that are compared from State to State.

This stealth assassination of the concept means that the months of debate that took place during the authorizing process will be thrown into the garbage and at the Federal level there will be no discussions of the obligations of States to provide safe buildings, up-to-date library books, science labs and qualified teachers. Black children will be tested and tested and tested until they are driven from the education process. But no one will be held accountable for not providing adequate resources.

The group with the least knowledge and wisdom about educational reform has assumed the greatest amount of decisionmaking power and prevailed in removing any chance at the establishment of accountability through visibility.

For the moment the neanderthals have triumphed; however, when pearls are thrown into a pig pen and the boars gang up to urinate on the pearls, the value of the pearls is in no way diminished. The power of the idea of opportunity-to-learn standards will one day soon be resurrected.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. Earlier this year, the Pacific Northwest experienced a flood event of devastating proportions. The resources provided in this bill for disaster relief will go a long way toward rebuilding the infrastructure in southwest Washington.

For instance, the Gifford Pinchot National Forest took a brutal beating by the flood. Roads, bridges and trails were obliterated by the flood waters, causing an estimated $13 million in damage. Many of these roads are key links to Mt. St. Helens National Volcanic Monument, an important tourist attraction in my district. Tourism related businesses in places like Randle and Cougar rely on the roads for their livelihood. The assistance in this bill will go a long way toward reopening access in the Gifford Pinchot.

In addition, the funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service will help repair our wildlife refuges that provide habitat for endangered species like the Columbia whitetailed deer in Wahkiakum County.

The Corps of Engineers also are provided significant funds to repair important dikes and levees. I am hopeful that some of these funds can be used for the design, dredging and monitoring of the relief channel at Willapa Harbor. This is an extremely important project for the people in Pacific County because it controls the erosion problem and restores navigation at Willapa Harbor.

With respect to the offsets in this bill, the Federal Emergency Management Agency has assured me that they have the necessary resources to take care of the human needs in the Pacific Northwest.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman LIVINGSTON. He has done the best job he can in negotiations with the Senate and the White House.

There is no question that this bill constitutes progress in the battle to reduce the deficit. With this and the other appropriations bills, budget authority is $23 billion below last year's level. This is an improvement over normal congressional spending patterns.

I will vote for this bill, but I want to make very clear my view that we should move faster in downsizing the Government. I regard this only as a down payment.

With Coloradan and other families struggling under an average tax burden of 38 percent of income, it is clear to me that there is still a great deal of work to be done.

Last year when we began balancing the budget, I wanted to do it in 5 years. I also wanted to give the families of Colorado tax relief, and shift money and power out of Washington and back to States and local communities.

We were told that this could not be done. We were told we must compromise with the Senate and with the President. So we agreed to a 7 year plan, only to have it vetoed by President Clinton.

President Clinton wanted a budget that would never balance. All he was willing to put on the table was a plan that pretends to balance, but puts all the cuts off until after the turn of the century when they will never happen.

We got no tax relief for families. Tax Freedom Day remains May 7, the latest day ever. The typical American family now pays more in total taxes than it spends on food, clothing, and shelter combined. I realize the Appropriations Committee has jurisdiction over only the discretionary portions of this bill, but the fact remains that it spends entitlement funds. In fact, in the health portion of this bill, over 75 percent is for mandatory entitlement programs, including Medicare and Medicaid. This House wants to reform these programs. President Clinton has vetoed reform.

Medicare is in trouble. Last year the Clinton administration projected that Medicare would go broke in 2002; we now know it will be much sooner, before the year 2000. What

have we done? Nothing. Once again, the tough choices are put off to the future.

It is true that the deficit is coming down. But it could and should be coming down much faster. Let us not forget, each of these deficits is added on top of a $5 trillion national debt that keeps getting bigger. We should be reforming entitlements, and we should be cutting more in 1996.

Much of the deficit reduction that is occurring is due to lower interest rates and lower inflation. In fact, the CBO now tells us that we will save $288 billion over the next 7 years in lower interest payments on items such as the debt and CPI adjustments to entitlements.

We should be using this fiscal dividend to get to balance much sooner and put an end to deficits for good. Instead we are spending much of it. This is a testament to the tremendous spending bias of Washington, DC.

It is time to dramatically downsize this Government. We need to send the money back home to States, communities, and families. While this bill is a downpayment, I am not ready to declare victory. There is much work to be done.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to briefly address a particular provision contained in H.R. 3019 which I believe should be implemented with careful attention by the Department of Education.

The provision renders institutions of higher education ineligible for the Pell Grant Program if they have been eliminated from the student loan programs due to high default rates. Default rate calculations have been the subject of much debate and I anticipate that the debate will continue during the next reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. As we all know, the Department of Education has had problems calculating these rates accurately in the past and I would not want to see an institution and its students harmed due to an incorrect calculation. I also believe that the Department of Education, by working in consultation with institutions, should implement the exception categories included in the provision in an expeditious and cost effective manner. Institutions should not be forced to spend huge sums to prove that they, in fact, qualify under the exception categories in the provision. A careful and thoughtful implementation process on the part of the Department of Education will help avoid many of the problems encountered in the past.

Again, we will be closely reviewing these types of important issues as we begin the process of reauthorizing the Higher Education Act.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today we have before the House an agreement on the remaining spending bills for fiscal year 1996. This bill reflects significant movement in the right direction. I was pleased to work for many of the President's priorities as a member of the conference committee.

Last year, the Republican Leadership made a conscious decision to hold priority programs for education, job training, and environmental protection hostage to their demands for tax cuts for the wealthy and deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. The Gingrich agenda has thrown the congressional budget process into chaos.

This conference agreement is a great improvement over the extreme House bill. Yet, the priorities in spending for fiscal year 1996 are difficult to justify. At the same time the majority is providing $7 billion more than requested by the Pentagon for defense programs, they are cutting deeply into priority programs which invest in our Nation's future.

Let me comment specifically on the conference agreement on the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. This bill provides for some of the highest priority investments for our future—the health and education of the American people. The bill provides $64.5 billion in discretionary spending, a decrease of $2.6 billion from comparable 1995 spending and $7.5 billion less than the President's request.

It is difficult not to comment on the judgement of moving $7 billion from priority education, job training, and health programs to new and unrequested defense spending. I clearly have a different view on how we should measure the strength of America.

Nonetheless, The President must be commended for standing strong and insisting that the egregious cuts in the House bill be overturned to restore much needed funding for education, job training, and environmental protection. President Clinton's leadership on these priority domestic programs has made a real difference.

The 17 percent cut to compensatory education has been reversed. The 57 percent cut to Safe and Drug Free Schools has been reversed. The elimination of Goals 2000 has been reversed. The elimination of the summer youth employment program has been reversed. Job training has been restored for more than 100,000 displaced American workers. Worker protections have been restored. Funding for the Ryan White CARE program has been increased. And, of the 17 riders to which the administration strongly objected 14 have been dropped and 3 have been modified.

The majority of anti-environment riders to the bill have been removed or the President has been given waiver authority to stop their implementation. We should never again try to use the budget process as the engine for bad environmental policy that does not have the fuel to pass Congress standing alone.

In addition, the bill restores the community policing program to fund 100,000 new police. And, the bill overturns the recently enacted requirement that HIV-infected service members be discharged. These changes are a great step forward.

While this bill is a great improvement over the House-passed bill, it does contain two unjustified provisions to assist New Hampshire and Louisiana with their Medicaid programs. At the same time, very well justified provisions to assist California public hospitals were not considered. My hope is that the situation in California can be addressed in other legislation.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time for the House leadership to commit itself to bipartisan solutions and an orderly budget process for 1997 so that we never again put the American people through the uncertainty reflected in passing the 1996 spending bills.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. However, I am disappointed that we were not able to reach a compromise on capping the direct lending program.

The Clinton administration has been right on the mark for its continued advocacy on behalf of students and their families with respect to education funding. As I, and 25 other Democrats wrote to the President in a letter last week, our focus has rightfully been on title I, Head Start, and raising the level of student aid.

However, the preoccupation with the new Federal direct student loan program is dramatically misplaced because direct lending does not increase the level of student aid or the quality of education. Direct lending is simply one administrative mechanism for delivering that aid.

It is unfortunate that we couldn't come up with a 40 percent compromise cap on direct lending to allow for a fair test of this new government-run program with the proven guaranteed student loan program.

I want to acknowledge the careful deliberation direct lending has received in this Congress and the strong Democratic opposition that has always followed direct lending. In fact, direct lending was pushed through Congress without a committee hearing in the House in 1993 and despite the misgivings of a bipartisan majority of the body. I am confident that the current direct loan program implementation plan could not survive a stand-alone vote in this Congress or the last Congress.

We have learned a lot over the last year.

The independent and nonpartisan Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance has cited the fact that the Department has risked the integrity of the direct loan program by allowing schools with high defaults and questionable records into the program.

We have confirmed that direct lending will add $350 billion in unnecessary borrowing added to the national debt.

And we know that there are no plans for the direct loan program to include the kind of risk-sharing on defaults included in the guaranteed student loan program that helps protect taxpayers.

Finally, we know—not only from the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] but also from the Congressional Research Service [CRS]—that in an apples-to-apples comparison, the direct loan program does not save tax dollars. Period.

A cap on direct lending to do a fair test with the schools currently in the program is more than fair—and is still the right thing to do.

A 40 percent cap test period would give the Department of Education time to focus on other management problems, such as the recent backlog in processing the basic financial aid form. I have no doubt that hundreds of individuals at the Department are working hard to solve these problems, but the fact is they have a lot of work to do. This is not the time to give them more responsibility.

The best student loan program for the next generation of America's students should include flexible repayment plans that make sense, incentives and risks for loan administrators who must make the program accountable to taxpayers, and improved safeguards in program integrity. The 40 percent compromise on direct lending would have given both loan programs a chance to deliver on these objectives.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I should also say that I share some of the frustration of my colleagues. This legislation is the result of a compromise. As with every compromise, there are things in the bill I would have preferred not to have. The bill also omits some provisions I would have liked to see included. On balance, however, Chairman LIVINGSTON and our leadership have brought

back a victory for the pro-life majority in the House, and a victory for the protection of unborn children.

Our most significant victory is that the conference report does not include the Hatfield language, which was included in the Senate bill and would have effectively written a blank check to the international abortion industry.

Last year the House voted several times to condition U.S. funding for population control activities on the Mexico City policy—a prohibition of funding for foreign organizations that perform or promote abortion. The House also voted to condition its support for the United Nations Population Fund [UNFPA] on an end to UNFPA support to the forced abortion policy of the People's Republic of China.

The House provisions recognized that money is fungible. The fiction advanced by the other side—that international population control agencies can use bookkeeping devices to spend their money on abortions, and our money on everything else—ignores this reality. United States taxpayers do not want their money going to organizations which support the PRC program that includes forced abortion which themselves perform abortions, or which seek to export abortions to countries that currently protect their unborn children. If population-control organizations insist that they want population money only for family planning activities unrelated to abortion, they could do so under the House provisions by getting out of the abortion business.

The Mexico City policy did not and would not lessen the overall U.S. contribution to international family planning. Almost all of the organizations which had received funding agreed to the terms of the policy and continued to receive funding. But the Mexico City policy has prevented these U.S. dollars from being used to enrich the international abortion lobby or to support its self-serving efforts to legalize abortion as a method of birth control.

Unfortunately, pro-abortion organizations would not let the foreign aid appropriations bill go forward unless they can get U.S. dollars and continue to pressure other nations to sanction abortion on demand—pressure which would appear to be endorsed by the United States because these groups receive substantial U.S. financial support.

For this reason, the House and Senate reached an impasse in negotiations, even though the House made several concessions in its pro-life language.

The issue was finally resolved by compromising not on abortion policy itself, but on the level of funding and the timing of expenditures. We dropped the Mexico City language in favor of a 35 percent cut in funds for international population control, and a provision that only one-fifteenth of the funding could be obligated in each of the 15 months for which fiscal year 96 funds will be available.

These provisions were designed to give both sides time—and an incentive—to negotiate further on the abortion issue. But the largest recipients of grants for population programs, and some of their supporters in Congress, instead chose to make wild and unsubstantiated charges against the compromise. Pro-abortion organizations were even accusing pro-life Members of Congress of causing more abortions. They had a simple formula: less money for abortion providers means more abortions, and more money for abortion providers means fewer abortions. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have recognized this assertion for the nonsense that it is, and they have omitted the pro-abortion Senate language.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. spending for population control has gone up dramatically in the last 3 years—from $325 million in fiscal year 1992 to about $550 million in fiscal year 1995—even in a time when money has been generally tight and many Federal expenditures have stayed level or declined. Even aside from concerns about the abortion issue, the Clinton administration has been giving disproportionate emphasis to population control as a solution to all problems. Our first foreign aid priorities should be programs that save the lives of children, protect refugees who are fleeing persecution, and create free and self-sustaining economic systems for people in emerging nations. The logic of disproportionate spending on population control seems to be that people will not need help if they are not around. Not only is this policy morally questionable, but it will not work.

The reduced funding level for population programs in fiscal year 1996 under the recent compromise will be about $356 million. This is substantially more than the United States spent on all population control programs in fiscal year 1992, or in any other year prior to the dramatic increases of the Clinton era.

Finally, and most important, the population-control lobby can eliminate the statutory ceiling imposed by the compromise—simply by agreeing to reasonable restrictions on international abortion-related spending. All we want is to re-erect a wall of separation between abortion and family planning.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to call attention to another important provision of the conference report: the Coates-Snowe-DeLay amendment, which is necessary to preserve the accreditation of medical schools that do not require their students to actively perform abortions. At the urging of the pro-abortion movement the ACGME imposed a rule that would have frozen out of the profession those students who would not do abortions. This provision will effectively reverse that coercive, anti-life, power play by the abortion industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to see even more pro-life provisions in the conference report. There are also other important omissions. Mr. GILMAN submitted a list of 18 noncontroversial provision from H.R. 1561, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. These important provisions included the MacBride principles for justice in Northern Ireland, the Humanitarian Aid Corridors Act, the restoration of asylum eligibility for forced abortion victims, and the extension of the Lautenberg amendment which has saved so many Jews and evangelical Christians in the former Soviet Union from persecution. Unfortunately, President Clinton saw fit to veto the bill that contained these important human rights provisions. I believe they should have been included in this conference report, especially because the report includes a waiver of the statutory requirement that there be an authorization for the State Department during fiscal year 1996.

But I know the going was tough—the majority of the Senate conferees and the White House were both against us, especially on the pro-life issues—and I congratulate Chairman LIVINGSTON and the leadership on their firm stand in favor of human life. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I spoke this afternoon about the need to put fiscal year 1996 appropriation issues behind us. With today's momentous vote on H.R. 3019 we have accomplished this. I wanted to speak a little more about an amendment I authored during markup of the Interior appropriations bill, and which is included in section 335 of the Interior Department portion of H.R. 3019.

The Kolbe amendment on Mount Graham is quite simple. It states that alternative site 2, which was issued by the Forest Service, is authorized and approved, and that the site—alternate 2—shall be deemed to be consistent with and permissible under the terms of the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (AICA), Public Law 100–696. What does this mean? The Kolbe amendment reaffirms what many people believed; that the alternative site chosen by the Forest Service for the location of the large binocular telescope [LBT] is in compliance with the authorizing language.

Why was this language necessary? To clarify, once and for all, that the alternative site for the large binocular telescope falls within the parameters established by Congress for the location of the Mount Graham telescopes. In fact, during the entire period in which the Forest Service defended itself against the lawsuits filed by various environmental groups, U.S. Attorney Janet A. Napolitano argued in both U.S. District Court and before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals that ''* * * [the site] satisfies the statutory requirement that the three telescopes comprising the Observatory, including the LBT, not exceed 24 acres within the marked boundary.'' ''The site'' she argued, ''also conforms to the requirements of Reasonable and Prudent Alternative 3 * * *.'' U.S. Attorney Napolitano concluded her argument by stating what many of us already knew and understood, ''the Approved site [alt 2] is the best site for the long-term survival of the red squirrel.''

The U.S. attorney is not only one who has taken the position which the Kolbe amendment clarifies. Ninth Circuit Court Judge Hall in her dissenting opinion stated:

> I think that the AICA confers discretion on the Forest Service to site the telescopes as it sees fit, so long as those locations are within the 24-acre ''Site'' described in section 601(b) of the AICA, and because I believe we are bound to defer to the Forest Service's own reasonable interpretation of the AICA * * *.

Judge Hall's final comment was:

> I find the further delay imposed by today's decision especially regrettable in light of the fact that the FS appears to have chosen to locate the LBT on Peak 10,477 in good faith and for laudable reasons: Peak 10,477, according to the FWS is now the location that would cause the least disruption to the squirrel's habitat.

I couldn't agree more.

I hope the adoption of the Kolbe amendment closes this unfortunate chapter of the Mount Graham Observatory. Alternative site 2 is in compliance with the AICA, and I look forward to the resumption of construction of the LBT. The discoveries that lie in the heavens await us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. Absolutely, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 3019) to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 25, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—25

Bonilla
Chabot
DeFazio
Dornan
Duncan
Funderburk
Graham
Hancock
Hilliard
Hunter
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Largent
Norwood
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (MI)
Souder
Thornberry
Waters
Watt (NC)
Yates

NOT VOTING—10

Baesler
de la Garza
Ewing
Jacobs
Peterson (MN)
Quillen
Rangel
Rose
Schroeder
Wilson

□ 1653

Mr. HUNTER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. TATE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I missed all votes today because I was in my district with James Lee Witt, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, to visit several of the areas in Champaign County which were devastated by tornadoes last weekend and to help formulate the Federal Government's response. Had I been present, I would have voted for passage of H.R. 3019, the omnibus appropriations bill conference report.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2723

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2723, the Work and Family Integration Act.

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

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Budget Act sets up procedures to allow the appropriations process to move forward in situations when the budget resolution is behind schedule. I would like to inquire of the Chair whether these procedures have been followed.

In particular, if the conference report on the budget resolution is not adopted by April 15, section 603 of the Budget Act directs the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to submit to the House a spending allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for the coming fiscal year. The allocation is to be based on the discretionary spending limits set by law. Its purpose is to allow the House to begin work on appropriation bills.

Section 603 of the Budget Act requires this allocation to be filed as soon as practicable after April 15. When I was chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I submitted this allocation when it was required, and my predecessor, Leon Panetta, did as well.

If we are to avoid running the Government on continuing resolutions again this year, it is essential that the appropriations process get started. The April 15 deadline set by the Budget Act for completion of the budget resolution passed more than a week ago, and the House markup has not even been scheduled.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether a fiscal year 1997 spending allocation to the Committee on Appropriations has been submitted to the House as required by section 603 of the Congressional Budget Act.