[Roll No. 473]

AYES—362

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Archer
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chambliss
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Snowbarger
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—56

Aderholt
Andrews
Armey
Barr
Berry
Bono
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Cox
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Doolittle
Duncan
Ganske
Goode
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hilleary
Houghton
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kingston
Largent
McInnis
McIntosh
McKinney
Mink
Nethercutt
Neumann
Packard
Paul
Paxon
Pombo
Radanovich
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Shadegg
Snyder
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Thune
Traficant
Vento
Wamp
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—15

Chenoweth
Cunningham
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Holden
Lucas
Moakley
Nadler
Pallone
Pelosi
Rangel
Schiff
Smith, Linda
Young (FL)

☐ 1649

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

Mr. NUSSLE and Mr. RILEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I missed nine recorded votes while I was in New Jersey bringing my newborn daughter and wife home from the hospital today. If I had been present, my vote would have been cast as follows:

Rollcall vote 465, motion to adjourn, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 466, the Journal, I would have voted ''no.''

Rollcall vote 467, the rule for H.R. 2203 conference report, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 468, energy and water appropriations conference report, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 469, previous question for House Resolution 255, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 470, motion to rise, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 471, motion to rise, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 472, the Evans amendment to H.R. 1370, I would have voted ''yes.''

Rollcall vote 473, the LaFalce amendment to H.R. 1370, I would have voted ''yes.''

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CALVERT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1370), to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2378, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, September 29, 1997, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2378) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998 and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the order of the House of Monday, September 29, 1997, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of September 29, 1997, at page H8137.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2378, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the conference report on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government. This is a very good conference report and one which represents a great success on all sides. It provides $12.7 billion for agencies that come under this Subcommittee's jurisdiction and, for the first time in 3 years, an increase in funding. I would point out that it is in strict compliance with the 1997 Balanced Budget Agreement.

The actions taken by the conferees boost support for both drug and law enforcement programs. The bill puts us on track for a drug-free America by the

year 2001. In total, the conferees have recommended $3.9 billion, $737 million over 1997, that is a 24-percent increase, for the Customs Service, ATF, the Secret Service, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Specifically, let me just highlight a couple of the specific items in this bill in the area of law enforcement. Mr. Speaker, we provide $1.6 billion for Customs to combat drugs that come in through our borders and to facilitate passenger and cargo processing. So both the interdiction and the processing of legitimate traffic across the border are accommodated. We provide an additional $8.4 million for the next stage of Operation Hardline, an initiative that was started years ago to harden our borders against drugs, and $4.5 million to equip Customs helicopters with night vision equipment.

There is $195 million for the drug czar's anti-drug media campaign aimed at youth, $20 million more than the President had proposed. We believe this is a major step toward a comprehensive campaign for a drug-free America. There is $10 million for the recently authorized Drug Free Communities Act; $7.3 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy's efforts to combat the dangers and growing problems of methamphetamine use in the U.S.; $13 million to provide counter drug technology assistance to State and local law enforcement; $159 million for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas that I know many Members are concerned about; and $5.2 million for ballistic imaging systems for State and local law enforcement.

In other areas outside of purely law enforcement, we also continued the Committee on Appropriation's aggressive oversight of the IRS, prohibiting the IRS from spending more money on its computer modernization programs without congressional approval. By maintaining restrictions on the IRS's use of money absent a solid set of blueprints or an architectural plan for how that is going to be spent, the conference committee ensures that there is not going to be even 1 more year of wasteful spending on the computer systems for the Internal Revenue Service.

The conferees also make year 2000 computer compliance a priority within the IRS, providing $377 million for Century Date Conversion efforts.

The conferees also include requirements ensuring that IRS is in compliance with the Taxpayer Bill of Rights.

Finally, the agreement ends taxpayer subsidy of political events at the White House. In conjunction with the White House, we have worked out language that includes a new accounting mechanism for the Executive Residence. The agreement requires not only that expenses of all political events be carefully tracked, but that all of these events be paid for up front so that taxpayers are not tagged with the cost of, even for 1 day, fronting the money for political events in the White House, no matter which party is in the White House.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this conference agreement. Not only are there no more free coffees at the White House, but the drug lords are not going to like this bill one bit. I think it is a bill that every Member of this body can support and support enthusiastically.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following:

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2378)

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY						
Departmental Offices	112,048,000	116,314,000	113,410,000	114,794,000	114,771,000	+2,723,000
Counterterrorism fund	15,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-15,000,000
Supplemental funding (P.L. 105-18)	1,950,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,950,000
Automation Enhancement	27,100,000	29,389,000	25,989,000	29,389,000	25,889,000	-1,211,000
(Delay in obligation)	.....	.....	.....	(15,000,000)	.....	.....
Office of Inspector General	29,770,000	31,333,000	29,927,000	29,719,000	29,719,000	-51,000
Office of Professional Responsibility	1,500,000	1,625,000	1,500,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	-250,000
Treasury Buildings and Annex Repair and Restoration	28,213,000	12,484,000	6,484,000	10,484,000	10,484,000	-17,729,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	22,387,000	23,006,000	22,835,000	22,835,000	22,835,000	+448,000
Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund (limitation on availability of deposits)	10,000,000	9,500,000	.....	.....	.....	-10,000,000
Violent Crime Reduction Programs:						
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	36,595,000	42,378,000	21,528,000	24,023,000	19,421,000	-17,174,000
Departmental Offices	18,300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-18,300,000
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network	1,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000	3,000,000	1,000,000	.....
United States Secret Service	20,000,000	20,664,000	16,837,000	21,178,000	15,731,000	-4,269,000
ONDCP - HIDTA	13,105,000	.....	5,000,000	8,500,000	23,200,000	+10,095,000
Gang Resistance Education and Training: Grants	8,000,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+2,000,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	.....	24,058,000	1,000,000	19,619,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
United States Customs Service	.....	20,100,000	43,635,000	44,635,000	60,648,000	+60,648,000
Total, Violent Crime Reduction Programs	97,000,000	118,200,000	97,000,000	130,955,000	131,000,000	+34,000,000
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center:						
Salaries and Expenses	56,185,000	65,663,000	64,663,000	64,663,000	64,663,000	+8,478,000
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses	21,584,000	11,111,000	32,548,000	13,930,000	32,548,000	+10,964,000
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center	77,769,000	76,774,000	97,211,000	78,593,000	97,211,000	+19,442,000
Interagency Law Enforcement:						
Interagency crime and drug enforcement 1/	.....	73,794,000	73,794,000	73,794,000	73,794,000	+73,794,000
Financial Management Service	196,518,000	202,560,000	199,675,000	202,490,000	202,490,000	+5,972,000
Reimburse Federal Reserve Bank (indefinite)	.....	122,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms:						
Salaries and Expenses	460,394,000	496,954,000	478,649,000	473,490,000	478,934,000	+18,540,000
Laboratory facilities	6,978,000	55,022,000	55,022,000	55,022,000	55,022,000	+48,044,000
Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	467,372,000	551,976,000	533,671,000	528,512,000	533,956,000	+66,584,000
United States Customs Service:						
Salaries and Expenses	1,549,585,000	1,566,826,000	1,526,078,000	1,551,028,000	1,522,165,000	-27,420,000
Customs facilities, construction, improvements	.....	5,512,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Operation and Maintenance, Air and Marine Interdiction Programs	83,363,000	92,758,000	97,258,000	92,758,000	92,758,000	+9,395,000
Customs Services at Small Airports (to be derived from fees collected)	2,406,000	2,406,000	2,406,000	2,406,000	2,406,000	.....
Harbor Maintenance Fee Collection	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	.....
Total, United States Customs Service	1,638,354,000	1,670,502,000	1,628,742,000	1,649,192,000	1,620,329,000	-18,025,000
Bureau of the Public Debt	165,335,000	169,426,000	169,426,000	169,426,000	169,426,000	+4,091,000
Internal Revenue Service:						
Processing, Assistance, and Management	1,790,288,000	2,943,174,000	2,915,100,000	2,943,174,000	2,925,874,000	+1,135,586,000
Tax Law Enforcement	4,104,211,000	3,153,722,000	3,108,300,000	3,153,722,000	3,142,822,000	-961,389,000
Rescission	.....	.....	-14,500,000	.....	-32,000,000	-32,000,000
Earned Income Tax Credit Compliance Initiative	.....	107,105,000	.....	.....	138,000,000	+138,000,000
Information Systems	1,323,075,000	1,272,487,000	1,292,500,000	1,272,487,000	1,272,487,000	-50,588,000
Rescission	-174,447,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+174,447,000
Information technology investments	.....	500,000,000	326,000,000	325,000,000	325,000,000	+325,000,000
Net total, Internal Revenue Service	7,043,127,000	7,976,488,000	7,627,400,000	7,694,383,000	7,772,183,000	+729,056,000
United States Secret Service:						
Salaries and Expenses	531,288,000	575,971,000	555,736,000	570,809,000	564,348,000	+33,060,000
Rescission	-7,600,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+7,600,000
Acquisition, Construction, Improvement, and Related Expenses	37,365,000	9,176,000	5,775,000	9,176,000	8,799,000	-28,566,000
Total, United States Secret Service	561,053,000	585,147,000	561,511,000	579,985,000	573,147,000	+12,094,000
Net total, title I, Department of the Treasury	10,494,496,000	11,770,518,000	11,188,575,000	11,315,801,000	11,378,484,000	+883,988,000

1/ Funded in CJSJ bill in FY 1997.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2378) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE II - POSTAL SERVICE						
Payments to the Postal Service						
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	85,080,000	86,274,000	86,274,000	86,274,000	86,274,000	+1,194,000
Supplemental funding (P.L. 105-18)	5,383,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,383,000
Payment to the Postal Service Fund for Nonfunded Liabilities	35,536,000	34,850,000	34,850,000	34,850,000	.....	-35,536,000
Total, title II, Postal Service	125,999,000	121,124,000	121,124,000	121,124,000	86,274,000	-39,725,000
TITLE III - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:						
Compensation of the President	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	.....
Salaries and Expenses	40,193,000	51,199,000	51,199,000	51,199,000	51,199,000	+11,006,000
Executive Residence at the White House:						
Operating Expenses	7,827,000	8,045,000	8,045,000	8,045,000	8,045,000	+218,000
White House Repair and Restoration	.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Special Assistance to the President and the Official Residence of the Vice President:						
Salaries and Expenses	3,280,000	3,378,000	3,378,000	3,378,000	3,378,000	+98,000
Operating expenses	324,000	334,000	334,000	334,000	334,000	+10,000
Council of Economic Advisers	3,439,000	3,542,000	3,542,000	3,542,000	3,542,000	+103,000
Office of Policy Development	3,867,000	3,983,000	3,983,000	3,983,000	3,983,000	+116,000
National Security Council	6,648,000	6,648,000	6,648,000	6,648,000	6,648,000	.....
Office of Administration	26,100,000	28,883,000	28,883,000	28,883,000	28,883,000	+2,783,000
Office of Management and Budget	55,573,000	57,240,000	57,240,000	57,240,000	57,440,000	+1,867,000
Office of National Drug Control Policy	35,838,000	36,016,000	43,516,000	36,016,000	35,016,000	-822,000
Unanticipated Needs	.....	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Federal Drug Control Programs: High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program	127,102,000	140,207,000	146,207,000	140,207,000	159,007,000	+31,905,000
Special forfeiture fund	112,900,000	175,000,000	205,000,000	145,300,000	211,000,000	+98,100,000
Total, title III, Executive Office of the President and Funds Appropriated to the President	423,341,000	515,925,000	558,425,000	485,225,000	568,925,000	+145,584,000
TITLE IV - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
Committee for Purchase from People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled	1,800,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	+140,000
Federal Election Commission	28,165,000	34,216,000	34,550,000	29,000,000	31,650,000	+3,485,000
Federal Labor Relations Authority	21,588,000	22,039,000	21,803,000	22,039,000	22,039,000	+451,000
General Services Administration:						
Federal Buildings Fund:						
Appropriation	400,544,000	84,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-400,544,000
Limitations on availability of revenue:						
Construction & acquisition of facilities	(657,711,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-657,711,000)
Environmental cleanup activities	(20,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-20,000,000)
Consolidated Federal Law Enforcement Bldg	(81,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-81,000,000)
Repairs and alterations	(639,000,000)	(434,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(350,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(-339,000,000)
Installment acquisition payments	(173,075,000)	(142,542,000)	(142,542,000)	(142,542,000)	(142,542,000)	(-30,533,000)
Operations and rental of space	.....	.....	(3,607,129,000)	.....	.....	.....
Rental of space	(2,343,795,000)	(2,275,340,000)	.....	(2,275,340,000)	(2,275,340,000)	(-68,455,000)
Building Operations	(1,552,651,000)	(1,331,789,000)	.....	(1,331,789,000)	(1,331,789,000)	(-220,862,000)
Repayment of Debt	(88,312,000)	(105,720,000)	(105,720,000)	(105,720,000)	(105,720,000)	(+17,408,000)
Previously appropriated activities	.....	(680,543,000)	(680,543,000)	(680,543,000)	(680,543,000)	(+680,543,000)
Total, Federal Buildings Fund	400,544,000	84,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-400,544,000
(Limitations)	(5,555,544,000)	(4,969,934,000)	(4,835,934,000)	(4,885,934,000)	(4,835,934,000)	(-719,610,000)
Policy and Operations	110,173,000	104,487,000	107,487,000	104,487,000	107,487,000	-2,686,000
Office of Inspector General	33,863,000	33,870,000	33,870,000	33,870,000	33,870,000	+7,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents	2,180,000	2,250,000	2,208,000	2,208,000	2,208,000	+28,000
Expenses, presidential transition	5,600,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,600,000
Rescission (P.L. 105-18)	-5,600,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+5,600,000
Total, General Services Administration	546,760,000	224,607,000	143,565,000	140,565,000	143,565,000	-403,195,000
John F. Kennedy Assassination Record Review Board	2,150,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	-550,000
Merit Systems Protection Board:						
Salaries and Expenses	23,923,000	24,450,000	25,290,000	24,810,000	25,290,000	+1,367,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(2,430,000)	(2,430,000)	(2,430,000)	(2,430,000)	(2,430,000)	.....
Morris K. Udall scholarship and excellence in national environmental policy foundation	.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	.....	1,750,000	+1,750,000

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1998 (H.R. 2378) — continued

	FY 1997 Enacted	FY 1998 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Archives and Records Administration:						
Operating expenses	196,963,000	206,479,000	202,354,000	206,479,000	205,166,500	+8,203,500
Reduction of debt	-4,012,000	-4,012,000	-4,012,000	-4,012,000	-4,012,000	.....
Archives Facilities and Presidential Libraries:						
Repairs and Restoration	16,229,000	6,650,000	10,650,000	13,650,000	14,650,000	-1,579,000
National Historical Publications and Records Commission:						
Grants program	5,000,000	4,000,000	5,500,000	5,000,000	5,500,000	+500,000
Total, National Archives and Records Administration	214,180,000	213,117,000	214,492,000	221,117,000	221,304,500	+7,124,500
Office of Government Ethics	8,078,000	8,265,000	8,078,000	8,265,000	8,265,000	+187,000
Office of Personnel Management:						
Salaries and Expenses	87,286,000	85,350,000	85,350,000	85,350,000	85,350,000	-1,936,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(94,736,000)	(91,236,000)	(91,236,000)	(91,236,000)	(91,236,000)	(-3,500,000)
Office of Inspector General	960,000	960,000	960,000	960,000	960,000	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(8,645,000)	(8,645,000)	(8,645,000)	(8,645,000)	(8,645,000)	.....
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employees Health Benefits	4,059,000,000	4,338,000,000	4,338,000,000	4,338,000,000	4,338,000,000	+279,000,000
Government Payment for Annuitants, Employee Life Insurance	33,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	-1,000,000
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund	7,989,000,000	8,336,000,000	8,336,000,000	8,336,000,000	8,336,000,000	+347,000,000
Total, Office of Personnel Management	12,169,246,000	12,792,310,000	12,792,310,000	12,792,310,000	12,792,310,000	+623,064,000
Office of Special Counsel	8,116,000	8,450,000	8,116,000	8,450,000	8,450,000	+334,000
United States Tax Court	33,781,000	34,293,000	33,921,000	34,293,000	33,921,000	+140,000
Total, title IV, Independent Agencies	13,057,787,000	13,367,287,000	13,287,665,000	13,284,389,000	13,292,084,500	+234,297,500
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(5,661,355,000)	(5,072,245,000)	(4,938,245,000)	(4,988,245,000)	(4,938,245,000)	(-723,110,000)
Net grand total	24,101,623,000	25,774,854,000	25,155,789,000	25,206,539,000	25,325,767,500	+1,224,144,500
Appropriations	(24,276,337,000)	(25,774,854,000)	(25,170,289,000)	(25,206,539,000)	(25,357,767,500)	(+1,081,430,500)
Rescissions	(-182,047,000)	.....	(-14,500,000)	.....	(-32,000,000)	(+150,047,000)
Emergency funding (P.L. 105-18)	(7,333,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-7,333,000)
(Limitations)	(5,661,355,000)	(5,072,245,000)	(4,938,245,000)	(4,988,245,000)	(4,938,245,000)	(-723,110,000)
Scorekeeping adjustments:						
Bureau of The Public Debt (Permanent)	129,000,000	144,000,000	144,000,000	144,000,000	144,000,000	+15,000,000
Ethics Reform Act Adjustment	-6,000,000	.....	.....	-2,000,000	.....	+6,000,000
Gold and platinum bullion	-12,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+12,000,000
Section 409	1,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,000,000
Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corp. (Sec. 638)	26,100,000	34,000,000	.....	.....	34,000,000	+7,900,000
Emergency funding for anti-terrorism	-275,328,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	+275,328,000
Trust fund budget authority	105,700,000	102,311,000	102,311,000	102,311,000	102,311,000	-3,389,000
US Mint revolving fund	.....	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000
Sallie Mae	.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+1,000,000
Federal buildings fund	.....	.....	-50,000,000	.....	-50,000,000	-50,000,000
Total, scorekeeping adjustments	-31,528,000	311,311,000	227,311,000	275,311,000	261,311,000	+292,839,000
Total mandatory and discretionary	24,070,095,000	26,086,165,000	25,383,100,000	25,481,850,000	25,587,078,500	+1,516,983,500
Mandatory	12,245,786,000	12,885,100,000	12,885,100,000	12,885,100,000	12,850,250,000	+604,464,000
Discretionary:						
Crime trust fund	97,000,000	118,200,000	97,000,000	130,955,000	131,000,000	+34,000,000
General purposes	11,727,309,000	13,082,865,000	12,401,000,000	12,465,795,000	12,605,828,500	+878,519,500
Total, Discretionary	11,824,309,000	13,201,065,000	12,498,000,000	12,596,750,000	12,736,828,500	+912,519,500

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

□ 1700

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. The chairman has outlined well the provisions of this conference report. I think all of the Members on my side of the aisle, as well as all of the Members on the chairman's side of the aisle, can be pleased with the fact that this bill addresses significant law enforcement problems: fighting drugs, fighting crime, providing funds to the ONDCP to make sure that our young people know of the dangers of drugs, and convince them to stay off and to just say no, as Mrs. Reagan so aptly suggested.

It also provides other funds for the IRS to make sure that we have a system that works. We have new people in place that are addressing the problems that the committee has seen and that the Congress has seen, and very frankly, I think this bill is a good bill that could be unanimously supported by the committee.

I want to make a point to the chairman. I do not see the major chairman on the floor. I understand there is a colloquy, and I will wait perhaps and hopefully the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman LIVINGSTON, will be on the floor. I understand he is on his way. I understand the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has a colloquy to enter into.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I congratulate the gentleman for his work on this bill, I congratulate him on the bipartisan fashion in which he has worked toward fashioning a bill that I think is acceptable to all parties.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say, since I did not in my opening remarks, I would like to return the compliment to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]. It has been a great pleasure to work with him. We have not agreed on everything, by any means, but I think we have always worked in a spirit of constructive cooperation, of finding answers to the problems, and I think what we have is a bill that has such bipartisan support because of the work of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and his staff, who I complimented when we considered the bill before. But I want to again compliment all the staff, the committee staff as well as the personal staffs on both sides of the aisle, for the work they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is it correct that in this bill Congress has increased the Office of Management and Budget's budget by $200,000 in order to help OMB facilitate their oversight and coordination of both new and ongoing statutory responsibilities, including the Congressional Review Act?

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this appropriated sum is significant because the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has learned in hearings over the past year and a half that OIRA has not been implementing and coordinating the Congressional Review Act, despite its organizing statute and President Clinton's Executive order.

To make the Congressional Review Act work, Congress and the agencies need OIRA'S expertise to coordinate agency input to the General Accounting Office on the new rules they promulgate. The Government Accounting Office has reported to us that they have been frustrated by OIRA's refusal to work with them in their role of helping Congress understand the impact of each major rule.

I appreciate the chairman's leadership on this bill.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] and the remarks that he has made. I look forward to working with him, and other Members who have expressed the same views on this issue, in the forthcoming year to ensure that the OMB dedicates the necessary resources to this and to other issues.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Cleveland, OH [Mr. KUCINICH].

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

Mr. Speaker, as a former local official, I know every dollar counts, and that local taxpayers are being asked to shoulder the ever-increasing burden of services the Federal Government no longer provides. That is why I support a money-saving program for local and State governments, and why I now oppose the Treasury-Postal appropriation.

The cooperative purchasing program, which Congress passed into law in 1994, at section 1555 of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act, was designed to allow local and State governments, school districts and public hospitals, to purchase goods and services at a super discount off the Federal rate, saving local taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars per year. Unfortunately, some have moved to take this particular program out of the conference report.

Here is how the cooperative purchasing program is supposed to work. A school district has to purchase computers, chalkboards, and basic furniture. Thanks to the cooperative purchasing program, the school district could buy the supplies and services it needed directly from vendors at the discounted prices the GSA negotiated. The GSA, as we know, is a procurement agency for the government.

These GSA-negotiated prices are often the lowest anywhere, allowing local taxpayers an opportunity to save money. Unfortunately, certain industry groups that benefit from government inefficiency would like nothing more than to have the law repealed. So the pharmaceutical industry wants to see the program repealed, because cooperative purchasing would entitle public hospitals and AIDS clinics to significant discounts on life-saving drugs. The medical equipment industry is also mobilizing against the discounts.

Mr. Speaker, we have a way to reduce the cost of government. It is called the cooperative purchasing program. Today the House will keep this idea and the program alive by rejecting the conference committee report. Let us tell our constituents we want to keep local taxes low and we reject the repeal of the cooperative purchasing program.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. Just briefly, obviously, that was an issue that there was strong feeling on, particularly in the Senate, and frankly it was impossible to prevail on that position from the House perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I would enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman. The chairman and I have had long discussions and worked many years on the FEC. We differ in our perspectives in some respects, but we have come, I think, to what is a fair agreement on both sides, given the status of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman, am I correct that under the language that we have adopted with respect to FEC term limits, that there are two Republican vacancies currently and two Democratic vacancies? As I understand it, there are three pending nominations and one Republican that was withdrawn and one that will be made. Hopefully both the executive and the legislative will cooperate to make sure those nominations are made prior to December 31.

It is our understanding that under those circumstances, they would then be able to be reappointed once after the initial appointment.

Is that correct, Mr. Speaker?

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, is correct. As the gentleman knows, I have been a proponent of term limits for appointed members in the executive branch for some time, and especially on the Federal Election Commission.

It now appears that we are in the final days of resolving this with the prospect that those term limits could be adopted for members on the Federal

Election Commission. In view of the fact that some members of the Commission have served for the duration of the Commission, since about 1974, it just seemed to me that term limits are an appropriate remedy.

That being the case, in order to get the bill signed without too much undue negotiation and/or a veto, I have agreed with the gentleman that we would make sure that any person currently on the Commission or any person who might be appointed to or nominated for an appointment to the Commission between now and December 31 of this year would not be subject to that term limit immediately, but would be able to be appointed for a subsequent term, and that would be their last term. Anybody nominated or appointed following December 31 of this year would in fact be subject to the one-term, one 6-year term limit, and would only be able to serve 6 years at the most.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the chairman for his comments. That is, indeed, my understanding, that the four vacancies, two Republicans and two Democrats that are pending now, three being nominated, one Republican to be nominated, they would be subject to these limits, to the extent that they could serve the term for which they are now nominated and one additional; that is, sitting members, now, could be reappointed for one term, but that all future commissioners would be limited to the one term.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is correct.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the chairman's clarification.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding time to me. I appreciate the gentleman's efforts that have gone into this.

I join with my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KUCINICH] in being very disappointed and expressing our disappointment in the fact that this bill has come back from conference that repeals the cooperative purchasing program, which was a program established under Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act in the 103rd Congress.

This act allows local governments to buy at a discount items off the GSA schedule that the Federal Government buys and at prices the Federal Government currently pays. This provision could have saved local governments, State and local governments tens of millions, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Instead of passing this cost down to State and local taxpayers, the Senate, without holding one hearing, has decided to repeal this provision. I am particularly disappointed that the Group 70 schedule, a schedule with over 1,200 vendors, where over 90 percent of the vendors who applied to get on that schedule can get on, was discarded.

This is going to cost State and local governments millions of dollars, perhaps billions of dollars over the next decade as they go to acquisitions of information technology, computers, and very complex procedures that take a lot of time to go out with a request for proposal, responses to the proposals, best and final.

If they had been allowed to purchase under the Cooperative Purchasing Act, they could have purchased right off the GAO's schedule, could have defined exactly what they wanted, and it would have compressed the acquisition time in a significant manner, and literally would have saved millions of dollars.

So I am very disappointed, as is the National Governors' Association, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the Conference of Mayors, and other State and local government organizations who have worked with this Congress over the last couple of years to try to help them bring savings to their taxpayers, as we are trying to do here at the Federal level.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I understand and appreciate the gentleman's position. As the gentleman knows, in fact, I share his position on this issue, and voted that way in committee before the bill was reported to the floor. As the gentleman well knows, I lost, and his position, as articulated now, lost as well. On a point of order it was struck, but the fact of the matter is the reality was that the majority of the conferees on the House side and the majority of the conferees on the Senate side were for doing what the Senate did.

I will tell my friend, who I believe serves on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the real problem is the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight did not demand that the jurisdiction of the committee be honored in this instance. Very frankly, this is an issue for the gentleman's committee. He is absolutely correct.

I regret that the initial recommendation of the gentleman from Arizona, Chairman KOLBE, which was, back when we did the supplemental in March, to defer this issue to the gentleman's committee for action, did not in fact happen. I appreciate the gentleman's point.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the Vice President supporting my position.

The letter referred to is as follows:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, September 23, 1997.

Hon. THOMAS M. DAVIS, III,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR TOM: Thank you for your strong support for the use of cooperative purchasing authority for state and local governments. The Administration opposes repeal of this authority in the Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act for 1998 and would support the House's position in conference.

In 1993, as part of my work on reinventing government, I recommended to the President that General Services Administration be granted the authority to allow states and localities to purchase items from the federal supply schedules so they could enjoy the same advantageous prices GSA is often able to negotiate under contracts it has set up for the federal government's use. Used in appropriate circumstances, this cooperative purchasing authority might result in significant savings to the American taxpayer. Congress agreed and in 1994, gave GSA cooperative purchasing authority in the historic Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act.

It is surprising that efforts are underway to repeal this authority without the benefit of congressional hearings or other opportunities to assess the advantages of this program for taxpayers. The General Accounting Office studied this issue and concluded that the provision, if managed effectively, would not harm the federal government. As a result, the Administration opposes this attempt to repeal the provision because it could deny state and local taxpayers the opportunity to share in the savings the Federal Government is able to negotiate as a large buyer of commercial items.

However, if the repeal cannot be stricken in Conference, the Administration is willing to work with the Congress on a compromise to permit such purchases for a number of specified product categories in demand by State and local governments and whose affected producers have not objected. We would further urge that this authority include a limited pilot program for pharmaceuticals used to treat life-threatening conditions, beginning with drugs used to treat HIV. We also urge the retention of GSA's authority to make any of the services it provides to Federal agencies available to a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that is to provide a commodity or service to the Federal Government under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act. GSA's total collection of administrative fees will not increase by more than the incremental increase in the cost of administering the program.

As a former county official, you appreciate more than most that taxpayers do not make much distinction between the federal, state, and local governments when they pay taxes. They want the benefit of savings and efficiency, from whatever level of government. If we do not work together to make this happen, we will never be able to restore the public's confidence in government. The cooperative purchasing program is an important example of how we need to use common sense to save tax dollars and do the right thing for all Americans.

Again, thank you for your leadership in this good fight.

Sincerely yours,

AL GORE.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, and to all those who are concerned about this issue, the fact of the matter is, I am on their side and we lost. But I would urge the gentleman to look at the balance of the bill, because in terms of all of the rest of the bill, in terms of IRS, in terms of Customs, in terms of Secret Service, in terms of ATF, in terms of the White House, in terms of all of the other issues that this bill covers, it is

a very positive bill for many of the folks that the gentleman and I represent.

I would urge the gentleman that this is really an issue that needs to be addressed in the gentleman's committee. It should not be in our committee, the gentleman is absolutely right. The fact of the matter is the majority believed that this should pass, and we did not have the votes to stop it. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the most felicity about this bill has been because our pay raise, our COLA increases, are tied to the salaries in this bill, because in actuality that is less of the amount of dollars than we are increasing the IRS. We as Republicans are going around the country right now criticizing the IRS, while we are increasing their dollars here. There are many reasons why we are doing it, but nevertheless, it is rather an inconsistent message.

Furthermore, many Republicans went around the country criticizing the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, and many gun owners around this country have been concerned about their abuses and civil rights abuses, yet we are not only not eliminating ATF, we are increasing ATF. I have great problems with this, as well as with the pay increase, and Members need to know that that is what is tied to this bill.

The second major concern I have is the process. It was not that we were not aware that this bill had us tied to the pay increase, it was that there was no rule vote, so we could not object to the rule. The rule, because we could not object to a rule, it meant that we were not allowed to offer any amendment to stop the pay raise. Therefore, the only thing we could do the first time was to vote against this bill the first time it went through. We could not do a motion to recommit or a motion to instruct conferees, because that is left to the minority leadership, so we had a procedural vote.

Once again, because it is a conference report, we cannot have a vote in this Congress on the pay raise. I think that is unfortunate. Thaere are a lot of Members, and I realize it is the will of this House, the majority of the Members favor a pay increase, but in fact this is another backdoor way to do it through, and it is unfortunate we did not have a straightforward vote.

□ 1715

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

Following up on the comments of the gentleman who has just spoken, this is not a back-door way to do anything. The amendment that the gentleman refers to, as I understand it, has been introduced in the form of a bill. It is in committee. It can be reported out. The fact of the matter is, we could add the amendment that the gentleman suggests to any bill being considered by this House. It is not germane on this bill because nothing in this bill deals with pay, as the gentleman knows. I presume he knows that. If he does not know it, I will inform him. Nothing in this bill deals with pay.

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that our salary increases are tied to the increases of Federal employees?

Mr. HOYER. To the extent that we cannot get any COLA adjustment if Federal employees do not get it, that is accurate. It is not included in this bill. No, sir. Nothing in this bill deals with the COLA's of Federal employees; nothing in this bill deals with the COLA's of Members; nothing, not one jot or tittle.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if this would fail, would we get our increase?

Mr. HOYER. Absolutely. If it would pass, we would get our increase.

Mr. SOUDER. The gentleman is saying that our salaries go up regardless of what we do?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am saying to the gentleman that nothing in this bill will affect his salary one way or the other.

Mr. SOUDER. Is it not true that this bill has historically, because it contains the salaries of Federal employees, the amendment to not have the pay raise, to eliminate the COLA is historically placed?

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, obviously salaries and expenses for Federal employees are in every bill that deals with every agency, as the gentleman knows.

The gentleman is correct that this bill deals with the Office of Personnel Management. He is further correct that from time to time this bill has been used as a vehicle to stop the COLA adjustment. It could be effected in any bill, I tell the gentleman. So the gentleman's comments are as relevant to any bill that we consider as they are to this one.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, is it not true that the Senate had placed their amendment on this bill and if we did it on another bill, the Senate has not passed it, therefore it could die in conference or could be vetoed by the President if it is freestanding, but if you do it on an appropriations bill, that it is less likely to be vetoed, and, secondly, that we have had no precedent in any other bill that the Senate has ever put that amendment on?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I think we could make that observation. Obviously, the Senate receded in this instance, as the gentleman knows, I think wisely so. I would hope that this conference committee would pass based upon the merits of this bill.

Mr. SOUDER. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would briefly like to respond to a couple of the other things that the gentleman from Indiana spoke about on the IRS.

I am very pleased with what we did here with the IRS. There are three increases that are in here for, as the gentleman from Indiana spoke about. Yes, it is an increase for IRS; $377 million of that increase is for Y–2K, that is the Year 2000 Compliance, to make sure that the computers are able to handle the shift to the new millennium. I do not think there is anybody that believes that we should have the whole system crash and the IRS not be able to function after the year 2000. That is what this money is in there for. We have funded that completely.

There is also $325 million for technology investment, what we used to call the tax system modernization where, we know, money was unfortunately frittered away in past years. So we have gone to a new system where now the money that we put aside for that is going to be fenced. We will not allow one dime of that to be spent until the committees, both the House and Senate, have seen the architectural plan for the spending of that money. There again, I think this is wise management and prudent spending.

Finally, for another initiative that this body has said is extraordinarily important, the $138 million for the earned income tax compliance initiative. We heard during the debate recently on the budget about the tremendous abuse of the earned income tax credit. We put in $138 million to enhance compliance and to cut down on the fraud and abuse of the earned income tax credit.

For all of those reasons, I think that the money that we have appropriated here, the increased money for the Internal Revenue Service, which, by the way, is still $204 million below the President's request, that that money that is in here is well spent. It has been carefully thought out. It has been worked out very carefully not only with the Internal Revenue Service, but also with the minority side, with the Senate, and I think that we have a very good handle on that money.

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

The fact of the matter is that I would hope that Members would concentrate on what this bill is, not what it is not, what it possibly could be, what could be added. There are a lot of great things that probably could be added to this bill that are not added to this bill. There are probably a lot of great things or bad things that this bill could preclude that it does not. But what it is, what this bill is that Members are going to consider is an excellent bill that does good and is bipartisan in nature. We all gave to reach agreement.

I thank the chairman for his leadership and effort on this issue.

REQUEST FOR QUORUM CALL

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Does the gentleman from Maryland move a call of the House? Under clause 6(e)(1) of rule XV, a point of no quorum is not in order at this point in the debate. Does the gentleman move a call of the House?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, could I be told how much time remains in the debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] has 17 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] has 18 minutes remaining.

REQUEST FOR CALL OF THE HOUSE

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will withhold that motion. Under clause 6(e)(2) of rule XV, recognition for a motion for a call of the House is entirely in the discretion of the Chair.

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

I want to reiterate why Members ought to vote for this bill. The reason they ought to vote for this bill is because it does some things that are very important to average Americans, families in neighborhoods, in communities, concerned about the safety of their children, concerned about the safety of their families, concerned about the safety of their neighborhoods.

It provides $3.9 billion for law enforcement efforts. Every Member in this House supports that kind of effort. The fact of the matter is, $1.6 billion of that money is for antidrug activities. We could all talk about making communities safe. We can go back to our town meetings and say, I want to keep America safe from drugs; I want to keep American kids off of drugs. But the fact of the matter is, this effort makes that happen. This is an important initiative.

ONDCP, which is the organization that General McCaffrey heads up, as all of you know, the most decorated soldier in America, General McCaffrey heads up the ONDCP. He has organized an effort across the Government to make sure that we maximize our effort to make our communities safe. We provide for monies to go on television. We know that there is nothing that impacts young people in America like television.

What this bill does is provide funds so that we can communicate with young people with reference to staying off drugs, as I said earlier, just saying no. That is a critically important effort. I would ask Members to focus on that. There are some of you who think this bill is not perfect. You are absolutely right, it not perfect, but it is a very important effort in trying to address the drug problem in America, safe communities in America.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I have a question about the funding in this for the IRS. Is it true or not true that the funding for the IRS increases by a half a billion?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, let me get that figure for the gentleman. Maybe the chairman has the exact figure.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I just covered this a moment ago. Let me tell the gentleman again what is in here. Although it is $204 million below what the President requested, we have three increases for the IRS.

We have $377 million for Y–2K, year 2000 compliance, to make sure that the computers are compliant and that we will be able to process tax returns at the new millennium, which I do not know of any Member who thinks we should not be able to do in our Federal agencies.

There is $325 million in this bill for technology investment. This was formerly called the tax system modernization program, but unfortunately that money was wasted, and we have now gone back and said that not one dime of this $325 million can be spent by the IRS until there is actually an architectural blueprint or a plan for how it is going to be used.

Finally $138 million is in there for the earned income tax compliance initiative. We heard about this during the debate over the budget, the concerns about fraud and abuse of the EITC. I think it is a priority of this House that we have more compliance with the EITC. That is why we have it in here.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, so the overall figure is somewhere over a half a billion?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the answer to the gentleman's question is yes, but I would point out to the gentleman, the bill is over $200 million below what the President felt necessary to fund the IRS. The committee cut that figure by over $200 million.

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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 220, nays 207, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

YEAS—220

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Archer
Armey
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cardin
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crapo
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Delahunt
DeLay
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gingrich
Green
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne
Pelosi
Pickering
Pickett
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Saxton
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stokes
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Torres
Towns
Upton
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bereuter
Berry
Bonior
Boswell
Brady
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Carson
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch

Duncan	Klug	Royce
Edwards	Kucinich	Ryun
Emerson	LaHood	Salmon
English	Lampson	Sanchez
Ensign	Largent	Sanders
Etheridge	Lazio	Sandlin
Evans	Lewis (GA)	Sanford
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Sawyer
Forbes	LoBiondo	Scarborough
Ford	Lofgren	Schaefer, Dan
Fox	Lowey	Schaffer, Bob
Franks (NJ)	Lucas	Schumer
Gejdenson	Luther	Sensenbrenner
Gekas	Maloney (CT)	Sessions
Gephardt	Manzullo	Shadegg
Gibbons	Mascara	Shays
Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Sherman
Goode	McGovern	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Slaughter
Goodling	McKinney	Smith (MI)
Gordon	Menendez	Smith, Adam
Goss	Metcalf	Smith, Linda
Graham	Mica	Snowbarger
Granger	Minge	Snyder
Gutierrez	Moran (KS)	Souder
Gutknecht	Myrick	Spratt
Hall (TX)	Neumann	Stabenow
Hamilton	Northup	Stearns
Hayworth	Norwood	Stenholm
Hefley	Nussle	Strickland
Herger	Pappas	Stump
Hill	Pascrell	Sununu
Hilleary	Paul	Talent
Holden	Pease	Tauscher
Hooley	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Hostettler	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry
Hulshof	Petri	Thune
Hutchinson	Pitts	Thurman
Inglis	Pombo	Tiahrt
Istook	Pomeroy	Tierney
Jenkins	Poshard	Traficant
John	Price (NC)	Turner
Johnson (CT)	Radanovich	Velazquez
Johnson (WI)	Ramstad	Visclosky
Jones	Reyes	Walsh
Kaptur	Riggs	Wamp
Kasich	Riley	Watkins
Kelly	Rivers	Watts (OK)
Kennedy (RI)	Rodriguez	Weller
Kennelly	Roemer	Weygand
Kildee	Rogan	White
Kim	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
Kind (WI)	Rothman	Wise

NOT VOTING—7

Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Young (FL)
Hinchey	Pastor	
Hinojosa	Schiff	

□ 1750

Messrs. SHAYS, COOK, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. BONO, MCINTOSH, and BONILLA changed their 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 upon the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 474 on H.R. 2378 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 474, final passage of the Treasury, Postal Appropriations Conference Report, H.R. 2378, I was unavoidably delayed. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted ''nay.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 474, the conference report to H.R. 2378, Treasury, Postal appropriations for fiscal year 1998, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 105–137)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Iran emergency declared in 1979 is to continue in effect beyond November 14, 1997, to the *Federal Register* for publication. Similar notices have been sent annually to the Congress and the *Federal Register* since November 12, 1980. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 1996. This emergency is separate from that declared with respect to Iran on March 15, 1995, in Executive Order 12957.

The crisis between the United States and Iran that began in 1979 has not been fully resolved. The international tribunal established to adjudicate claims of the United States and U.S. nationals against Iran and of the Iranian government and Iranian nationals against the United States continues to function, and normalization of commercial and diplomatic relations between the United States and Iran has not been achieved. In these circumstances, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities that are in place by virtue of the November 14, 1979, declaration of emergency and that are needed in the process of implementing the January 1981 agreements with Iran.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1997.*

NOTICE

CONTINUATION OF IRAN EMERGENCY

On November 14, 1979, by Executive Order 12170, the President declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States constituted by the situation in Iran. Notices of the continuation of this national emergency have been transmitted annually by the President to the Congress and the *Federal Register*. The most recent notice appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 31, 1996. Because our relations with Iran have not yet returned to normal, and the process of implementing the January 19, 1981, agreements with Iran is still underway, the national emergency declared on November 14, 1979, must continue in effect beyond November 14, 1997. Therefore, in accordance with section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)), I am continuing the national emergency with respect to Iran. This notice shall be published in the *Federal Register* and transmitted to the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 30, 1997.*

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2267, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 239 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2267.

□ 1755

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Friday, September 26, 1997, amendment No. 16 by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] had been disposed of and section 616 was open to further amendments.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

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

Mr. Chairman, the first order of business on the consideration of this bill is the matter dealing with the census. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of last week, debate time on this amendment was limited to 80 minutes.

On this side of the aisle, I do not anticipate any extraneous motions, in which case, if the other side could agree to that, we could have 80 minutes where Members would be able to attend