

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today with the chairman of our subcommittee to present the conference report on H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies appropriation bill. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for the open and interactive way in which he has allowed us to deal with this legislation in this bipartisan way. I want to congratulate him on his first conference report, and his efforts in bringing it to the floor. I would like to think that I could congratulate him in the sense that we are going to be all done, but I do not think that is the case. I think we will be seeing this bill again after a Presidential veto.

Mr. Speaker, in many respects this is a good bill, and I support the lion's share of it. It is below the total level of discretionary spending provided last year. That was a goal that I think everybody embraced. Law enforcement funding, Mr. Speaker, is a very important part of this bill, as the chairman said. Funding for Federal law enforcement activities and for Federal support of State and local law enforcement has been significantly increased.

The Department of Justice, Mr. Speaker, receives \$2.4 billion in excess of last year's funding, with the Violent Crime Trust Fund being increased by over \$1.5 billion.

Mr. Chairman, this robust funding for law enforcement includes money for 200 new FBI positions, plus significant amounts of money for new equipment and facilities and for support of these new positions. It includes funding for 30 new Drug Enforcement Administration agents, with new equipment and mobile enforcement teams to support those important new hires.

Mr. Speaker, amazingly, this legislation provides for a total of 3,000, let me repeat that for my colleagues and anyone who is listening, for 3,000 new positions at the Immigration and Naturalization Service, including 800 new border patrol agents and 400 new inspectors, and corresponding support personnel.

Mr. Speaker, in the law enforcement area this bill provides \$175 million, full funding, as the chairman indicated, for the Violence Against Women Act programs, and it includes \$535 million for the Byrne Grant Program, a very popular, very effective, local law enforcement grant program.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is adequate in my view in other areas. The Economic Development Administration is funded at the House level, and I think it is appropriate at this time to give special recognition to our chairman. In representing his district from Kentucky, and I my district from West Virginia, we appreciate how important the Economic Development Administration is

to areas that are experiencing economic hardship. That agency has reached out and is broadening its portfolio and addressing the concerns of economically distressed areas as a result of military spending displacements.

NOAA is funded, Mr. Speaker, at \$80 million above the House level. I consider that to be a good thing. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, several departments and agencies are severely underfunded in this bill. The committee's allocation in my view is as much as \$500 million short. In fact, virtually every other part of this bill has been reduced from last year.

The Department of Commerce's funding level of \$3.4 billion is \$600 million less than last year. Tragically, Mr. Speaker, in my view, this conference agreement zeros out the highly effective Advanced Technology Program. It is tragic from the standpoint that I think substantively the ATP program is extremely important to our strategic activities to be competitive economically into the future as we compete with the world's economy. But also, Mr. Speaker, I think we should point out in this bill that zero funding the ATP program makes us renege on grants that we have already granted to some 400 companies. I do not think that action speaks very well.

The State Department and its related agencies are reduced by \$800 million below last year. That is too low. We are advised they are going to limp along with that. That cannot continue—that kind of treatment of the State Department. And many other related agencies, such as the Legal Services Corporation, are reduced dramatically. Peacekeeping functions, Mr. Speaker, are so underfunded, almost ignored, that we expect to be dealing with a \$1 billion plus deficit next year to meet our international peacekeeping obligations.

Mr. Speaker, many of these underfunded or zeroed out programs are extremely important parts of President Clinton's economic revitalization initiatives or his foreign policy initiatives, or simply our commitments to ensure that the disadvantaged receive legal services. It is clear from the President's statements that any or all of them may cause him to veto this bill.

But, Mr. Speaker, the President is committed to veto this bill because funding of the COPS program as a block grant program jeopardizes the 26,000 cops already on the beat. But, more importantly, and probably because we will get beyond that jeopardy, it makes impossible his commitment, a very fundamental part of his campaign and a very fundamental part of his law enforcement crime fighting initiative, to achieve the goal of putting 100,000 new police officers on the beat by the end of fiscal year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program that is working, and it need not be fixed simply because it was not invented by

the majority. It was President Clinton's program. The first year, from last year's 1995 fiscal year funding, we have put almost 26,000 new policemen on the beat. The first year met 25 percent of the goal. In the second year, the lowest estimates and projections are that we will put another 24,000 or 25,000 policemen on the beat if we get funding for the COPS program. That is 50,000 new policemen on the beat in the first 2 years of a 6-year program where the President promised to have 100,000 by the end of the century. We are far ahead of schedule on this program. There is no legitimate criticism of the so-called COPS program. In my mind the block granting of this program is an effort to undermine a program that is already working.

The President has indicated, Mr. Speaker, that this item is nonnegotiable, and I expect it to be the subject of the motion of recommit on this conference report.

In addition, because the bill enacts by reference certain provisions of H.R. 728, the formula for States to receive the block grant funds provided in this bill is heavily skewed toward those States with high populations and high crime rates. Smaller States, rural areas that are getting the job done, are disadvantaged in this bill.

Further, Mr. Speaker, this bill contains 31 pages of legislation in a bill that only has 78 pages in total. The issues addressed by these three legislative proposals are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. These items include a major legislative rewrite of the Truth in Sentencing Initiative grants, prison litigation reform and Legal Services Corporation. All these provisions amend current law and have impacts that are not clearly defined, despite the claims of the Committee on the Judiciary. The reasons they have ended up in this appropriations bill are unclear to me, because as far as I know, we still have a Committee on the Judiciary with an especially competent chairman and ranking member, and I see no reason why an appropriations bill should contain such extensive authorizing language.

Members may in fact be surprised by the impacts some of this language will have on the distribution of prison grant funds for their States. Preliminary information, for instance, from the Justice Department, indicates that some States that are currently eligible for prison grants will not be eligible for Truth In Sentencing incentive grants. While some of these States may become eligible for general prison grant funds, the amount of the funds available for this purpose has been reduced substantially from what it could have been under current law.

Having said all that, Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that in a bill as large and diverse as this one, there will always be things that we agree with and things that we do not. We all know it will be vetoed. I intend to work closely with the gentleman