

# SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT ELIMINATION OF TRADE RESTRICTIONS ON IMPORTATION OF U.S. AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SHOULD BE TOP PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 213, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 213, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were— yeas 420, nays 4, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

YEAS—420

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Gallegly
Ackerman	Coble	Ganske
Aderholt	Coburn	Gejdenson
Allen	Collins	Gekas
Andrews	Combest	Gephardt
Archer	Condit	Gibbons
Army	Cook	Gilchrest
Bachus	Cooksey	Gillmor
Baesler	Costello	Gilman
Baker	Cox	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Coyne	Goodling
Ballenger	Cramer	Gordon
Barcia	Crane	Goss
Barr	Crapo	Graham
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Granger
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Green
Bartlett	Danner	Greenwood
Barton	Davis (FL)	Gutierrez
Bass	Davis (IL)	Gutknecht
Bateman	Davis (VA)	Hall (OH)
Becerra	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	DeGette	Hamilton
Bereuter	Delahunt	Hansen
Berman	DeLauro	Harman
Berry	DeLay	Hastert
Bilbray	Deutsch	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart	Hastings (WA)
Bishop	Dickey	Hayworth
Blagojevich	Dicks	Hefley
Bliley	Dingell	Hefner
Blumenauer	Dixon	Herger
Blunt	Doggett	Hill
Boehlert	Dooley	Hilleary
Boehner	Doolittle	Hilliard
Bonilla	Doyle	Hinchey
Bonior	Dreier	Hinojosa
Bono	Duncan	Hobson
Borski	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boswell	Edwards	Holden
Boucher	Ehlers	Hooley
Boyd	Ehrlich	Horn
Brady (PA)	Emerson	Hostettler
Brady (TX)	Engel	Houghton
Brown (CA)	English	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Ensign	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	Eshoo	Hunter
Bryant	Etheridge	Hutchinson
Bunning	Evans	Hyde
Burr	Everett	Inglis
Buyer	Ewing	Istook
Callahan	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Calvert	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Camp	Fawell	(TX)
Campbell	Fazio	Jefferson
Canady	Filner	Jenkins
Cannon	Foley	John
Cardin	Forbes	Johnson (CT)
Carson	Ford	Johnson (WI)
Castle	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Chabot	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Chambliss	Fox	Jones
Christensen	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski
Clay	Franks (NJ)	Kaptur
Clayton	Frelinghuysen	Kasich
Clement	Frost	Kelly
	Furse	Kennedy (MA)

Kennedy (RI)	Nadler	Shadegg
Kennelly	Neal	Shaw
Kildee	Nethercutt	Shays
Kim	Neumann	Sherman
Kind (WI)	Ney	Shimkus
King (NY)	Northup	Shuster
Kingston	Norwood	Sisisky
Klecza	Nussle	Skaggs
Klink	Oberstar	Skeen
Klug	Obey	Skelton
Knollenberg	Olver	Slaughter
Kolbe	Ortiz	Smith (MI)
Kucinich	Owens	Smith (NJ)
LaFalce	Oxley	Smith (OR)
LaHood	Packard	Smith (TX)
Lampson	Pallone	Smith, Adam
Lantos	Pappas	Smith, Linda
Largent	Parker	Snowbarger
Latham	Pascrell	Snyder
LaTourette	Pastor	Solomon
Lazio	Paxon	Souder
Leach	Payne	Spence
Lee	Pease	Spratt
Levin	Pelosi	Stabenow
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Petri	Stenholm
Linder	Pickering	Stokes
Lipinski	Pickett	Strickland
Livingston	Pitts	Stump
LoBiondo	Pombo	Stupak
Lofgren	Pomeroy	Sununu
Lowey	Porter	Talent
Luther	Portman	Tanner
Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Tauscher
Maloney (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Tauzin
Manton	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
Manzullo	Radanovich	Taylor (NC)
Markey	Rahall	Thomas
Martinez	Ramstad	Thompson
Mascara	Rangel	Thornberry
Matsui	Redmond	Thune
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Thurman
McCollum	Reyes	Tiahrt
McCrery	Riggs	Tierney
McDade	Riley	Torres
McDermott	Rivers	Trafficant
McGovern	Rodriguez	Turner
McHale	Roemer	Upton
McHugh	Rogan	Velazquez
McIntosh	Rogers	Vento
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Visclosky
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Walsh
McKinney	Rothman	Wamp
McNulty	Roukema	Watkins
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Watt (NC)
Meek (FL)	Royce	Watts (OK)
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Waxman
Menendez	Ryun	Weldon (FL)
Metcalfe	Sabo	Weldon (PA)
Mica	Salmon	Weller
Millender-	Sanchez	Wexler
McDonald	Sanders	Weygand
Miller (CA)	Sandlin	White
Miller (FL)	Sanford	Whitfield
Minge	Sawyer	Wicker
Mink	Saxton	Wilson
Moakley	Scarborough	Wise
Mollohan	Schaefer, Dan	Wolf
Moran (KS)	Schaffer, Bob	Woolsey
Moran (VA)	Schumer	Wynn
Morella	Scott	Yates
Murtha	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Myrick	Serrano	Young (FL)
	Sessions	

NAYS—4

Chenoweth  
DeFazio

Paul  
Waters

NOT VOTING—10

Burton  
Conyers  
Cunningham  
Gonzalez

Goode  
Kilpatrick  
McCarthy (MO)  
McInnis

□ 1448

Mr. BONIOR and Mr. BOEHNER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mrs. CHENOWETH changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the elimination of restrictions on the importation of United States agricultural products by United States trading partners should be a top priority in trade negotiations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 508 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. 4276.

□ 1450

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. 4276) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Monday, August 3, 1998, the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) had been postponed and the bill was open from page 2, line 23, through page 3, line 13.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN:

On page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$40,000,000)".

On page 21, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$60,000,000)".

On page 25, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

On page 64, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

On page 70, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

On page 85, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$9,000,000)".

On page 92, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

On page 99, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$109,000,000)".

On page 99, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$109,000,000)".

## RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 255, noes 170, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

## AYES—255

Abercrombie	Frelinghuysen	McGovern
Ackerman	Frost	McHale
Allen	Furse	McHugh
Andrews	Ganske	McIntyre
Baesler	Gejdenson	McKinney
Baldacci	Gekas	McNulty
Barcia	Gephardt	Meehan
Barrett (WI)	Gilchrest	Meek (FL)
Becerra	Gilman	Meeks (NY)
Bentsen	Goodling	Menendez
Berman	Gordon	Millender-
Berry	Green	McDonald
Bilbray	Greenwood	Miller (CA)
Bishop	Gutierrez	Minge
Blagojevich	Hall (OH)	Mink
Blumenauer	Hamilton	Moakley
Boehlert	Harman	Mollohan
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)
Borski	Hefner	Morella
Boswell	Hilliard	Murtha
Boucher	Hinchey	Nadler
Boyd	Hinojosa	Neal
Brady (PA)	Holden	Nethercutt
Brown (CA)	Hoolley	Ney
Brown (FL)	Horn	Oberstar
Brown (OH)	Houghton	Obey
Camp	Hoyer	Olver
Canady	Hulshof	Ortiz
Capps	Jackson (IL)	Owens
Cardin	Jackson-Lee	Pallone
Carson	(TX)	Pascarell
Castle	Jefferson	Pastor
Chambliss	John	Payne
Clay	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi
Clayton	Johnson (WI)	Peterson (MN)
Clement	Johnson, E. B.	Pickett
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Condit	Kaptur	Porter
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Poshards
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Price (NC)
Cramer	Kennelly	Pryce (OH)
Cummings	Kildee	Quinn
Danner	Kim	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kind (WI)	Ramstad
Davis (IL)	Klecicka	Rangel
Davis (VA)	Klink	Regula
DeFazio	Klug	Reyes
DeGette	Kucinich	Rivers
Delahunt	LaFalce	Rodriguez
DeLauro	LaHood	Roemer
Deutsch	Lampson	Ros-Lehtinen
Diaz-Balart	Lantos	Rothman
Dicks	Largent	Roybal-Allard
Dingell	LaTourette	Rush
Dixon	Lazio	Sabo
Doggett	Leach	Sanchez
Dooley	Lee	Sanders
Doyle	Levin	Sandlin
Edwards	Lewis (CA)	Sawyer
Ehlers	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Ehrlich	Lipinski	Serrano
Engel	Lofgren	Shays
Eshoo	Lowey	Sherman
Etheridge	Luther	Sisisky
Evans	Maloney (CT)	Skaggs
Farr	Maloney (NY)	Skelton
Fattah	Manton	Slaughter
Fawell	Markey	Smith (NJ)
Fazio	Martinez	Smith, Adam
Filner	Mascara	Snyder
Forbes	Matsui	Spratt
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Stabenow
Fowler	McCollum	Stark
Fox	McCrery	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McDade	Stokes
Franks (NJ)	McDermott	Strickland

Stupak  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Tauzin  
Thompson  
Thurman  
Tierney  
Torres  
Traficant  
Turner

Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Walsh  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (PA)

Wexler  
Weygand  
White  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)

## NOES—170

Aderholt  
Archer  
Armey  
Bachus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Bilirakis  
Bliley  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brady (TX)  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Campbell  
Cannon  
Chabot  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins  
Combust  
Cook  
Cooksey  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cubin  
Deal  
DeLay  
Dickey  
Doolittle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Foley  
Fossella  
Gallegly

Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Goodlatte  
Goss  
Graham  
Granger  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Herger  
Hill  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hostettler  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jenkins  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Latham  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalfe  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Moran (KS)  
Myrick  
Neumann  
Northup  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pappas  
Parker  
Paul  
Paxon

Pease  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Pitts  
Pombo  
Portman  
Radanovich  
Redmond  
Riggs  
Riley  
Rogan  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Roukema  
Royce  
Ryun  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer, Dan  
Schaffer, Dan  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith, Linda  
Snowbarger  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sununu  
Talent  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thune  
Tiahrt  
Wamp  
Watkins  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Young (FL)

Conyers  
Cunningham  
Gonzalez

## NOT VOTING—9

## □ 1508

Mrs. KELLY and Mr. SAXTON changed their vote from "aye" to "no." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, \$75,312,000.

In addition, \$59,251,000, for such purposes, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

## OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provi-

sions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App.), \$36,610,000; including not to exceed \$10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and for the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of motor vehicles, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That up to one-tenth of one percent of the Department of Justice's allocation from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund grant programs may be transferred at the discretion of the Attorney General to this account for the audit or other review of such grant programs, as authorized by section 130005 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-322).

## UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, \$7,400,000.

## LEGAL ACTIVITIES

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed \$20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia; \$462,265,000; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds available in this appropriation, not to exceed \$17,834,000 shall remain available until expended for office automation systems for the legal divisions covered by this appropriation, and for the United States Attorneys, the Antitrust Division, and offices funded through "Salaries and Expenses", General Administration: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That \$813,333 of funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act shall be transferred by the Attorney General to the Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets in the United States: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

In addition, \$8,160,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, to remain available until expended for such purposes.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, as amended, not to exceed \$4,028,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$68,275,000: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$68,275,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18(a)) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and

shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the General Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1999, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1999 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$0: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$68,275,000 in fiscal year 1999 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1999.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES  
ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental and cooperative agreements, \$1,037,471,000; of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 2000, for (1) training personnel in debt collection; (2) locating debtors and their property; (3) paying the net costs of selling property; and (4) tracking debts owed to the United States Government: *Provided*, That, of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000,000 of those funds available for automated litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Offices of the United States Attorneys, not to exceed 9,044 positions and 9,312 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Attorneys.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENSIGN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENSIGN:

Page 7, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$1,676,000)"

Page 7, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$3,000,000)"

Page 26, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$3,000,000)"

Page 30, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$3,000,000)"

Mr. ENSIGN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the subcommittee chairman, for working with me on this amendment.

What my amendment seeks to do is to increase funding for drug courts by \$3 million. While I would like to have included a little more money for the drug courts, right now they are funded at \$40 million, and my amendment takes them to \$43 million for this year.

The drug courts are something that I truly believe in, and I am going to outline the reasons that I believe in them. But I do want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for working with us on this amendment, coming up with an offset so that we can have this amendment paid for.

First of all, the drug courts, while they started about 10 years ago across the country in communities, have had

a great effect on reducing crime throughout our communities. Every single community that has tried a drug court has found them to be successful: successful in reducing crime, reducing recidivism, as well as saving the taxpayer money.

Now, in my own State of Nevada, I want to praise one of the judges there, Judge Lehman. Although we have several drug courts across the State of Nevada, Judge Lehman is the person that I am the most familiar with.

Judge Lehman so far has had 931 people graduate from his program in the drug court program. Of those, only 13 percent have had rearrests after 6 years. Now, normally in our prison system we have about a 75 to 80 percent repeat-offender rate.

Let me give these numbers again. Normally in our prison system we have about a 75 to 80 percent recidivist, or repeat offender, rate. Under Judge Lehman's drug court, only 120 out of almost 1,000 people who have gone through the drug courts have actually been rearrested for any reason after 6 years. That is only a 13 percent repeat-offender rate.

I do not think that there is anything else in our criminal justice system that can point to that type of success.

What drug courts represent are local, State, and Federal Government coming together, because that is where the funding comes from, to say let us put some common sense back into our criminal justice system.

Across the country, criminal justice system professionals estimate that at least 45 percent of the defendants convicted of drug possession commit a similar offense within 2 or 3 years of release of jail.

Drug courts have proven truly remarkable in preventing hundreds of repeat drug offenses in the country. More than 70 percent of the drug court clients have successfully completed the program or remain as active participants, and recidivism rates from drug participants, this is across the country, range from 2 percent to 20 percent.

So we can see not only in Nevada we have had success in drug courts, but across the country. Not only do we save taxpayer money, we are also saving lives.

Let me point out something that most people would not think about. Many children in this country today are born with what we call fetal alcohol syndrome or fetal drug syndrome. These babies are born to addicted mothers, not only of alcoholics but also of drug addicts.

Every person that we can get off drugs through these programs or off alcohol through these programs, that is a life we could be changing. Because fetal alcohol syndrome, if my colleagues have talked to any parents that have adopted a child or any parents that have actually had one in their own family, these children go through some devastating consequences. As a matter of fact, in our

criminal justice system today, people that were fetal alcohol syndrome babies turn out in many cases to actually be involved in the criminal justice system by committing crimes later.

We need to put a stop to fetal alcohol syndrome, to people using alcohol and drugs while they are pregnant; and one of the best ways to do that is to start at the preventive side. And the drug courts have been very successful in getting people off drugs, off of alcohol, so that we do not end up with this fetal alcohol syndrome.

□ 1515

I want to just conclude by saying that I appreciate what the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) has done and to say that this amendment while it is just a small amount of money in the big picture is still something that is very significant because of the tremendous success that drug courts have had across the country.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases drug courts by \$3 million. That is on top of the \$10 million increase that we already have in the bill for a total of \$43 million for drug courts, which is about a 33 percent increase. I agree with the gentleman, the drug court concept is working, and as more States and localities find out the benefits of the drug courts, more and more are applying for moneys. Consequently, that is the reason that we included a hefty increase already in the bill. But the gentleman's amendment, I think, is well placed and I am prepared to accept the amendment and so do at this time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are strongly in favor of drug courts, and we think that the gentleman has crafted his amendment in the way it would be acceptable to us. We have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to request that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) engage in a colloquy with me and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I am pleased to engage in a colloquy with both the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, the committee report provides additional resources to the DARE program through the use of unobligated balances in the COPS program. I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their continued support of

programs which will help reduce drug use among our Nation's youth.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has received a significant appropriation request for the DARE program in order to improve and expand the DARE curriculum to more middle schools.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me thank the gentleman from Washington for raising this issue and for his work on the Drug-Free America Task Force. The committee received a request from the task force on the day of our subcommittee markup for significant funds to expand the DARE program into middle schools and I have worked to provide additional funds for the DARE program. I will continue to work in conference with the Senate to see that DARE's curriculum continues to be improved and, to the extent, appropriate access to additional funds be made available.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NETHERCUTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee and a longtime supporter of the DARE program, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT). There is need for expanding the DARE program to middle schools and to ensure that the best available curriculum is used. Additionally, the success of the DARE program is not solely limited to Federal resources. In my district and across the country, DARE has the support and financial backing of communities and private industry.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to continue to work with both gentlemen on this issue, and I commend the gentleman for bringing it up.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, \$54,231,000, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, to remain available until expended for such purposes.

#### UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), \$114,248,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$114,248,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1999, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1999 appropriation from the Fund estimated at \$0: *Provided further*, That any such fees collected in excess of \$114,248,000 in fiscal year 1999 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1999.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$1,335,000.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service; including the acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of vehicles, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, \$477,611,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i); of which not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; and of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 for development, implementation, maintenance and support, and training for an automated prisoner information system shall remain available until expended.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Skaggs:

Page 9, line 8, after "\$477,611,000" insert "(increased by \$100)".

Page 84, line 15, strike "the Television Broadcasting to Cuba Act,".

Page 84, line 20, strike "and television".

Page 84, line 21, strike "\$383,957,000," and insert "\$374,518,000,".

Mr. SKAGGS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment makes a very small addition to the Marshals Service fund and deletes \$9.4 million in funding for TV Marti for a very simple reason: It is a complete waste of money.

I wish to amend the bill at this point in particular so that Members who may be looking for offsets for more worthy uses of funds later in the bill would be able to have this \$9.4 million for more deserving application, or conceivably that our good chairman would have a little bit of working room when he gets to conference, which I suspect he would welcome.

For Members who may not be familiar with this program, I will first try to explain the logical reasons that we ought to end TV Marti, but let me just acknowledge at the outset some advice that I got from a very informed staff person over at the United States Information Agency. He said, "Congressman, you know, you're trying to use logic to battle a cartoon." So if some of this seems a little bit surreal as we go along, that perhaps will help Members understand what is going on.

Mr. Chairman, TV Marti is broadcast out of a balloon hung over the Florida Keys most weekdays from 3:30 a.m., until 8 a.m., and it goes to, or tries to go to, the greater Havana area. But since TV Marti began broadcasting in 1990, virtually nobody has seen it because, sad to say, the Castro govern-

ment is very successful in jamming it. To date we have spent over \$110 million, real money, on this failed program.

I think it follows, quite logically, that since nobody sees this TV program, it really can make no contribution to bringing freedom and democracy to Cuba, a goal which we all share.

On the other hand, this amendment does not touch Radio Marti, the sister program of TV Marti, which does get through, just as Radio Free Europe got through despite jamming by the Soviets during the Cold War. My amendment has no effect on Radio Marti.

During the Cold War, radio transmissions had a significant audience in the Eastern Bloc because it is relatively easy to defeat jamming of radio. Television signals, on the other hand, are exclusively line of sight, easy to jam and as a practical matter there really is no alternative frequency.

TV Marti's broadcasts have been jammed from the beginning. At least seven, count them, seven objective studies by people without an ax to grind in this have been done since 1991. Not one of them has found any significant audience for TV Marti.

We should have disbanded this operation back in 1994 after an advisory panel found there was no significant audience. Instead, the backers of this program came up with, I think, the slightly nutty idea that if only we changed from a VHF, very high frequency, signal to an ultrahigh frequency, UHF signal, that that would solve the problem. We spent \$1.7 million doing that, knowing full well that it would be even easier to jam the UHF signal than the VHF.

All it takes to do that is for some signal to be transmitted on the same frequency as TV Marti with a comparable field strength. Our own National Association of Broadcasters has told us it requires little more than a 100-watt transmitter and an off-the-shelf antenna and that that could deliver enough field strength in a 30-mile diameter to be effective.

Here is a map of the greater Havana area. The hash marks on the overlay indicate a 30-mile diameter. This is the area that can be jammed effectively with a 100-watt transmitter. It takes about 200 watts of power to yield the 100-watt signal. Members can see there is a little bit of area that is not quite covered, so maybe we need two jammers for a total of 400 watts. So for four light bulbs' worth of power, sad to say, the Castro government is able to completely null this TV signal coming from the balloon over the Keys. While he is spending literally nickels and dimes on electricity to do this, we are spending about \$25,000 a day wasting taxpayers' money sending invisible television to nowhere.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SKAGGS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Nonetheless we did this UHF to VHF conversion, and it was really no surprise that the signal still did not get through.

Let me just give my colleagues some visual evidence that was elicited by one of our own government technicians who went down to Cuba to check on what was going on technically. This is a picture of the TV Marti logo when it came on the air on Channel 64 while this USIA technician was monitoring signals. A couple of minutes later, once the jamming signal was put on the air by Castro's people, this was the jammed picture that came through. Likewise, sometimes we use a different channel. This is what Channel 50 of TV Marti looks like when the jamming is in place. There has been a survey done by the U.S. Interest Section at the Swiss Embassy where we have our presence in Havana showing that virtually no one sees this new UHF signal.

Now, there is some suggestion that this is still a bargain. Let me just tell Members, compared to the costs of our other international broadcasting efforts, TV Marti is not only a waste of money because the signal does not get through but it's also a very, very rich program in terms of our costs of producing an hour that we put on the air.

As Members can see, for each hour of programming by comparable efforts, Radio Marti 8 to 11 employees; Radio Free Asia, 8 to 15; Voice of America, 1.3. A real bargain. Just to give Members a television comparison, C-SPAN, about 9 employees. TV Marti in order to get one hour of programming on the air takes 40.6 employees.

There are other costs as well. Right now we have one balloon flying over the Keys for this purpose and for air interdiction, drug interdiction purposes. The National Security Council has decided that we will risk a hole in our air defenses by letting this one aerostat balloon instead be used on TV Marti.

As I said, we have already spent \$110 million on this. If we fully fund it again we will have gone to about \$120 million. This is simply a classic example of a failed program.

Supporters of this program say it will be a propaganda victory for the Castro regime if we eliminate it. I have got to believe that it is a much bigger victory for the American taxpayer if we stop this kind of waste. We are spending millions while he is spending nickels and dimes. We will continue to broadcast to Cuba with Radio Marti. This is not giving up on that effort.

I know many colleagues have heard my pitch on this before, but it is way past time to put this failed program out of its misery. I ask for Members' support on the amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MORAN OF VIRGINIA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SKAGGS

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORAN of Virginia to the amendment offered by Mr. SKAGGS:

Strike the last line of the amendment and insert "\$374,520,000."

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simply a perfecting amendment. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado that TV Marti is an unfortunate waste of taxpayers' money. Because its broadcasts are jammed, TV Marti does not have a significant audience and in fact I would think it should be eliminated. Like the underlying amendment, my amendment deletes the funding for TV Marti but leaves just a bit more money in the international broadcasting operations for other programs.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentleman would accept my amendment.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment to my amendment, and if may I ask him to continue to yield, I think there is one other important consideration that ought to be brought to Members' attention as we deal with this whole issue.

Recently there was a survey done in Cuba under the auspices of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the overall entity that supervises our international broadcasting activities. Based upon that survey, in which 4 people out of 284 surveyed said they may have seen TV Marti in the last few days, our own Broadcasting Board of Governors has determined and issued a report that this UHF signal is jammed just as easily as the old VHF was and there is no significant audience.

There is going to be, I suspect, some use of this survey, and I just think it is important for Members to understand how this survey was done. The persons surveyed included only those who had come to the U.S. interest section in the Swiss Embassy in Havana to apply for visas to come to the United States, so that was not exactly a random sample. These are people that are trying to get out, understandably so.

Also of interest is the fact that in the waiting room for the U.S. interest section there is a television set there which broadcasts TV Marti because they have a satellite dish. So the idea that even these 4 people out of 284 give us any basis for hope that the signal is getting through I think is pretty well undermined by the way this survey was done.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Colo-

rado (Mr. SKAGGS). It just boggles the mind how with all the priorities that we have in this country, that we would be spending millions and millions of dollars to maintain a system that serves no real function other than perhaps a political one.

I saw the chart up there, and would the gentleman confirm that we have more than 40 employees working on TV Marti compared to a handful on Radio Free Asia and some of the programs that actually are effective?

Mr. SKAGGS. If the gentleman will yield, that was a calculation of number of FTEs per hour of programming, and it is about 40 FTEs per hour for TV Marti. Its sister operation, radio, is way down there, around 8 employees per hour. Of course that is radio rather than TV, but even discounting for that, it is a very, very rich program.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. This is really an unbelievable waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) has expired.

(On request of Mr. HEFNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MORAN of Virginia was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Chairman, without going into the technical part of broadcasting, I have some experience with broadcasting. I own radio stations, and sponsors that buy spots on one's radio station or television station, they have to justify that they are reaching so many people in their market.

There is not an investor, there is not a corporation in the United States that would pay the tariff to carry the television to Marti. This is absolutely a total waste of money. From a practical standpoint, this is money, and the priorities are absolutely ridiculous.

In the first place, it is probably the highest cost per listener of any station in the United States or anywhere else because unless the government pays it, one could not afford to broadcast this into this area, and to me we have our priorities kind of messed up here.

Mr. Chairman, in the Committee on Appropriations we did away with the heating assistance to our poor people and our older people, and we are spending these millions of dollars on Television Marti that is absolutely producing no results. And to me that is a total waste of money, a total waste of priorities, and we should go ahead, just go ahead and kill this thing and be done with it because it is absolutely useless for the purpose that it was supposedly set up to do.

Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely not working, and it is a waste of taxpayers' money.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it really is a scandal. I think the only reason that it

continues is that most taxpayers just have no idea that this is going on. They have no idea of the facts. They trust the Congress is going to do the right thing with their tax money.

But I cannot imagine any objective observer, any average taxpayer who would want their money wasted in such a scandalous fashion as it is with TV Marti, where there is no audience, where there is an enormous amount of overhead, and where no advertiser would ever purchase time because there is no audience to this thing. And yet we are spending millions and millions and millions of dollars, apparently for some political purpose but certainly not for any objective public policy purpose.

So, unless the gentleman has anything further to add, I will conclude my statement, and I appreciate the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) accepting the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition.

The perfecting amendment and the amendment both would do away with the funding for TV Marti. The gentleman from Colorado, a friend and member of our subcommittee who has served so well in this Congress and in our subcommittee, has led a long and determined effort to kill funding for TV Marti.

This is the most recent chapter of a long book, and the gentleman is to be commended for, if nothing else, his persistence and a well-reasoned argument, but the full committee again this year rejected his amendment in full committee. It has been rejected in subcommittee. It has been rejected in full committee for several years running.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, the full committee adopted the gentleman's substitute to my amendment, which was not ultimately made part of the bill because I withdrew it. I think it is not exactly fair to say it was rejected on the merits.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the point is well taken, but again it is the same effort. It is the effort to eliminate TV Marti funding.

This year the bill includes \$9.4 million for TV Marti, which represents a continuation of just basic funding. The gentleman's amendment would delete the entire amount.

Despite the continuing difficulties that the gentleman cites in TV Marti, terminating this program, Mr. Chairman, is not the answer. Termination is not the answer. Providing accurate and objective news, as we know, helped bring about change in the former Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe, and we are now broadcasting, as we all know, for the first time into Asia and other parts of the world. It can play the same role in China and in Cuba as well.

We are all frustrated by the difficulties of reaching a large audience with

TV Marti, but we should not let those difficulties bar us or prevent us from trying. I, for one, am unwilling to give up and give in to Fidel Castro. Deleting the money for TV Marti is running up the white flag to Fidel Castro.

Mr. Chairman, I do not possess a white flag.

We have a duty to press for more freedom in the prison that lies so close to our shores and with such strong historical ties with the United States, so I support continued funding. We will encourage the USIA and the Broadcasting Board that oversees these programs to bring us some more creative and realistic proposals to increase the reception of these broadcasts in Cuba, but I think we should continue to try.

The aerostat that is being used as the antenna for broadcasting TV into Cuba is a shared aerostat with the Department of Defense. Our Nation's defense rests upon this so-called balloon. That is the way the DOD communicates. We are using the Department of Defense balloon, or aerostat, for reaching an audience in Cuba.

Yes, we have had difficulty in reaching into Havana, but we are still reaching portions of Cuba. And so I urge the defeat both of the perfecting amendment and the gentleman from Colorado's amendment, and hope that the House will not run up the white flag on this proud building.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. Chairman, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to seek to receive and to impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. So for almost four decades the people of Cuba have been denied this basic, universally-recognized right. They have been denied this right by the Castro regime.

The Cuban dictatorship realized from the onset that knowledge empowers, and it knew that if it controlled the flow of information, it would be able to manipulate the Cuban people and forever imprison them in a parallel world created by Castro's lies and twisted propaganda. Thus, if it were to sustain its campaign against the United States, against American newspapers, magazines and broadcasts, it had to be prohibiting all the information at all cost.

So, Mr. Chairman, the people of Cuba have lived in absolute darkness about the U.S. commitment to freedom and democracy in their island Nation until the first broadcast of Radio Marti was transmitted into Cuba. Another milestone was crossed when TV Marti began its transmissions in 1990.

Do we want to allow the veil of silence to envelope Cuba once again? Cutting off funding for TV Marti would

do just that. TV Marti challenges Castro's hold by educating the Cuban people about our policies in the United States and about American society. It is critical to fulfilling the mission that USIA has of explaining and supporting American foreign policy and of promoting U.S. national interests through a wide range of overseas information programs.

TV Marti offers the U.S. Government our capacity to reach out to the Cuban people on two fronts. It is an integral component of a multifaceted strategy to bring freedom and democracy to the last bastion of communism in our Western Hemisphere, and it is also a conveyor of truth as well as its servant. Thus, eliminating TV Marti would place truth at a significant disadvantage against the venom that is spread daily by the Castro regime.

We have heard arguments from opponents of TV Marti that it does not reach the Cuban people because of jamming by the regime. Well, copies of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that I quoted from earlier and the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights, those documents are frequently confiscated by the Castro regime. Does that mean that we should stop trying to send these valuable international documents to the dissidents, to the growing opposition, to the general population? Religious groups tell us that they routinely try to smuggle bibles into Cuba. Castro's thugs block their distribution. So we should stop sending bibles to the enslaved Cuban people? Of course not.

TV Marti is reaching the Cuban people. One new viewer means that one more person will question the situation in Cuba. One more viewer means one more person that has escaped Castro's intellectual imprisonment.

Castro used to very massively jam Radio Marti, and the opponents on the other side worked very hard to get the funding out of Radio Marti. Well, now the signal is going through, the technology was improved, so now they say we have got to block TV Marti.

But if this body passes the Skaggs amendment or the Moran amendment, the House of Representatives would be awarding a tremendous victory that we would be bestowing upon the oppressors, while at the same time depriving the enslaved people of Cuba of a critical tool that we can give them, which is unbiased, free information. It would essentially cut off the flow to Cuba, as the dictatorship would be able to concentrate its resources on blocking the remaining broadcast, and the result would be an even more strengthened Castro regime.

Does the United States Congress want to be an accomplice to the further entrenchment of a regime which serves as a safe haven for U.S. criminals? We have a long list from the FBI of U.S. fugitives who are now given refuge in Cuba, and we know that Castro is harboring global terrorists. We know that Castro allows Cuba to be used as a

transit point for illegal narcotics trafficking that will later reach the U.S. shores.

We should not be held accountable for all of this misery in Cuba. We should help the Cuban people free themselves of the oppressor. We should not be an accomplice for this further entrenchment of a regime.

The only choice available to us today, Mr. Chairman, is to support TV Marti and vote against the Skaggs and the Moran amendments, and I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for his steadfast support of these very needed programs of transmission to the enslaved people of Cuba.

□ 1545

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me first show our colleagues two quick things here. First of all, this picture that the gentleman from Colorado has made available to me is a transmitting gadget which costs about \$5,000. This is effective in jamming a signal of one of the largest taxpayer's waste of money, which has cost \$110 million. So for \$5,000, I can jam that signal. I think that is a better deal.

Secondly, let us understand what TV Marti is. TV Marti is, and I have called it this for many years that I have been the coauthor of this book that the gentleman from Colorado has been writing, is an electronic toy for a lot of people, for a little group in this country, that makes a lot of political donations and in return gets a foreign policy that they like.

I would hope that instead of taking taxpayer dollars to buy that toy called TV Marti, they would do what I do. When I want my electronic toys, I simply use my Radio Shack card, and it is much cheaper and does not hurt the taxpayers in any way. So I would recommend that to some folks in Miami and others places.

It is interesting to note that one of the things that happened with TV Marti is its offices were moved to Florida, I think we did that last year or the year before, because, supposedly, I think, you could get closer to Cuba through your transmission, not from Washington, but from Florida. I do not think that is what it was, but that is what we were told it was.

I have a lot of respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I keep watching him every time he defends TV Marti to see if he is smiling or not, because I want to make sure that he really believes everything he is telling us.

Let us understand something: TV Marti may survive today once again. We are going to get closer to defeating it one of these days, but it may survive again. If it survives, it is only because it is a political issue that we Americans do not know how to deal with.

We found out how to deal with China; we found out how to deal with Viet-

nam; we know how to deal with Korea. We even, it looks like, know how to deal with Iran and Iraq. But we do not know how to deal with Cuba. So we keep taking taxpayer dollars to build this big monster called an island of 11 million people that is somehow going to invade us and take us over one day. We are not going to discuss that part. The only invasion they will make can be seen at Yankee Stadium and other places where their quality of baseball continues to increase our quality of baseball.

Mr. Chairman, if Members are going to support this, support it for what it is. It is a political ploy to satisfy a small group of people. Most people in that community do not even believe that this is good use of taxpayer dollars. But what you cannot do is continue to stand here and say that TV Marti is the salvation of American democracy, that TV Marti somehow is going to save the Western World from this monster of an island in the Caribbean.

TV Marti, I submit once again, is nothing more than a small group of people's electronic toy. I do not mind them having a toy, but not with my tax dollars.

So I would hope Members would support the gentleman from Colorado's amendment, and I will yield to him. I know he has a few additional statements to make.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I just wanted to offer some response to the gentlewoman from Florida, who I know feels deeply and sincerely, and I respect her feelings. And if I thought that somehow TV Marti was able to be made successful in getting information into Cuba, then the very moving arguments that the gentlewoman made would have some real traction.

But this is not DAVID SKAGGS saying this does not work. Every time we have asked some outside group to take a look at this problem of electronics, how do you overcome a 100-watt jammer with a TV signal from an aerostat balloon, they keep coming back and saying it is not feasible. It does not work.

That is what we heard from the President's task force in 1991 and 1994. It is what we heard from the U.S. Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy in 1991 and 1993. It is what the GAO said in 1992. It is what the advisory panel that the Congress set up in 1993 told us in 1994. It is what the Committee on Appropriations investigative staff said in 1995. It is what the Board of Broadcasting Governors, the entity we set up to supervise this whole part of the government, told us twice this year. It does not work.

I am sorry, it does not work. We should not spend money on it.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am a loyal mem-

ber of the Committee on Appropriations and I respect the work done by both the majority and the minority, but it really hurts to see we are cutting education, we are cutting heating for senior citizens, we are cutting environmental programs, and we are wasting \$110 million on a signal that was seen once with some Popeye cartoons.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) which seeks to eliminate TV Marti.

Soviet communism may have been a bad memory in Europe, but the crushing weight of its repression still bears down on the Cuban people. Cuba is not a normal nation; it is a totalitarian state. A still ruthlessly effective secret police snuffs out the slightest dissent with repression and harsh prison terms. Freedom of the press does not exist in Cuba. It is even illegal to possess a copy of the Miami Herald. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is considered by Cuban officials as enemy propaganda.

Uncensored information is freedom's lifeblood in a closed society, and Fidel Castro fully knows that. That is why he jams Radio and TV Marti. He does not do it 100 percent successfully either. That is why he and his regime would have cause to celebrate if TV Marti were silenced by the Skaggs amendment.

TV Marti, with an appropriation of some \$9 million, provides the Cuban people with a window to the outside world and a hopeful glimpse of the future. It is vitally important that Cuban-Americans are active participants in Radio and TV Marti's good work. We need to bear in mind that it was Fidel Castro who forcibly divided the Cuban family. Radio and TV Marti helps to reunite the Cuban family in their common quest for freedom. That is the spirit behind Radio and TV Marti.

If TV Marti's audience is limited, it is because that is the way Mr. Castro would like it. TV Marti's reporting is journalistically sound and evenhanded. That is why Mr. Castro opposes it. That is an important argument why we should be for it.

The Castro regime complains loudly at every effort by our Nation to support freedom in Cuba. We should not waver in our message of hope for the Cuban people that one day their nightmare, too, will end.

I ask my colleagues to think about the dissidents in Cuba and about the millions more who quietly resist that dictatorship. Silencing TV Marti will send a chilling message to every Cuban who has the courage to struggle



against Mr. Castro's tyranny. Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to defeat the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and we have worked very, very hard to work with very few funds this year. If we were talking about the things that the gentleman from New York and the gentlewoman from Miami were talking about, if we were getting results, all right. Nobody shows us any results from these broadcasts. You air from 3 o'clock in the morning until 8 o'clock. I am convinced if they were not jammed, there would be very few people watching television at 3 o'clock in the morning.

If you look at the cost, there is not any television station or a band of television stations that the cost is as much as it is for TV Marti.

Somebody is making a lot of money, it is not very efficiently run, and there is, as I said earlier, not a corporation in the world that would invest money in as few listeners as TV Marti has.

I made the point about the yoke of communism that the Cuban people bear, and that is a tragedy. But we have had a policy in Cuba ever since I have been involved in politics that has not been effective. TV Marti is not effective, and even the proponents of TV Marti can give you no numbers of how many people that TV Marti is reaching and what the cost per listener is that it costs the taxpayers of this country.

I yield to nobody in my fight to release people from the yoke of communism and for defense of this great country, but these arguments are pretty ludicrous when you talk about that this is our last stand to try to do away with Castro, and that if TV Marti is gone, we have lost the whole battle and we do not have the commitment to the Cuban people. To me, that is totally ludicrous, and I would urge that Members vote for the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the campaign which has been led by the gentleman from Colorado in Jihad fashion for years to kill Cuba broadcasting has had many tactics and strategies. The tactic that is being emphasized now, the tactic *la mode*, is Castro jamming. That is the tactic being emphasized now.

We have heard other tactics, and we have certainly seen them. The gentleman from Colorado referred to report after report, investigation after investigation, report after report, investigation after investigation that has been imposed upon that group of Federal workers, and yet they continue to do their job and to do a good job.

One of the last reports imposed upon those Federal workers, done by the Board of Broadcasting Governors, contained a survey, the most scientific and empirical survey that has been done in

any totalitarian state with regards to the reception of our broadcasts, and the survey was specifically with regard to what the gentleman from Colorado with his amendment seeks to kill today, Television Marti. That survey, which was made public first in two "Dear Colleagues" from the gentleman from Colorado, dated July 23, stated that TV Marti viewership, and I mention it here, has a 1.5 percent audience share.

Now, let us look at this. This is the survey that I first came across from a report that the gentleman from Colorado made public now, a 1.5 percent audience share. Let us compare that to the other equally important radio broadcasts that our Nation sends, for example, to China, Radio Free Asia. In Cantonese,  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent is what that same report from the Board of Governors says is the audience share of Radio Free Asia in Cantonese, our broadcasts to China. Not 1.5 percent, but  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent. In English,  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent. In Mandarin, 2 percent, comparable to the 1.5 percent audience share that TV Marti has.

This is with a survey, which, of course, then in a subsequent Dear Colleague, the gentleman from Colorado said "No, no, no, wait a minute. I am not making that survey public; do not pay attention to it now, because I made reference to it in a Dear Colleague."

No, I want to make reference and emphasis on the survey that the gentleman from Colorado made public, a 1.5 percent audience share. This was an actual survey of viewers of Television Marti.

What are the comparables with regard to the radio broadcasts, very important broadcasts to Croatia and Hungary and Slavonia and Russia? They are all comparable, for example, around the 2 percent range.

I do not know if the Russians continue to jam or not. I do know that when the Russians were at their maximum jamming capacity, it was down to what it is in China today,  $\frac{1}{10}$  of 1 percent. But I have never heard in the 6 years that I have been in Congress, nor in my studies beforehand, the gentleman from Colorado or the other opponents of Cuba broadcasting, never once have I heard them say, "Oh, wait a minute. There is jamming. There was jamming of Radio Free Europe. There was jamming of Radio Liberty. There is jamming today by the communist Chinese of Radio Free Asia, so we have to eliminate that."

No, thank God, they have not embarked upon their Jihad to try to kill Radio Free Asia, and they did not try to kill Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

□ 1600

But for some reason, they have embarked and they continued to embark on this Jihad to kill Cuba broadcasting.

He says now that it is TV Marti that he is after, based on the pretext of the

audience. But I remember, I remember in 1993 when I was a freshman Member of this House and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) had an amendment, and succeeded at the first stage in the appropriations process in killing radio and television, television and radio. The greatest success story in the history of USIA broadcasts, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) tried to kill that as well. But he cannot use the reception argument on that, so he talks about the reception of TV Marti. According to the gentleman's own report that he made public, it is 1.5 percent.

Let us be clear. I think the best way which we can understand what the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is after is in Castro's own newspaper, Cuba Workers, from July 20:

The recent budget approved by the U.S. House contains funding again for Radio and TV Marti. It is incredible how much money is wasted to support extremist positions of the most conservative American legislators. Fortunately, of course, there are some legislators who have been objective in opposing these bills, such as Democrat Representative DAVID SKAGGS, whose analyses prove that both Radio and TV Marti are a waste of public funds.

I do not think it is a time to provide a victory for Castro. It is a time to continue the fight for freedom of information for Cuba, and continue funding for TV Marti.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Skaggs and Moran amendments. Year after year we have defeated the attempts to eliminate funding for TV Marti, and to deny over 40,000 Cubans viewership of this important independent news. Even those who disagree with our policy on Cuba, and that is not what is in debate here, must believe in the opportunity for an open window of information to the Cuban people.

If they do not believe in that, then they must take the same position on a whole host of other TV broadcasting that we do to other parts of the world that cannot meet the audience share that TV Marti meets.

Supporters of the amendment would have us believe that no one in Cuba is seeing TV Marti. Quite the contrary. The Broadcasting Board of Governors reports that Cuba has a 1.5 percent audience share in Cuba. That is greater than the audience share in 37 other countries where we have broadcast through VOATV and World Net TV.

What are some of those countries? China, North Korea, Pakistan, Somalia, Indonesia, parts of Africa. If we accept this standard that a 1.5 share is not enough, then clearly, for all of those other countries for which we have an interest in sending a message from the United States about our intentions vis-a-vis those countries, about our position vis-a-vis those countries, about what we stand for in our foreign policy, then we must also seek



to eliminate those, because if not, we have a double standard in the process.

Mr. Chairman, that means that 1.5 percent more people in Cuba are watching TV Marti broadcasts than there are viewers in China, in North Korea, in Somalia, in Turkey, in Cameroon, and 30 other nations. In fact, audience share in North Korea is less than 1 percent, and the audience share for Cantonese broadcasts in China is a mere .1 percent. Why do we not see amendments eliminating funding for broadcasts to those? By this standard, these broadcasts should be eliminated forthwith.

The question that I think some have failed to ask themselves is why does Castro seek to abolish TV Marti? Why does he care if TV Marti does not penetrate Cuba? Because it does. TV Marti does penetrate Cuba and it does reach some Cuban households.

If we think about that, if we think about the messages that go to the Cuban government and the Cuban military who do have access to TV Marti and our ability to send messages at that level of the government, if we think about the ability to be ready in a time of transition when jamming may not be done, when there is a movement internally in the country, our ability to talk to those people by the power of images, such as CNN, it will be important. We will not be able to do that transmission if we do not have TV Marti at that time.

In our own interest section, TV Marti is played. Over 75,000 Cubans enter our interest section every year. What are they doing while they are waiting to see a counselor or officer? They are seeing TV Marti and the broadcasts that are recorded.

Yes, Cuba does jam TV Marti some of the time, but America has never responded to a recipient country's jamming of programming by simply giving up. That is the standard the Members will set. If jamming is the reason why Members will not permit TV Marti to go forward, then understand that if any other countries are jammed, we do not have the audience share, and the same situation will be sought to apply for others.

The Cuban people have not given up on their hope of democracy. I do not think we in America who are a fountain and beacon of light to people throughout the world in terms of information, that we should be giving up on them and creating a different standard.

Even Joe Duffey of the United States Information Agency, the director, in letters to the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS), and others have said that they in fact believe that TV Marti can be effective. We need to make sure that at this point in time we in fact stand with the free flow of information.

Let me close on that. So many of my colleagues who have a disagreement about our policy talk about a free flow of information. We have heard in the past both Radio and TV Marti attacked

on this floor. Now it is limited to TV Marti. Forty thousand Cubans; the ripple effect: 75,000 who see it at the U.S. intersection, the government officials, the military officials who have satellites. All of them make a dramatic impact, and the ripple effect of that can flow into the mightiest walls of oppression.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SKAGGS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MENENDEZ was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman did not mean to mischaracterize the recent survey that he referred to. In fact, as the gentleman may not be aware, the Broadcasting Board of Governors did not find a 1.5 percent audience share. In fact, they discounted this mock survey that both the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Florida earlier alluded to as being invalid, as having any statistical significance at all.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding from Mr. Duffey, who is the USIA director and who ultimately oversees all of Cuban broadcasting as part of the broadcasting that the United States Information Agency does in terms of surrogate broadcasting, that that 1.5 percent is a valid share of the audience.

Mr. SKAGGS. If the gentleman will yield further, Mr. Chairman, in fact it is the Board of Broadcasting Governors that oversees this entire operation, not Mr. Duffy anymore, in terms of policy and validation. Mr. Duffy happened to dissent from the finding of the Board of Broadcasting Governors that basically discounted this so-called survey, which, as I mentioned earlier, was not a scientific survey at all. It was a survey voluntarily returned by visa applicants who had been standing in line.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reclaiming my time, I would venture to say that the gentleman, with all due respect, and I know this is a passionate issue for him and he has pursued it year after year, that what the gentleman comes to the floor and suggests is also not based on any scientific survey.

I do believe that Mr. Duffey, who is a director of the United States Information Agency and oversees Voice of America, World Net TV, and others, has a greater ability than the gentleman or I, sir, to determine whether or not something is effective in the context of surrogate broadcasting from the United States throughout the world.

In that context, I am willing to listen to the expert in that context. He clearly believes that this makes sense.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. For years I have supported the efforts of my colleagues to pass legislation which would make it more difficult for Mr. Castro to continue his dictatorship in Cuba. But I believe also that that effort should be bottomed on effective means of accomplishing the purpose, and that that effort should be bottomed on something which is going to spend the taxpayers' money well.

Here is a picture, and I am sorry that we do not have a bigger one, but this is TV Marti. We are going to spend \$9 million on this picture being displayed in Havana. It is going to cost the Cubans for the jamming of TV Marti about the equivalent of the cost of about four 100-watt light bulbs a day. That is all it is going to cost. We are going to spend \$9 million on this. It will be a fine employment for a number of people who will profess their strong anti-Castro credentials. It will be the continuation of \$100 million in wasted public expenditures belonging to the American taxpayer.

It is not long back that there was a hurricane that hit down there in Florida. It blew down the balloon that holds up the transmitter. The interesting thing is that nobody in Cuba knew whether that balloon was up or down, and nobody in Cuba knew what was being sent out on TV Marti. But then, they did not know that when TV Marti's balloon was up, and they did not know that when TV Marti was broadcasting.

We are the conservators of money belonging to the taxpayers of the United States. The amount in this bill is only about \$9 million. We can say that is not much money, but that is \$9 million that we could spend for something else that would be more worthwhile. It is something which would enable us to perhaps have some more effective way of dealing with Fidel Castro and his thugs. It is also \$9 million we could use better on efforts to better the lives of our people. It is \$9 million that we could use better to perhaps reduce the national debt.

I understand the enthusiasm of my colleagues who support the cause of Cuba. They figure anything we do which is going to hurt Castro is good. That is fine reasoning, providing it in fact does hurt Mr. Castro, and provided in fact it does see to it that Mr. Castro leaves office at the earliest possible minute and that democracy be restored to Cuba. Certainly that is a laudible goal for the United States.

But to spend \$9 million a year broadcasting a picture which looks like this to Cuba and culminates in \$100 million in expenditures over time, whose sole visible benefit to the United States is that we have provided modest levels of increased employment in Florida for people who profess to be opposed to Castro, no.

I am not a representative of anybody except the American people and the folks of the 16th District. I think that

almost every one of us would say that that was our function here in the Congress, to serve the people that elect us, and also to serve the interests of the people of the United States.

We should look at this picture and ask ourselves whether this is what we want to spend our constituents' money on. We should ask ourselves whether we want to spend the taxpayers' money on something that has proven to reach so few people, to confer so little benefit on the United States, to do so little hurt to communism and Fidel Castro, and to do so at such large costs.

TV Marti has been reviewed time after time, including by agencies like the General Accounting Office. They have found that it is totally ineffective, and it is totally ineffective in terms of getting whatever story there is out.

The one good thing that can be said about TV Marti is that it has given a rallying point to anti-Castro Cubans. It has provided fine employment for them. It has given them leverage and political posture and position in the United States, but it has done nothing to hurt Fidel Castro or communism, or to further our American policies.

Indeed, all it has done has been to dissipate some significant amounts of energy, large amounts of the taxpayers' money, and to provide a fiction that people can come in here and tell us something. Look at this picture. That is what Cubans in Havana are seeing. It is a picture of a well-scrambled, well-obfuscated television channel which is costing the Cubans virtually nothing, but which costs the United States a lot. Support the amendment. Let us get rid of this turkey.

□ 1615

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this House is the institution in the world that epitomizes freedom in the world. Our country, the oldest democracy in the history of the world, when we say that it just kind of rolls off our tongues, but I think every once in a while we need to stop and think about what that means.

The price of freedom has not been easy, as all of us know. It has been costly in many ways, in lives and money over hundreds of years at this point in time. This House and this country has had a commitment to that. We have used a variety of methods to achieve our goals. Who would have thought in this Chamber, in this country, really in this world that the Berlin Wall came down, the Soviet Union does not exist. And how did that happen?

History books will be written about how it happened, why it happened. But I think clearly an instrumental part of that was Radio Free Europe. The facts are it was jammed. It was jammed on a continuous basis. It was jammed more effectively, less effectively during different points in time. The facts are

that we are trying to bring freedom throughout the world today in the darkest corners of this planet, where freedom has what appears to be no hope, whether it is in North Korea or in China.

We are committed as an institution, I think universally, every one of us, I really believe, as well as every American, towards those goals. Yet in those countries I just mentioned, as we try to broadcast in to them, the penetration, because of effective jamming, is very, very small. Less than 1 percent of people in those countries are able to hear what we broadcast.

At no point in the history of the United States of America have we given up on our actions towards freedom. This amendment is an attempt to do exactly that. I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment because this would be a dark chapter in the history of this House, a turning back of really over 200 years of American freedom.

My colleagues, several colleagues have argued of the fact that a very small percentage of Cubans are able to see TV Marti, I can even accept that, of 1.5 percent. But let us talk about what that means. That means 40,000 people, 40,000 people do have access. And this is not, it is funny, in terms of what the reality is of Cuba.

I happen to represent the district in this country closest to Cuba. I represent south Florida and the Florida Keys, including Key West. When I am in Key West, I am 90 miles from Havana. I am actually 110 miles from Miami. I actually live about 60 miles north of Miami. My district goes even further north, to give my colleagues a sense of the geography of south Florida.

I live in a community, I have friends and I have actually been to Cuba on several occasions when we have had emigration go through at Guantanamo station. I have had the opportunity to talk to people who literally walk through mine fields, literally walk through mine fields to get to freedom. Some of the people that walked through did not make it. It is not a movie. It is a reality of what the country is today.

We hear from movie stars who go there, the Jack Nicholsons of the world, who idolize or make statements about Fidel Castro. I would point my colleagues to the statement of one of our colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who is the only Holocaust survivor in this Chamber, who visited Cuba and talked to us and said that Cuba today, in terms of the people, is worse than pre-Nazi Germany. That is from his words and from his eyes. It is a country of political prisoners. It is not the idyllic island in the Caribbean of serenity and golf courses. It is a place of torture. It is a demon in our midst, a demon 90 miles from our shore.

To send the message that we do not care, that we are willing to put up with it, that we, for the first time in the his-

tory of the United States of America, are going to back down on our commitment to freedom would be absolutely tragic.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in opposition to the Skaggs amendment which would zero out all funding for TV Marti. The Skaggs amendment is aimed at the heart of what is sometimes called surrogate broadcasting. An even better term is freedom broadcasting, sending the message of freedom to people who live in countries where this message is not permitted to be carried on domestic radio and television stations.

The Skaggs amendment would deprive the many thousands of Cubans who are now able to see TV Marti, despite the Castro regime's jamming of vital information about the free world. This would not be the only effects of the amendment. If the United States concedes defeat to Castro, we will also be depriving millions of Cubans of the hope that comes with knowing that the free world cares.

Eliminating freedom television broadcasting to Cuba, as the Skaggs amendment will do, would send exactly the wrong message at exactly the wrong time. The silencing of TV Marti would provide new hope for the Castro dictatorship and a fresh dose of despair for the Cuban people.

The argument that TV Marti is technologically inadequate and that we should, therefore, not fund it is designed to be a self-fulfilling prophecy. The Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, which I chair, has examined this question in public hearings over the last 3 years.

We discovered, in effect, that it is too soon to evaluate the success of TV Marti because, frankly, the Clinton administration has never really tried to make TV Marti work. The reasons TV Marti does reach some Cubans have nothing to do with technology. They have more to do with administrative timidity.

Right now, because of jamming by the Castro regime, TV Marti admittedly has an audience in Havana that is probably limited to about 40,000 people. But it could also be received by many more people outside of the Havana area, as well as by government officials and the Communist Party elite who have access to satellite television.

It is important to let these officials know that the world is watching them, but there is no question we can do better. I am informed that Castro has devoted 15 to 20 powerful transmitters to jamming TV Marti, while we employ only one transmitter to send the signal.

In the past when tyrannical regimes have jammed the Voice of America or Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, we have responded to the jamming with more powerful transmitters and

multiple transmission sites. When it comes to jamming and finding solutions to jamming, we regularly defeated the Soviet Union in its heyday.

I believe we can defeat the Castro regime, at least getting information in. The only question is whether we have the political will. I remind my colleagues that when the authorizing bill came up on the floor for the foreign relations reform bill, H.R. 1757, I offered the amendment on Radio Free Asia that would make it a 24-hour service. It is about a third of that right now. Twenty-four hours, despite the fact that Radio Free Asia was being jammed routinely by the Beijing dictatorship as well as by the Hanoi dictatorship.

But we made the decision that we were going to try to overcome the obstacles and get the message through. I happen to believe that that can be the case if there is the political will to do so. Where there is a will there is a way. Unfortunately, right now we are allowing this not to get through, because we do not have that want, that ability to push hard. Really, it is the old Washington two-step. You cripple it, you do not do everything that you could possibly do, and then you say it is not working.

We have yet to really try, and I remember when Radio Marti, when Members would stand up and many of the opponents who are against it would stand up and say it is not getting through. It is getting through now in many instances, and I think the same will happen with TV Marti. We have got to have the political will, and hopefully the administration will get that soon.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not know what is wrong with the gentleman from Colorado. I just do not understand why he thinks it is a waste to spend \$110 million to produce such a beautiful example of modern art.

This, as has been indicated in the debate before, is a picture of the channel 50 as it is being jammed by Cuban authorities. This is what Cubans are learning when they watch the TV channel which is being jammed. I, for the life of me, cannot figure out why on earth the gentleman from Colorado thinks it is a waste of money to produce such a gorgeous picture.

I would have to say seriously, Mr. Chairman, it is my responsibility in this House, as the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, to review spending priorities, not just in this subcommittee but in all 13 subcommittees across the government, and try to decide where we must have money spent and where it would be nice to have money spent but, nonetheless, cannot afford to have it spent. If ever there was an area that fell into the latter category, this is it.

I would simply point out, the issue is not whether we like Mr. Castro or not. The issue is whether or not we think it

is worth spending \$110 million of the taxpayers' money to get this. I do not believe it is.

I was just up in the Committee on Rules, listening to some of our friends on the majority side explain to the Committee on Rules that we must eliminate the low-income heating assistance program in this country because we cannot afford to provide help to people who make \$8500 a year or less to heat their homes. I come from a State where we have 40-below-zero winters. I do not think the people in my district would agree with that statement.

I do not think they would think it would be better to put money here than it would be to put it in the pockets of seniors and people making less than \$8500 a year who need help so they do not have to choose between heating and eating.

I do not think that the young kids in this country who are going to be denied summer youth employment would think that this is a better investment than giving them their first experience at dealing with the world of work.

This Capitol just came under assault a week and a half ago. I happen to think that putting that money that is wasted on this nonsense would be far better spent if we put it into programs to help children with mental health problems so that they do not grow up to be the kind of nut cakes who just attacked the Congress last week and killed two people who gave their lives to defend the people who work in this place or visit this place every day.

We need to make serious choices about where money goes. This, Mr. Chairman, is not a serious choice.

Support the Skaggs amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. I have listened to the sincerity of the debate on both sides. And I simply want to note at the beginning that I do not think that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) really meant to characterize the efforts of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) as being a jihad against anything, really. At least, if he did, I consider it to be a really unfortunate characterization.

I think the Skaggs amendment is nothing more or less than a sincere effort to cut funding this year, some 9.4 million in this bill, for a program which really has little demonstrable effect, however well intentioned.

I believe, if I am not mistaken, this has been the fifth year that the gentleman has offered such an amendment to cut TV Marti. And for those who are concerned that he is initiating this effort in an untimely way, that TV Marti has not had an opportunity to fix the technical problems, I would suggest that if within 5 years we cannot fix the technical problems associated with broadcasting TV Marti to Cuba, then perhaps it is time to stop funding it.

Also likewise with regard to the administrative problems associated with the program, administrative and managerial and programming problems, the gentleman made comparisons that it took 40.6 FTEs to produce a unit of broadcasting versus some much smaller, how much, with regard to radio, 8 for radio for other similar kinds of broadcasting.

□ 1630

That suggests there are some real programmatic inefficiencies, at least, in this program. And, again, this has gone on for a long number of years, 5 years, I know, that the gentleman has undertaken this effort. And if in that time we cannot fix these technological, these programmatic and these administrative and managerial problems that are associated with TV Marti, perhaps it is time to call it quits and consider applying this \$9.4 million to some of the programs that the distinguished ranking minority member alluded to, or other programs in this very tight budget, such as drug courts or bullet-proof vests or school security personnel. There are lots of worthy programs in this bill, lots of efforts that could be funded across this Nation with this \$9.4 million.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his effort and yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. My sense is we may not have other speakers, and I want to take a very brief moment to close the debate, if I may.

Again, with all respect to the earnestness and the heartfelt commitment expressed by those that oppose this amendment, I have to say to them that we have tried and tried and tried, and this simply does not work.

It is not, as the gentleman from New Jersey suggested a moment ago, a question of political will. Political will cannot repeal the law of physics, and it is the basic electronics of this that make it doomed to failure.

To compare it with radio is to do the apples and oranges thing. Yes, radio works, and all of the statistics cited I would not refute because they are radio statistics, and I am not touching Radio Marti. It does get through. Although a few years ago I criticized it and attempted to cut funding for it, it has reformed and it is now a legitimate, worthy operation.

I just ask my colleagues again to stop the insult to the American taxpayer of spending \$10 million year in and year out to send no-see TV to Cuba. Stopping this will be a victory for them, not cause for celebration for Castro, because we will continue to penetrate that closed society with Radio Marti.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude this debate. I know it has been debated here this afternoon, the issue of Radio Free Marti, and the issue of what utility it has even though there is quite a bit of jamming going on.

I can tell my colleagues that Radio Free Marti is something that is important to the people of Cuba, who remain faithful to the ideal that they will someday have a democracy, and that will be based upon the freedoms that we enjoy in this country: the freedoms of speech. But we cannot expect that this thing is going to be born overnight. And the only way for us to prepare a free Cuba is to be able to prepare Cuba for the transition that it is inevitably going to make to a democracy, and the way to do that is through the instruments of democracy, and that is through freedom of speech.

Mr. Chairman, maybe not all of the people of Cuba are able to hear Radio Free Marti, but there are over 40,000 who are definitely able to tap into Radio Free Marti. And I know, from speaking to Cuban exiles here in this country that have spoken to me about their experience in Cuba, that they have translated to me the fact that although not everybody in Cuba is able to receive Radio Free Marti, the fact remains that their family members, their friends and so forth, amongst them all someone receives it and is able to spread the word.

How do we suppose that the underground press is able to operate over there? They are not able to operate in the current environment but for the fact that Radio Marti helps to balance out the flow of information that is being received by the people of Cuba. Are we supposed to give up on the people of Cuba just because a majority of people do not get Radio Free Marti? Are we supposed to assume that just because a majority do not understand it and receive it, that those that do are not spreading the word informally through the grapevine?

I think that this is an important vehicle for us to build a solid foundation for a future relationship between the United States and Cuba. Keep in mind, and I will conclude with this, keep in mind that Cuba is 90 miles off the coast of the United States. Someday we hope to enjoy a good strong relationship based upon democracy, and I should think that this is an investment that is worth our while because there is going to be a country that is close to us, and they are going to look back and understand that we were with them, the people of Cuba, I mean, all along, even though we were against their government.

I think that is the message that we want to make sure the people of Cuba understand, is our beef is not with the people of Cuba, it is with the Cuban government that continues, as all press have acknowledged, to be amongst the most repressive regimes on the issue of free speech. So I think that means even more of an obligation for us in this

country to make sure freedom of speech is not killed altogether on the island of Cuba.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to say that I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Rhode Island. He is absolutely right. It is absolutely imperative we defeat the Skaggs amendment and vote "no" on it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I take note of my colleague's comments from New York and say that I am glad that we have finally reached some accord on some issue on this floor.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SKAGGS. The Kennedy-Solomon rapprochement will be noted in the record, I am sure.

I just wanted to make sure the gentleman was aware, as he may not be, that my amendment does not deal with Radio Marti, to which the gentleman addressed all of his remarks. It is about TV Marti.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Excuse me. I mean to correct that. But the point of my remarks holds true, because what I am talking about here is the voice of democracy, whether that is TV or radio. The issue here is making sure the message gets across to the people of Cuba, and that is what is so fundamental here.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

So many of our colleagues have been holding up a picture, and they say does this picture justify spending that much money on the transmissions of TV Marti? Let me show my colleagues a few more pictures. These are children who were killed by Castro's thugs just a few years ago.

This is a child just a few months old. This is a child about my daughter's age, right behind me, about 12 years of age. These were children who were killed, massacred, by Castro's thugs because they attempted to leave the island.

Now, this news was not broadcast on the Island of Cuba. Because of Radio and TV Marti, people understood what these pictures meant. And these pictures were transmitted on TV Marti airwaves. And as it has been pointed out, these pictures have been shown to thousands of Cubans who daily visit our U.S. interest section in Havana, thousands of people who go there because they are waiting for visas to come to the United States.

How about these pictures, I would say to my colleagues? What do these

pictures say? They say to me that these are people who are risking their lives to live in freedom, to live in democracy, to live in the best of what brought us here to this country, whether we are native born or a naturalized American, as I am. This picture says a lot to me.

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Chairman, the Cuban people are yearning to breathe free. They are yearning for unbiased information—not communist propaganda from the Castro regime. TV and Radio Marti provide this medium of information to a people who are desperately seeking freedom. The United States via TV and Radio Marti greatly assists those who struggle for basic political and human rights everyday of their lives.

Imagine, Mr. Chairman, if you were forced to watch or listen to controlled information that merely glorifies a communist dictator and his policies and covers up the atrocities being inflicted on the Cuban people. Imagine, that you were not told that your country received resounding criticism from the international community when they brutally shot down Americans over international waters. Imagine you were not told that only the communist party elite were being paid in hard currency for their work with the tourist industry while the average Cuban citizen was paid in worthless pesos. Mr. Chairman, if TV and Radio Marti did not report this information (the truth) the Cuban people would be without a great resource and their quest for a democratic nation would be severely damaged.

Mr. Chairman, let's be honest with the Cuban people and let them have access to the real story. Defeat these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS).

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS), as amended.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 251, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—172

Abercrombie	Carson	Doyle
Allen	Christensen	Edwards
Baessler	Clayton	Ehlers
Barrett (NE)	Clement	Eshoo
Barrett (WI)	Clyburn	Etheridge
Becerra	Coble	Evans
Bentsen	Collins	Farr
Berman	Cummings	Fattah
Berry	Danner	Fazio
Blumenauer	Deal	Filner
Boehlert	DeFazio	Ford
Bonior	DeGette	Frank (MA)
Borski	Delahunt	Frost
Boucher	DeLauro	Ganske
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Gejdenson
Brown (CA)	Dingell	Gibbons
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gilchrest
Camp	Doggett	Hamilton
Capps	Dooley	Harman

Hefner	Millender-	Sanders
Hilliard	McDonald	Sandlin
Hinchey	Miller (CA)	Sawyer
Hinojosa	Minge	Schumer
Hoekstra	Mink	Scott
Holden	Moakley	Sensenbrenner
Hooley	Mollohan	Serrano
Houghton	Moran (VA)	Shuster
Hoyer	Morella	Skaggs
Jackson (IL)	Nadler	Slaughter
Jefferson	Neal	Smith, Adam
Johnson (WI)	Nethercutt	Snyder
Johnson, E. B.	Neumann	Stabenow
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Stark
Kelly	Obey	Stokes
Kildee	Olver	Strickland
Kind (WI)	Owens	Stupak
Klecza	Parker	Sununu
Klink	Paul	Tanner
Kolbe	Payne	Tauscher
LaFalce	Pelosi	Taylor (MS)
Lee	Peterson (MN)	Thompson
Levin	Pickett	Thurman
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Tierney
Lofgren	Poshard	Torres
Lowe	Price (NC)	Turner
Luther	Quinn	Upton
Maloney (NY)	Rahall	Velázquez
Markey	Ramstad	Vento
Martinez	Rangel	Visclosky
Mascara	Regula	Walsh
Matsui	Rivers	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Rodriguez	Watt (NC)
McDermott	Roemer	Waxman
McGovern	Roukema	Weygand
McIntyre	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey
McKinney	Rush	Wynn
Meehan	Sabo	Yates
Meeks (NY)	Sanchez	

## NOES—251

Ackerman	Davis (VA)	Istook
Aderholt	DeLay	Jackson-Lee
Andrews	Deutsch	(TX)
Archer	Diaz-Balart	Jenkins
Armey	Dickey	John
Bachus	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Dreier	Johnson, Sam
Baldacci	Duncan	Jones
Ballenger	Dunn	Kaptur
Barcia	Ehrlich	Kasich
Barr	Emerson	Kennedy (MA)
Bartlett	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Barton	English	Kennelly
Bass	Ensign	Kim
Bateman	Everett	King (NY)
Bereuter	Ewing	Kingston
Bilbray	Fawell	Klug
Bilirakis	Foley	Knollenberg
Bishop	Forbes	Kucinich
Blagojevich	Fossella	LaHood
Bliley	Fowler	Lampson
Blunt	Fox	Lantos
Boehner	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Bonilla	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Bono	Gallely	LaTourette
Boswell	Gekas	Lazio
Boyd	Gephardt	Leach
Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Brown (FL)	Gilman	Lewis (KY)
Bryant	Goode	Linder
Bunning	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Burr	Goodling	Livingston
Burton	Gordon	LoBiondo
Buyer	Goss	Lucas
Callahan	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Calvert	Granger	Manton
Campbell	Green	Manzullo
Canady	Greenwood	McCollum
Cannon	Gutierrez	McCrery
Cardin	Gutknecht	McDade
Castle	Hall (TX)	McHale
Chabot	Hansen	McHugh
Chambliss	Hastert	McIntosh
Chenoweth	Hastings (FL)	McKeon
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	McNulty
Combust	Hayworth	Meek (FL)
Condit	Hefley	Menendez
Cook	Herger	Metcalf
Cooksey	Hill	Mica
Costello	Hilleary	Miller (FL)
Cox	Hobson	Moran (KS)
Coyne	Horn	Murtha
Cramer	Hostettler	Myrick
Crane	Hulshof	Ney
Crapo	Hunter	Northup
Cubin	Hutchinson	Norwood
Davis (FL)	Hyde	Nussle
Davis (IL)	Inglis	Ortiz

Oxley	Royce	Spratt
Packard	Ryun	Stearns
Pallone	Salmon	Stenholm
Pappas	Sanford	Stump
Pascarell	Saxton	Talent
Pastor	Scarborough	Tauzin
Paxon	Schaefer, Dan	Taylor (NC)
Pease	Schaffer, Bob	Thomas
Peterson (PA)	Sessions	Thornberry
Petri	Shadegg	Thune
Pickering	Shaw	Tiahrt
Pitts	Shays	Traficant
Pombo	Sherman	Wamp
Porter	Shimkus	Watkins
Portman	Sisisky	Watts (OK)
Pryce (OH)	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Radanovich	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Redmond	Smith (MI)	Weller
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Wexler
Riggs	Smith (OR)	White
Riley	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Rogan	Smith, Linda	Wicker
Rogers	Snowbarger	Wilson
Rohrabacher	Solomon	Wise
Ros-Lehtinen	Souder	Young (AK)
Rothman	Spence	Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—11

Clay	Gonzalez	McInnis
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Towns
Cunningham	Kilpatrick	Wolf
Furse	McCarthy (MO)	

□ 1700

Messrs. GRAHAM, LAMPSON, SHERMAN, BILBRAY and SHIMKUS changed their vote from "aye" to "no." Messrs. PAUL, COBLE, NEUMANN and Ms. DELAURO changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment, as amended, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, \$25,553,000, for such purposes, to remain available until expended, to be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

#### JUSTICE PRISONER AND ALIEN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FUND, UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

There is hereby established a Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System Fund for the payment of necessary expenses related to the scheduling and transportation of United States prisoners and illegal and criminal aliens in the custody of the United States Marshals Service, as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, including, without limitation, salaries and expenses, operations, and the acquisition, lease, and maintenance of aircraft and support facilities: *Provided*, That the Fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments from amounts available to the Department of Justice, other Federal agencies, and other sources at rates that will recover the expenses of Fund operations, including, without limitation, accrual of annual leave and depreciation of plant and equipment of the Fund: *Provided further*, That proceeds from the disposal of Fund aircraft shall be credited to the Fund: *Provided further*, That amounts in the Fund shall be available without fiscal year limitation, and may be used for operating equipment lease agreements that do not exceed 5 years.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee has been very generous in the past 2 years in appropriating some \$20 million each year to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America from the Local Law Enforcement Block Grants program to assist them in reaching an additional 400,000

young people each and every year. This money has been matched at least dollar for dollar by local sources and is sustained in the long-term by private sector funding, including companies such as Coca-Cola, Nike, Tupperware, Major League Baseball, Ford Motor, EDS, Taco Bell and many, many others.

With more than 2,000 local clubs serving nearly 3 million young people, primarily in at-risk communities, this money is very well spent.

It is an effort to provide productive activities that offer our youth an alternative to crime.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the other body has allocated \$40 million for the Boys and Girls Clubs program.

Given the increased needs of the program and its record of achievement in outreach, will the gentleman work with me to provide access to additional funds in the conference committee?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARCIA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, this has been a worthwhile program, as the gentleman has indicated, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman to consider a possible increase in money within our budget limits, which as you know are very tight.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### FEDERAL PRISONER DETENTION

For expenses, related to United States prisoners in the custody of the United States Marshals Service as authorized in 18 U.S.C. 4013, but not including expenses otherwise provided for in appropriations available to the Attorney General, \$425,000,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 561(i), to remain available until expended.

#### FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For expenses, mileage, compensation, and per diems of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law, including advances, \$95,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovations, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings, and the purchase of equipment incident thereto, for protected witness safesites; and of which not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, established by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, \$6,699,000 and, in addition, up to \$1,000,000 of funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred by the Attorney General to this account: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict prevention and resolution activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations

Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

On page 11, line 14, strike \$6,699,000 and insert \$7,199,000.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment means a lot to many of us and before I start, I would like to thank both the gentleman from California (Mr. DIXON), the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for their support and because of their understanding of the impact and the concern that is raised by this amendment.

If we all could imagine just for a moment a dark and winding road on a very, very dark night and the next morning finding a bloody path of the dismembered body of James Byrd. This incident rocked not only this Nation but it rocked the world and a town like Jasper was put in the spotlight.

If there ever was a time that a city needed the cooperative, quiet expertise of the Community Relations Service, possibly a little known service of the United States Justice Department, it was certainly then at a very difficult time in June in the State of Texas and in the city of Jasper.

But the work of the Community Relations Service is not limited to a tragedy like Jasper. We find that that service with limited staff goes through this Nation to bring unity and commonality and to bring people together after tragic events or when local officials feel that there is no way they can handle these issues alone.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to provide additional funding to the Community Relations Service, and I am pleased to say that this service is receiving the recognition it deserves under the current Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has generously agreed to increase CRS funding by an additional \$500,000 with an additional authorization under the Attorney General's funding for \$1 million. This goes a long way beyond the \$5.3 million presently allotted.

In May 1998, \$2 million was transferred from the Assets Forfeiture Fund under appropriations to the CRS. That added additional money. This money, however, was specifically earmarked as a one-time-only increase in order to enable CRS to update their archaic computer systems. Presently CRS has only used \$800,000 of those moneys and

so they will be able to use that money in addition to this amendment. But they are still underfunded. They have worked hard in my home State around this very crucial tragedy in Jasper, Texas.

Let me share with this body a letter dated July 13, 1998 from the mayor of the city of Jasper, Mayor Horn:

I am writing to alert you to the excellent work of the U.S. Department of Justice Community Relations Service in helping to keep this community together after the tragic and brutal murder of Mr. Byrd on June 7, 1998. As a local official in Jasper County, I am particularly concerned about the effect such a heinous incident can have on a community. Mr. Ephraim V. Martinez from the Houston CRS office met with us shortly after the tragedy and he and other CRS staff have been there practically every day since then meeting with all segments of our community in providing valuable support. CRS was also with us as we made preparations for the recent rallies by the KKK and the New Black Panther Party. In August CRS will be providing diversity and conflict management training to school district personnel and later to students, and in addition they will be helping us to fund and to organize a city-wide community task force to deal with these racial concerns.

CRS was crucial in helping the community begin healing during the aftermath of Mr. Byrd's tragic death and as well they worked very hard during the recent rallies opposing the KKK.

Mr. Chairman, I can say to Members, I was there along with my colleagues from Texas and particularly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) who represents that area, during these troubling times. We saw the tension, the pain, the dismay, and CRS was on the ground helping that community to heal. They were not fearful, they were not hysterical, they were calm. And the local officials welcomed them into their community. They brought together all kinds of people, in prayer, in deliberation and, yes, in resolution. CRS services are sought by mayors, police chiefs, school superintendents and civic leaders.

Mr. Chairman, is it not true an important part of the Federal Government is to coalesce with those individuals in local government to make better what is bad? The Community Relations Service helps to bring about racial harmony over racial disharmony.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. But yet in all of that, we find that CRS has had to deny over 40 percent of the applicants who have wanted them to come in and assist in promoting racial harmony. We have also found that they have helped in communities that suffered the rage of Church arson burnings.

CRS has a staff that is overworked. With this increased funding, I hope CRS can increase staff and go out into new areas and bring about the racial

harmony, the ethnic harmony, the religious harmony that this Nation truly agrees with.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, that I thank those who have assisted me in this amendment and ask that we realize the importance of the Community Relations Service and provide this additional funding so that they may do their job well.

(On request of Mr. DIXON, and by unanimous consent, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DIXON. I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman for this excellent amendment. The testimony by the Attorney General of the United States is that CRS does excellent work. Her amendment will certainly add to the efficiency of the organization. I would urge the chairman and the ranking member to accept this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. I am prepared to accept the amendment. I think it is an excellent amendment and would be prepared to accept it, but I would hope that we could do that very quickly, because we do have much more business to attend to. Can we agree and let this be the end of it?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kentucky would be so kind, because he has been kind, I know we had a very vigorous debate, if he would allow three speakers who have been waiting here for three hours to speak and contain their remarks in maybe five minutes, because I am told they will be very brief, I would ask his indulgence because some of them have had personal experience with the CRS, and then we would be happy to close at that point.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentlewoman has three speakers?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes. And I believe, I do not want to speak for them, but I believe they may be able to summarize in that time frame of the five minutes.

CITY OF JASPER,  
Jasper, TX, July 13, 1998.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,  
U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

Dear Ms. LEE: Let me first of all express my appreciation for being with us during the funeral services for James Byrd, Jr. on June 13, 1998, and for your continued support.

I am writing to alert you to the excellent work of the U.S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Service (CRS) in helping to keep this community together after the tragic and brutal murder of Mr. Byrd on June 7, 1998. As a local official in Jasper County, I am particularly concerned about the effect such a heinous incident can have on a community.

Mr. Ephraim V. Martinez from the Houston CRS office met with us shortly after the tragedy, and he and other CRS staff have been here practically every day since then, meeting with all segments of our community

and providing valuable support. CRS was also with us as we made preparations for the recent rallies by the KKK and the New Black Panther Party. In August, CRS will be providing diversity and conflict management training to school district personnel, and later to students.

CRS staff is currently working with us in convening a permanent, city-wide community task force to deal with racial concerns and other matters that have surfaced as a result of the tragedy. The task force will be under my office, and will be called the Mayor's Community Task Force "2000".

CRS is a unique arm of the Federal government, charged with helping communities address tensions which arise due to differences in race, ethnicity and national origin. While cases like the incident in Jasper grab the media headlines and shock the nation, CRS responds to similar incidents, large and small, across the country. I also have become aware of the excellent work CRS did to resolve tensions between Vietnamese fishermen and the KKK on the Texas coast, and the issues between Vietnamese store operators and African-American communities in Houston, and blacks and police issues in Austin. Last year, it also convened church arson prevention seminars in several Texas cities, including Houston and San Antonio. Earlier this year, it conducted hate crimes training for police officers, and police executives in the Houston area and in Corpus Christi.

In recent years, CRS has struggled to maintain adequate funding. In FY 1998, CRS suffered massive budget reductions which cut the agency in half. With a modest budget of \$5.3 million, CRS now has the smallest staff in its history.

I am asking you, as an elected representative of our great state, to help support the Community Relations Services (CRS). President Clinton has requested funding for CRS at \$8.9 million for 1999. This represents a small investment given CRS' valuable and critical work in communities across America. We here in Jasper certainly appreciate its assistance.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

R.C. HORN,  
Mayor.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman be given three minutes to yield as she sees fit.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object. We can get the gentlewoman time, but these other speakers have been waiting. Under the five-minute rule they have a right to strike the last word and have their own time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROGERS. Then I am not so sure we need to agree to this amendment. If there is going to be an objection on the time allocation of this strict a nature, then perhaps we need to renegotiate the whole thing, so I withdraw my approval of the amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take but a second because I certainly do not want to threaten my colleagues' time with this wonderful amendment. But I want to stand because of the fact that I am very well acquainted with the work of the CRS.

□ 1715

I come from an area that has had several racial conflicts, and if it were not for the intervention of the CRS, much could have happened that did not. They come in in a professional way, they work with the groups there, they work with the agencies, they work with the people on the street, and it is always good to have a Federal presence in the neighborhood and in the community when violence or conflict happens.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should realize that this is an important service that the Department of Justice gives, and it is always good for people to see both sides of the Department of Justice, not just the enforcement side but the preventive side. When they come in and help to have some of the conflict resolved, it is extremely important, and they do not come in and try to work alone. They work with the enforcement agencies that are already in those communities.

I am from Miami, Florida. I have seen CRS work, and I do hope, because they have accepted this amendment, I think the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and his committee have done a credible job of accepting this amendment because it is good and it is needed.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I support this amendment. Clearly, they have been extremely responsive. I made a request Monday following the funeral, spoke very personally to the Director of the FBI as well as Ms. Ochi, who is the National Director of CRS. They have come to give dates, and they will continue to work in that community, and they have been responsive not only for that community but for communities all over the Nation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not intend to prolong the time. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the agreement would, in fact, stand, that this amendment be accepted. I simply rise because it is such an important concept; that is, the concept of resolving conflict, not just letting it lay, not letting it go, not hoping that things are going to work out but actually putting resources together to help work them out. I think that is an important concept, and I would certainly hope that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) would continue to hold in terms of the agreement to accept the amendment.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to encourage the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) to allow this free and open dialogue concerning the good work of CRS to go forward. One of the healthy things about the American de-

mocracy is that people do have an opportunity of free speech, open and healthy debate and dialogue, in support of their views and opinions, and I would trust that we would not in any way interrupt that in this very beautiful process called the United States Congress.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has offered a very potent amendment. We cannot ignore the problem of the lingering racism in our society in recent months. We have seen racism expressed in violent and grizzly fashion. The Nation was horrified when James Byrd was dragged to his death behind a pickup truck in Jasper, Texas, just because he was African American. The Community Relations Service played a key role in keeping the community of Jasper together after this tragic incident and prevented the spread of more violent racial incidents.

Mr. Chairman, CRS services help local communities prevent racial conflicts and violence, and I would trust that we would continue to ensure that the amendment of the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is in fact upheld for this vital and necessary and humanitarian endeavor.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Community Relations Service and the Jackson-Lee amendment. As many of my colleagues know, Jasper, Texas, located in my congressional district, experienced a terrible racially-motivated crime when James Byrd, Jr., was brutally dragged from the back of a pickup by three white men identified with white supremacy groups. For all of us who believe that racial prejudice and hatred have no place in American society, this tragic event serves as a reminder of how much is left to be done.

Shortly after Mr. Byrd's death my fellow congressional colleagues and I passed a resolution asking that we join together to eliminate the vestiges of racial hatred remaining in our society. Now we have a chance to put our money where our mouth is.

Mr. Chairman, the Community Relations Service has done an outstanding job in keeping the community together in Jasper after the tragic and brutal murder of James Byrd on June 7 of this year. Mr. Efrain Martinez from the Houston CRS office met with Mayor R.C. Horn and community leaders in Jasper immediately after the tragedy, and he and other CRS staff have been there practically every day since, meeting with all segments of the community of Jasper, providing needed support.

CRS worked with the community as they made preparations for the recent rallies of the Ku Klux Klan and the new Black Panther party. Later this month CRS will be providing diversity and conflict management training to school district personnel, and later to students. CRS staff is currently working with Jasper in convening a permanent city-wide community task force



to deal with racial concerns and other matters that have surfaced as a result of this senseless tragedy. The task force will be headed by Mayor R.C. Horn and will be called the Mayor's Community Task Force 2000.

CRS is a unique arm of the Federal Government charged with helping communities address tensions which may arise due to differences in race, ethnicity or national origin. Without CRS assistance, unresolved community racial tensions and conflict can fester and become fuel for even more serious community-wide civil unrest.

While cases like the incident in Jasper grab the media headlines and shock the Nation, CRS is responsible for dealing with similar incidents, large and small, all across this country. I am aware of the excellent work that CRS has done in my home State of Texas to resolve tensions between Vietnamese fishermen and the Ku Klux Klan. They have also worked to resolve issues between Vietnamese store operators and an African American community in Houston, and to deal with problems between the police and African Americans in Austin. Last year CRS also convened church arson prevention seminars in several Texas cities, including Houston and San Antonio. Earlier this year it conducted hate crimes training for police officers and police executives in the Houston and Corpus Christi areas.

In recent years CRS has struggled to maintain adequate funding. In fiscal year 1998 this valuable organization suffered massive budget reductions which cut the agency in half. With a modest budget of \$5.3 million, CRS now has the smallest staff in its history.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) asks for another \$2 million to bring CRS' budget to the \$9 million recommended by the President. This represents a small investment given the valuable and critical work of CRS in communities all across our country. I know the citizens of Jasper, Texas who have pulled together in this time of tragedy, in these trying circumstances, appreciate the assistance that they received from CRS. Let us renew our commitment to root out racial prejudice in our society, to bring our Nation together. Let us remember James Byrd's death.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give CRS the additional \$2 million that it needs to carry out its valuable work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TURNER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and, as I expressed, we were actually on the ground in Jasper to see how that community was brought together, and I think it is important to note that Texas does not stand as the poster child for these kinds of heinous acts. CRS goes all over the Nation fighting

for those who have been discriminated against and where there is racial strife.

We have seen the increase in hate crimes against African Americans, against Hispanics, against gays and lesbians, against Anglos, against those who have different religious faith. The CRS is able to go in and to ease the pain of that community, and I just want to note what the gentleman said: Between 1992 and 1997 the CRS budget declined more than 80 percent and its staffing by two-thirds, an all time low.

So I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his kind words on helping to support an amendment that provides an extra \$500,000 for this service.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(A)(ii), (B), (F), and (G), as amended, \$23,000,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

#### RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION

##### ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses in accordance with the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, \$2,000,000.

#### INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

##### INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the detection, investigation, and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking not otherwise provided for, to include intergovernmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, \$304,014,000, of which \$50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances remaining available at the end of the fiscal year shall revert to the Attorney General for reallocation among participating organizations in succeeding fiscal years, subject to the reprogramming procedures described in section 605 of this Act.

#### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 2,688 passenger motor vehicles, of which 2,000 will be for replacement only, without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General, \$2,750,615,000; of which not to exceed \$50,000,000 for automated data processing and telecommunications and technical investigative equipment and not to exceed \$1,000,000 for undercover operations shall remain available until September 30, 2000; of which not

less than \$282,473,000 shall be for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to our national security; of which not to exceed \$69,846,000 shall remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$8,046,000 shall be for equipment to address chemical and biological attacks; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, and drug investigations; and of which \$1,500,000 shall be available to maintain an independent program office dedicated solely to the automation of fingerprint identification services: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$45,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That no funds in this Act may be used to provide ballistics imaging equipment to any State or local authority which has obtained similar equipment through a Federal grant or subsidy unless the State or local authority agrees to return that equipment or to repay that grant or subsidy to the Federal Government.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 13, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 15, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

Page 26, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 30, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)".

Page 43, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$21,579,000)".

Page 44, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,600,000)".

Mr. SOUDER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the funding for drug court programs by an additional \$6 million over the amount currently contained in the bill, which we also just added \$3 million to a little while ago in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN). Although the committee should be commended for providing a \$10 million increase plus the \$3 million that were accepted over last year's level and the President's request for drug courts, I believe that the demand and social and economic benefits of the program justify an even larger increase.

There is no greater issue in our society than our war against illegal drugs. It is both a war and, as our drug czar said, a cancer, and we need creative solutions to address this.

I want to commend the chairman of this subcommittee who has been a leader in the drug task force, the Anti-Drug Task Force, as we work towards a drug-free America, and for his willingness to increase, as he has pointed out

with this amendment, a 33 percent increase in drug courts in this country. However, we also have already pending requests that are 50 percent higher.

One of the problems that we go through in appropriations bills are tough choices, and this amendment offers such a tough choice. The increase in drug court funding in my amendment would be provided by reducing the bill's increases in funding for the Economic Development Administration to a 2 percent increase to account for inflation.

Let me say that again. We are not eliminating EDA, we are not decreasing EDA. The money would come only by reducing the bill's 18.9 percent increase in salaries and expenses in EDA and the 8.4 percent increase in grants to a 2 percent level of inflation. In my view, any increase over and above the level of inflation is not appropriate in light of the health of the economy, the reservations about the effectiveness of EDA, and this opportunity to put more money into drug courts.

Now let me once again explain a little bit about drug courts. They are used to place nonviolent drug defendants in judicially supervised treatment programs. A drug court is a successful alternative to placing drug users in overcrowded jails, where in all likelihood they will serve little time and receive no form of substance abuse treatment. We recently heard testimony in the Subcommittee on National Security, of which I am vice chairman, that individuals who were referred to drug treatment programs through drug courts and other parts of the criminal justice system stayed in treatment significantly longer than referrals from other sources.

The success of drug courts has been in part demonstrated by the dramatic increase in the number of courts across the Nation. Since 1989 more than 275 jurisdictions have implemented a drug court to address the problem of substance abuse in crime. Currently there are another 150 drug courts being planned and another 13 jurisdictions are exploring the feasibility of these drug courts.

Drug court participants and graduates are not rearrested. The recidivism rate for drug court participants and graduates ranges from 2 to 20 percent, far below that in any other drug program. Drug court participants and graduates break their addictions. The average positive urinalysis test while in drug court is only 15 percent. In some jurisdictions, such as San Jose, California, it is as low as 7 percent, significantly lower.

Drug courts also have saved the lives of innocent babies. Five hundred twenty-five drug-free babies have been born to participants of drug courts. They reunite families. Over 2,430 parents regained custody of their children. Drug courts help former addicts become constructive members of society. Seventy-five percent of drug court graduates either retain or obtain employment.

□ 1730

The important thing to remember here is that all across the country, in many jurisdictions, including in my hometown of Fort Wayne, where Ron Davenport, the head of the Washington House, has indicated that the Drug Court program works because it provides a simple motivation to participants. If they do not cooperate, they go to jail. But it also moves them into treatment programs and creative ways to do this.

It has been demonstrated, as I said, in my home area. There is another 50 percent increase waiting to come into this system, and conversely, there seems little need to provide significant increases to EDA when the country continues to enjoy strong economic growth. My amendment would only reduce the increases to the level of inflation. This is not an attempt to eliminate EDA.

I know there are many supporters in Congress for EDA. The question is, should EDA be increased more than 2 percent, or should that money go to Drug Courts? I believe, given the nature of the problems that we face in every Congressional district in this country, in families across this country, whether it be in direct crime, in property, or violence or internal family violence caused by drug and alcohol abuse, Drug Courts are an area where we should boost up.

As I said earlier, this is a matter of priority. Where would you put your money? To the increased funding in EDA, or to the increased funding in Drug Courts, which I grant has gone up, but is not going up enough to meet the demand.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there he goes again, and here we go again. An amendment plain and simple to severely cut funding for the Economic Development Administration. I strongly urge a no vote on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a vote about whether or not you support the Drug Court program. We support the Drug Court program in this bill at an unprecedented historic level. We already provide tremendous increases for Drug Courts. In fact, the bill includes a 43 percent increase above current level spending, and well above the Administration's request for the Drug Court program. In fact, a few minutes ago there was an amendment that passed this House with our approval that increased Drug Courts even more, another \$3 million, by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN).

Make no mistake about it. What this debate really is all about is whether or not you support EDA. This debate we have had over and over again, year after year on this bill, and every time this House has stood fast with those who want to help the most distressed portions of the country, even in these good times.

Once again, last year, an overwhelming majority, 305 Members to be exact,

voted to support the work of the EDA. Again this year, I urge the House to continue to show support for this important program and again vote to defeat the Souder amendment.

If we do not vote this amendment down, we will be depriving hard-hit communities in every State in this Nation of the vital assistance these programs provide. EDA gives our poorest urban and rural areas the tools with which to raise themselves up by their own bootstraps to create new jobs, expand their local tax base and leverage private investment. It gives them a hand, not a handout, and, Mr. Chairman, this program works.

If your town is hard hit by sudden and severe job losses when a plant shuts down, it is EDA that is there to help. If your community has been devastated by a natural disaster, like the recent floods this year in the Midwest, EDA is there. If your community is suffering because your local factory has shut down because it cannot compete in the global economy, EDA can help your community. And if your district has suffered from cutbacks in the defense industry, EDA is the only federal program dedicated to helping your community retool that economy.

Critics of this program fail to recognize that the EDA has been reformed, reduced and streamlined over these last 3 years by actions of this Congress. Due to this Congressional oversight by both the authorizing and appropriations committees, EDA's grants are truly targeted to the most distressed areas. The development and selection of projects has been moved out of Washington and back towards the local and state levels, and EDA's bureaucracy has been cut by over one-third since 1995.

In addition, since the vote last year the House has continued to demonstrate its support for EDA programs. On July 23, your colleagues in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure approved an EDA reauthorizing bill that reforms the programs and responds to past criticisms of the program and tracks this appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, clearly there are communities that do not need help. They have infrastructure, they have industry, they have access to education, all the requirements for a healthy regional economy. But other areas, Mr. Chairman, like my area, must rely on us and EDA to help them cope with job losses, defense cuts and other economic disasters. They are the ones that need our help. They are the ones who are turning to us for this vote.

So I urge Members to do as they did last year and the year before and the year before and the year before, and turn down this amendment by an overwhelming margin. Vote down the Souder amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman from Indiana's

amendment, and I echo the sentiments of our chairman, "there you go again."

Mr. Chairman, this amendment presents a truly false choice between the EDA and Drug Courts. It is the oldest game I guess in Congress, that if you want to cut a program and you are having difficulty making your case on the merits, then try to find a place to put that cut that will be compelling and bolster your argument because of the nature of the account that you want to increase.

I know that our colleagues will not be fooled by that. This amendment would cut \$21.579 million, almost, almost, the entire increase provided above last year's level, from the Economic Development Administration's grant programs. Additionally, it also cuts \$3 million from EDA's salaries and expenses account.

In considering this amendment, we must first examine why an increase for EDA was provided by the committee. In its fiscal year 1999 budget request, the administration proposed a new \$15 million initiative within EDA, and they paid for it by decreasing funding for EDA's existing grant programs by \$22 million and increasing total funding for the agency by \$28 million.

This new program was designed to provide assistance to communities adversely impacted by trade agreements. The committee considered this request and decided that while the intent of the new initiative was worthwhile, EDA's existing grant programs could achieve the best results.

To this end, the committee accepted the administration's proposal to increase overall funding for the agency and allocated that increase to EDA's proven programs, which clearly have the jurisdiction and the ability to best assist trade impacted communities.

This is a very worthwhile investment. In fact, a 1997 study of the public works program conducted by Rutgers University and the New Jersey Institute of Technology, among others, yielded the following results: For every \$1 million in Federal funding provided for EDA's public works grants program, 327 jobs are created or retained at a cost of only \$3,058 per job. For every \$1 million in Federal funding provided through the grant program, \$10.8 million in private sector investment was leveraged and the local tax base was increased by \$10.13 million. I think those are pretty good results, pretty impressive results, on our investment.

Mr. Chairman, I know of no other agency or program of the Federal Government more critical to the economic development needs of communities around this Nation than EDA. EDA programs target funds to areas in need of assistance and respond to the special needs of each individual town and city.

EDA has programs which benefit communities at almost every stage of the development process. For communities experiencing structural economic change resulting from long-term

deterioration in industrial sectors or the depletion of natural resources, as my area, EDA provides flexible assistance to help them design and implement their own local recovery strategies. For communities facing prolonged economic distress, EDA provides the funding necessary to repair decaying infrastructure and to develop the new infrastructure which business needs to grow.

For the communities faced with the massive job losses associated with defense downsizing, EDA provides the funding to develop projects at the local level that support community redevelopment priorities.

EDA's grant and technical assistance programs really work. Any of my colleagues can look around their districts and point to economic success stories catalyzed by EDA funding.

So, does EDA warrant an increase? I say yes. Economic development is a local process with a specific appropriate Federal role. EDA, in direct partnership with distressed communities, provides seed funding that promotes long-term investments that respond to locally defined economic priorities.

It is clear that EDA is in need of additional resources to deal with adverse economic effects on trade-impacted communities, among other things. That is what this money is for, and I urge defeat of this ill-advised amendment.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I understand why we need more money in Drug Courts. I support the concept, but not transferring \$250 million from EDA. That is not the way it is supposed to be done.

Let me tell you what the EDA has been doing. EDA was created to assist those distressed communities impacted by different cutbacks and base closures. In those poor distressed areas, they have been highly successful in creating jobs in those poor areas.

In addition to the fine job they have done, we have made major reforms this year. One is called the Federal Loan Guarantee Program, which gives local governments tools to stretch out the dollars to several times more so they can attract better private financing portfolios to be able to build more public works projects, in turn creating permanent jobs.

Second, we create what is called pockets of poverty areas, so we can look at pockets of small distressed areas, rather than on a regional bases. That program has already been implemented, and I appreciate the committee chairman for this. This idea has been thoroughly evaluated by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development.

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to correct, for the record, it is a \$25 million reduction out of the increase. There is still a 2 percent increase.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this cut would amount to an immediate loss in the communities of 7,000 jobs, and, after 6 years, that 7,000 jobs would create another loss of 7,000.

The Drug Courts are needed. The gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) have in fact increased the dollar amount for the Drug Courts. But there are several reasons why this amendment should be defeated.

Number one, an administrator over there by the name of Phil Singerman has done an absolutely outstanding job. The committee has had a number of hearings, and an EDA authorization bill finally has a chance for the light of day, which will make some significant changes.

First of all, the country, 80 percent of this Nation, is eligible for EDA money. The committee feels that, in many cases, distressed communities that really need the help are being overlooked. The change has been made in only 36 percent of the country, that the truly distressed areas will be eligible.

Second of all, there is a new program created with the limited EDA funds. Monies will now be used to buy down interest rates when the banks and savings and loans invest in their own communities.

□ 1745

For the first time we are partnering with and have participatory programs that are leveraging more and more private money back into community development. Finally, it was brought up by the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) also the aspects of international trade and job loss, because international trade is also now being addressed by EDA, and those communities that are suffering a loss of jobs from displacements due to international trade are now being addressed.

I would just like to say one other thing. I come over here to the floor and I watch these bills go through with a million dollars for Bosnia, billions of dollars for Russia, billions of dollars for proposals all over the world. But when we try and get a little increase for economically depressed communities, we find literally a number of excellent places to supposedly put this money.

I will support more money for drug courts. The committee has already increased those accounts, and there was already an amendment they accepted to further embellish the account, but not from the people in the communities who are being left behind.

I am asking Members to understand this issue. This is a jobs issue. This is

a fairness issue. It will impact upon the people we are concerned about the most.

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

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

As someone who opposed NAFTA and Bosnia, opposed money for Bosnia, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I do wish the RECORD to show that it is tough to be eliminating 7,000 jobs, since the money has not been spent yet. It may keep us, in the gentleman's opinion, from creating those jobs.

Secondly, this is not a cut, it is a reduction of the increase.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I did vote against NAFTA, I did vote against GATT. I say to the gentleman, I am going to stone cold vote no against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would note that it is a bit of technicality to suggest it is not a cut because it already has not passed. This legislation is about become law, and if the gentleman's amendment were passed, it would be a significant cut in the 1999 appropriation.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of bills with a lot of discussion on this floor. There are 13 bills to become law. This is one of them. If this amendment passes, it will ultimately cut 14,000 jobs, pursuant to the hearings we held.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will now rise informally to receive a message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4103. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4103) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STEVENS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. BOND, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HUTCHISON, Mr. INOUE, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr.

DORGAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, AND JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, Will Rogers said that government programs have three things in common: a beginning, middle, and no end. That is true of the EDA.

I will include for the RECORD a letter from Mr. Orson Swindle, who was Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development under President Reagan from 1985 to 1989. I will enter this entire document in the RECORD, but I will quote from it, that the findings of many people would be as follows:

EDA's development functions duplicate the activities of programs within the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Housing and Urban Development, and Interior, as well as the Appalachian Regional Commission, Small Business Administration, Federal Emergency Agency, and Tennessee Valley Authority. On these grounds alone, the program ought to be eliminated.

We are not proposing to eliminate the program. As a matter of fact, we are proposing to limit the increase to that which is adjusted for inflation. We also are very much opposed to a 19 percent increase in administrative overhead for this program, where in fact this agency has not proved its need for that.

Let us be clear what this amendment is about. It is not about cutting EDA, it is about increasing EDA, just not increasing it as much. It is about limiting the increase in the overhead for the administration of EDA. Why would we want to do that? Because we know that our discussions on appropriations bills are about priorities. We know where the savings are.

The other thing we might also know is that as far as EDA's charge, we seem to have been in this past year in one of the greatest times of our productivity, success, industrial growth rate, increase in standard of living that this country has seen. Yet, in 90 percent of our communities, EDA is active because there is supposedly a problem with lack of jobs in all of those communities.

I do not deny that there are significant areas in our country that have a need for EDA grant money, but not 90 percent of the country.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, first of all, that Mr.

Swindle, who is a very fine gentleman, had these very strong views about EDA before he came to, I believe, head the agency, did he not?

Mr. COBURN. I am sorry?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I was suggesting that Orson Swindle, to whom the gentleman alluded, I believe he headed EDA at one point in time.

Mr. COBURN. I do not know that he actually headed it. He was Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that he had these strong views about EDA before he came to the job. I just remember that.

The gentleman mentioned the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Department of Agriculture as agencies one could go to who had duplicate programs with EDA. I would ask the gentleman, what were the other agencies?

Mr. COBURN. The other agencies that had duplicative functions?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. That duplicated the authorization.

Mr. COBURN. The Appalachian Regional Commission, the Small Business Administration, the Federal Emergency Agency, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Departments of Defense, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, and the Department of Agriculture all have programs that are duplicated by EDA in one form or another.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would not hold myself out as an expert on EDA, but we do an awful lot of EDA projects in our district, unfortunately because we qualify under the criteria. Just standing here right now, I cannot think of one EDA project we have going where we could have gone to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. COBURN. Reclaiming my time, I think the defining words are that there would be a consensus that there are many programs duplicated by the EDA. That may not be the case in the gentleman's particular district.

Let us talk about drug courts, reclaiming my time. Drug courts offer us tremendous savings, and there are some real data that needs to be shared with our body. They open up prison space for violent offenders. Most State and local jails as well as Federal jails are operating above capacity. This is largely due to the high number of incarcerated drug offenders, many of whom are nonviolent.

Drug courts provide a structured alternative to prison for those non-violent offenders. Not only does this program save money, it helps to ensure that adequate prison space is available to house the most violent offenders in our society.

I want to give the gentleman some savings from drug courts from some of the areas across the country. Denver, Colorado, saves between \$1.8 and \$2.5 million per year because of drug courts; Phoenix, Arizona, reported this last year a saving of \$112,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) has expired.