

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Other initiatives (crime trust fund).....		13,100,000	80,600,000	+ 80,600,000	+ 87,500,000
Construction.....		99,259,000	98,400,000	+ 98,400,000	-859,000
Subtotal.....	2,203,595,000	2,584,370,000	2,430,481,000	+ 226,888,000	-153,889,000
(Counterterrorism supplemental)	(28,200,000)		(48,940,000)	(+ 20,740,000)	(+ 48,940,000)
Subtotal, operating level.....	(2,231,795,000)	(2,584,370,000)	(2,479,421,000)	(+ 247,626,000)	(-104,849,000)
Digital telephony (crime trust fund).....		33,400,000			-33,400,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	(2,231,795,000)	(2,617,770,000)	(2,479,421,000)	(+ 247,626,000)	(-138,349,000)
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	799,944,000	845,409,000	828,729,000	+ 28,785,000	-16,680,000
Diversion control fund.....	-43,431,000	-47,241,000	-47,241,000		
Direct appropriation.....	756,513,000	798,168,000	781,488,000	+ 24,975,000	-16,680,000
Crime trust fund.....		12,000,000	12,000,000	+ 12,000,000	
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration.....	756,513,000	810,168,000	793,488,000	+ 36,975,000	-16,680,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
Salaries and expenses:					
Direct appropriation.....	1,102,475,000	1,453,471,000	1,421,481,000	+ 319,006,000	-31,990,000
Immigration legalization fund.....	(3,482,000)	(1,823,000)	(1,823,000)	(+ 1,659,000)	
Immigration user fee.....	(330,952,000)	(357,084,000)	(357,084,000)	(+ 26,132,000)	
Land border inspection fund.....	(1,584,000)	(5,965,000)	(5,965,000)	(+ 4,381,000)	
Immigration examinations fund.....	(291,097,000)	(304,572,000)	(450,217,000)	(+ 159,120,000)	(+ 145,645,000)
Breached bond fund.....	(6,200,000)	(6,358,000)	(6,358,000)	(+ 158,000)	
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	(1,735,790,000)	(2,129,273,000)	(2,242,928,000)	(+ 507,138,000)	(+ 113,655,000)
Immigration initiative (crime trust fund).....	100,600,000	335,498,000	152,642,000	+ 52,042,000	-182,856,000
Border control system modernization (crime trust fund).....	154,600,000		150,900,000	-3,700,000	+ 150,900,000
Construction.....	50,000,000		11,000,000	-39,000,000	+ 11,000,000
Immigration Emergency Fund.....	30,000,000			-30,000,000	
Total, Immigration and Naturalization Service.....	(2,070,990,000)	(2,484,771,000)	(2,557,470,000)	(+ 488,480,000)	(+ 92,689,000)
Appropriations.....	(1,182,475,000)	(1,453,471,000)	(1,432,481,000)	(+ 250,008,000)	(-20,990,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(255,200,000)	(335,498,000)	(330,542,000)	(+ 48,342,000)	(-31,956,000)
(Fee accounts).....	(633,315,000)	(675,802,000)	(821,447,000)	(+ 188,132,000)	(+ 145,645,000)
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,381,634,000	2,630,259,000	2,614,578,000	+ 232,944,000	-15,681,000
Prior year carryover.....	-30,000,000		-40,000,000	-10,000,000	-40,000,000
Direct appropriation.....	2,351,634,000	2,630,259,000	2,574,578,000	+ 222,944,000	-55,681,000
Crime trust fund.....		13,500,000	13,500,000	+ 13,500,000	
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	2,351,634,000	2,643,759,000	2,588,078,000	+ 236,444,000	-55,681,000
National Institute of Corrections.....	10,302,000	10,158,000		-10,302,000	-10,158,000
Buildings and facilities.....	276,301,000	323,728,000	323,728,000	+ 47,427,000	
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+ 96,000)	
Total, Federal Prison System.....	2,638,237,000	2,977,645,000	2,911,806,000	+ 273,589,000	-65,839,000
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice Assistance:					
Direct appropriation.....	97,977,000	102,345,000	97,977,000		-4,368,000
Crime trust fund:					
Drug Courts.....	29,000,000	150,000,000		-29,000,000	-150,000,000
Violence Against Women Grants.....	26,000,000	174,900,000	74,500,000	+ 48,500,000	-100,400,000
Ounce of Prevention Council.....	1,500,000			-1,500,000	
Crime prevention.....		30,000,000			-30,000,000
Model intensive prevention.....		48,216,000			-48,216,000
State prison drug treatment.....		27,000,000	27,000,000	+ 27,000,000	
Other crime control programs.....		4,426,000	900,000	+ 900,000	-3,526,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	56,500,000	434,542,000	102,400,000	+ 45,900,000	-332,142,000
Total, Justice Assistance.....	154,477,000	536,887,000	200,377,000	+ 45,900,000	-336,510,000
State and local law enforcement assistance:					
Direct appropriations:					
Byrne grants.....	62,000,000	240,000,000	50,000,000	-12,000,000	-190,000,000
Weed and seed fund.....	13,456,000	5,000,000	(23,500,000)	-13,456,000	-5,000,000
Subtotal, Direct appropriations.....	75,456,000	245,000,000	50,000,000	-25,456,000	-195,000,000

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Crime trust fund:					
State and local block grants:					
Byrne grants.....	450,000,000	260,000,000	475,000,000	+25,000,000	+215,000,000
Local law enforcement block grant.....	1,300,000,000	1,902,964,000	2,000,000,000	+700,000,000	+97,036,000
Subtotal, State and local block grants.....	1,750,000,000	2,162,964,000	2,475,000,000	+725,000,000	+312,036,000
Upgrade criminal history records.....	100,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	-75,000,000
State Correctional Grants.....	24,500,000	500,000,000	500,000,000	+475,500,000
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.....	130,000,000	300,000,000	300,000,000	+170,000,000
Youthful offender incarceration.....	8,643,000	19,643,000	+19,643,000	+10,000,000
Rural law enforcement.....	10,252,000	-10,252,000
Other crime control programs.....	26,799,000	13,700,000	+13,700,000	-13,099,000
Subtotal, Crime trust fund.....	2,004,500,000	3,034,658,000	3,333,343,000	+1,328,843,000	+298,685,000
Total, State and local law enforcement.....	2,079,956,000	3,279,658,000	3,383,343,000	+1,303,387,000	+103,685,000
Juvenile justice programs.....	155,250,000	148,500,000	148,500,000	-6,750,000
Public safety officers benefits program:					
Death benefits.....	27,645,000	28,474,000	28,474,000	+829,000
Disability benefits.....	2,072,000	2,134,000	2,134,000	+62,000
Total, Office of Justice Programs.....	2,419,400,000	3,995,653,000	3,782,828,000	+1,343,428,000	-232,825,000
Appropriations.....	(358,400,000)	(526,453,000)	(327,085,000)	(-31,315,000)	(-199,368,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(2,061,000,000)	(3,469,200,000)	(3,435,743,000)	(+1,374,743,000)	(-33,457,000)
Total, title I, Department of Justice.....	12,243,068,000	15,291,038,000	14,474,522,000	+2,231,454,000	-816,517,000
Appropriations.....	(9,898,068,000)	(11,326,839,000)	(10,534,035,000)	(+635,967,000)	(-792,804,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(2,345,000,000)	(3,964,200,000)	(3,940,487,000)	(+1,595,487,000)	(-23,713,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,483,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses.....	20,949,000	20,949,000	20,949,000
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	42,500,000	47,177,000	42,500,000	-4,677,000
Total, Related agencies.....	63,449,000	68,126,000	63,449,000	-4,677,000
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration.....	266,093,000	279,558,000	264,885,000	-1,208,000	-14,673,000
Export Administration					
Operations and administration.....	38,644,000	46,441,000	38,644,000	-9,797,000
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs.....	407,783,000	407,783,000	328,500,000	-79,283,000	-79,283,000
Salaries and expenses.....	32,144,000	31,183,000	20,000,000	-12,144,000	-11,183,000
Total, Economic Development Administration.....	439,927,000	438,966,000	348,500,000	-91,427,000	-90,466,000
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development.....	43,789,000	47,921,000	32,000,000	-11,789,000	-15,921,000
United States Travel and Tourism Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	16,328,000	16,303,000	2,000,000	-14,328,000	-14,303,000
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development.....	868,230,000	899,315,000	749,478,000	-118,752,000	-149,837,000
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses.....	46,896,000	57,220,000	40,000,000	-6,896,000	-17,220,000
Economics and statistics administration revolving fund.....	1,677,000	-1,677,000
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses.....	136,000,000	144,812,000	138,000,000	-8,812,000
Periodic censuses and programs.....	142,083,000	193,450,000	135,000,000	-7,083,000	-58,450,000
Total, Bureau of the Census.....	278,083,000	338,262,000	271,000,000	-7,083,000	-67,262,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	20,961,000	22,932,000	19,709,000	-1,252,000	-3,223,000
Public broadcasting facilities, planning and construction.....	28,983,000	7,959,000	19,000,000	-9,983,000	+11,041,000
Endowment for Children's Educational Television.....	2,499,000	2,502,000	-2,499,000	-2,502,000
Information Infrastructure grants.....	48,962,000	99,812,000	40,000,000	-8,962,000	-59,812,000
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration.....	101,405,000	133,305,000	78,709,000	-22,696,000	-54,596,000
Patent and Trademark Office					
Salaries and expenses.....	82,324,000	110,868,000	100,000,000	+17,876,000	-10,868,000
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure.....	510,385,000	639,655,000	488,709,000	-20,676,000	-149,946,000
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services.....	264,486,000	310,679,000	263,000,000	-1,486,000	-47,679,000
Industrial technology services.....	434,673,000	642,458,000	81,100,000	-353,573,000	-561,358,000
Construction of research facilities.....	64,639,000	69,813,000	60,000,000	-4,639,000	-9,813,000
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.....	763,798,000	1,023,050,000	404,100,000	-359,698,000	-618,950,000
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research and facilities 2/.....	1,829,292,000	2,021,135,000	1,690,452,000	-138,840,000	-330,683,000
Offsetting collections - fees.....	-6,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000	+3,000,000
Direct appropriation.....	1,823,292,000	2,018,135,000	1,687,452,000	-135,840,000	-330,683,000
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund).....	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)
(By transfer from Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund, permanent).....	8,500,000	3,900,000	3,900,000	-4,600,000
(Damage assessment and restoration revolving fund).....	-1,500,000	-3,900,000	-3,900,000	-2,400,000
Total, Operations, research and facilities.....	1,830,292,000	2,018,135,000	1,687,452,000	-142,840,000	-330,683,000
Coastal zone management fund.....	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)
Mandatory offset.....	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)	(7,800,000)
Construction.....	97,254,000	52,299,000	42,731,000	-54,523,000	-9,568,000
Fleet modernization, shipbuilding and conversion.....	22,936,000	23,347,000	20,000,000	-2,936,000	-3,347,000
Fishing vessel and gear damage fund.....	1,273,000	1,282,000	1,032,000	-241,000	-250,000
Fishermen's contingency fund.....	999,000	1,000,000	999,000	-1,000
Foreign fishing observer fund.....	400,000	396,000	196,000	-204,000	-200,000
Fishing vessel obligations guarantees.....	250,000	250,000	-250,000	-250,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.....	1,953,404,000	2,096,709,000	1,752,410,000	-200,994,000	-344,299,000
Technology Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,992,000	13,906,000	5,000,000	-4,992,000	-8,906,000
National Technical Information Service					
NTIS revolving fund.....	8,000,000	-8,000,000
Total, Science and Technology.....	2,735,194,000	3,133,665,000	2,161,510,000	-573,684,000	-972,155,000
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	36,471,000	35,826,000	29,100,000	-7,371,000	-6,726,000
Office of Inspector General.....	16,897,000	22,249,000	21,849,000	+4,962,000	-400,000
Total, General administration.....	53,358,000	58,075,000	50,949,000	-2,409,000	-7,126,000
Total, Department of Commerce.....	4,103,718,000	4,662,584,000	3,388,197,000	-715,521,000	-1,274,387,000
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies....	4,167,167,000	4,730,710,000	3,451,646,000	-715,521,000	-1,279,064,000
(By transfer).....	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)
TITLE III - THE JUDICIARY					
Supreme Court of the United States					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices.....	1,657,000	1,662,000	1,662,000	+5,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	22,583,000	24,172,000	24,172,000	+1,589,000
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	24,240,000	25,834,000	25,834,000	+1,594,000
Care of the building and grounds.....	3,000,000	4,003,000	3,313,000	+313,000	-690,000
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	27,240,000	29,837,000	29,147,000	+1,907,000	-690,000

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,758,000	1,892,000	1,892,000	+ 134,000
Other salaries and expenses	11,680,000	13,603,000	12,178,000	+ 498,000	-1,425,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	13,438,000	15,495,000	14,070,000	+ 632,000	-1,425,000
United States Court of International Trade					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges	1,385,000	1,413,000	1,413,000	+ 28,000
Other salaries and expenses	10,300,000	9,446,000	9,446,000	-854,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	11,685,000	10,859,000	10,859,000	-826,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges	220,428,000	226,024,000	226,024,000	+ 5,596,000
Other salaries and expenses	2,116,699,000	2,419,941,000	2,185,000,000	+ 65,301,000	-234,941,000
Direct appropriation	2,340,127,000	2,645,965,000	2,411,024,000	+ 70,687,000	-234,941,000
Crime trust fund		30,700,000	41,500,000	+ 41,500,000	+ 10,800,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	2,340,127,000	2,676,665,000	2,452,524,000	+ 112,397,000	-224,141,000
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund	2,250,000	2,320,000	2,318,000	+ 68,000	-2,000
Defender services	250,000,000	295,781,000	260,000,000	+ 10,000,000	-35,781,000
Fees of jurors and commissioners	59,346,000	72,008,000	59,028,000	-318,000	-12,980,000
Court security	97,000,000	116,433,000	109,724,000	+ 12,724,000	-6,709,000
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services	2,749,723,000	3,163,187,000	2,883,594,000	+ 134,871,000	-279,593,000
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses	47,500,000	53,445,000	47,500,000	-5,945,000
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses	18,828,000	20,771,000	18,828,000	-1,943,000
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds	28,475,000	32,900,000	32,900,000	+ 4,425,000
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses	8,800,000	9,500,000	8,500,000	-300,000	-1,000,000
Total, title III, the Judiciary	2,904,689,000	3,335,994,000	3,045,398,000	+ 140,709,000	-290,596,000
Appropriations	(2,904,689,000)	(3,305,294,000)	(3,003,888,000)	(+ 99,209,000)	(-301,396,000)
Crime trust fund		(30,700,000)	(41,500,000)	(+ 41,500,000)	(+ 10,800,000)
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs	1,726,878,000	1,748,438,000	1,716,878,000	-10,000,000	-31,560,000
Security enhancements		9,720,000	9,720,000	+ 9,720,000
Registration fees	700,000	700,000	700,000
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	1,727,578,000	1,758,858,000	1,727,298,000	-280,000	-31,560,000
Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	372,480,000	383,278,000	-20,696,000	-9,204,000
Security enhancements		1,870,000	1,870,000	+ 1,870,000
Total, Salaries and expenses	383,972,000	374,350,000	385,148,000	-18,826,000	-9,204,000
Capital investment fund		32,800,000	18,400,000	+ 18,400,000	-18,400,000
Office of Inspector General	23,850,000	24,250,000	27,669,000	+ 3,819,000	+ 3,419,000
Representation allowances	4,780,000	4,800,000	4,780,000	-20,000
Protection of foreign missions and officials	8,579,000	8,579,000	8,578,000	-1,000,000
Acquisition and maintenance of buildings abroad	421,760,000	421,760,000	391,760,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	6,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-500,000
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	593,000	593,000	593,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)
Administrative expenses	183,000	183,000	183,000
Total, Repatriation loans program account	776,000	776,000	776,000
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	15,465,000	15,465,000	15,165,000	-300,000	-300,000
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	129,321,000	125,402,000	125,402,000	-3,919,000
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	2,723,581,000	2,773,040,000	2,688,975,000	-34,606,000	-84,065,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
International Organizations and Conferences					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment.....	872,661,000	923,057,000	870,000,000	-2,661,000	-53,057,000
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year assessment.....	533,304,000	445,000,000	425,000,000	-108,304,000	-20,000,000
International conferences and contingencies.....	6,000,000	6,000,000	3,000,000	-3,000,000	-3,000,000
Total, International Organizations and Conferences.....	1,411,965,000	1,374,057,000	1,298,000,000	-113,965,000	-78,057,000
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	12,858,000	13,858,000	12,358,000	-500,000	-1,500,000
Construction.....	6,844,000	10,398,000	6,844,000		-3,754,000
American sections, international commissions.....	5,800,000	6,290,000	5,800,000		-490,000
International fisheries commissions.....	14,669,000	14,669,000	14,669,000		
Total, International commissions.....	39,871,000	45,215,000	38,471,000	-500,000	-5,744,000
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000		
Appropriation (FY 1995 Defense Bill, P.L. 103-335).....	5,000,000			-5,000,000	
Total, Department of State.....	4,190,517,000	4,202,312,000	4,038,446,000	-154,071,000	-165,866,000
RELATED AGENCIES					
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency					
Arms control and disarmament activities.....	54,378,000	76,300,000	40,000,000	-14,378,000	-36,300,000
United States Information Agency					
Salaries and expenses.....	475,645,000	496,002,000	445,645,000	-30,000,000	-50,357,000
Technology fund.....		10,100,000	5,050,000	+5,050,000	-5,050,000
Office of Inspector General.....	4,300,000	4,583,000		-4,300,000	-4,583,000
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....	238,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	-46,189,000	-60,586,000
Transfer (FY 1995 Foreign Ops Bill, P.L. 103-336).....	42,000,000			-42,000,000	
Subtotal.....	280,279,000	252,676,000	192,090,000	-88,189,000	-60,586,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund.....	2,800,000	300,000	300,000	-2,500,000	
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....	997,000	397,000	397,000		-597,000
International Broadcasting Operations 3/.....	468,073,000	395,240,000	341,000,000	-127,073,000	-54,340,000
Radio Free Asia: Operations 3/.....	10,000,000	(10,000,000)	(5,000,000)	-10,000,000	
Broadcasting to Cuba 3/.....	24,809,000	(26,063,000)	(24,809,000)	-24,809,000	
Radio construction.....	85,314,000	85,919,000	70,164,000	-15,150,000	-15,755,000
East-West Center.....	24,500,000	20,000,000		-24,500,000	-20,000,000
North/South Center.....	4,000,000	1,000,000		-4,000,000	-1,000,000
National Endowment for Democracy.....	34,000,000	34,000,000	28,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
Total, United States Information Agency.....	1,414,117,000	1,300,327,000	1,082,646,000	-331,471,000	-217,881,000
Total, related agencies.....	1,468,495,000	1,376,627,000	1,122,646,000	-345,849,000	-253,981,000
Total, title IV, Department of State.....	5,659,012,000	5,578,939,000	5,158,082,000	-499,920,000	-418,847,000
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Maritime Administration					
Operating-differential subsidies (liquidation of contract authority)...	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
Maritime Security Program.....		175,000,000			+175,000,000
Operations and training.....	76,087,000	81,650,000	84,600,000	-11,487,000	-17,050,000
Ready reserve force:					
Maintenance, operations and facilities.....	149,653,000			-149,653,000	
Rescission.....	-158,000,000			+158,000,000	
Total, Ready reserve force.....	-8,347,000			+8,347,000	
Maritime Guaranteed Loan Program Account:					
Guaranteed loans subsidy.....	25,000,000	48,000,000	48,000,000	+23,000,000	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(250,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(1,000,000,000)	(+750,000,000)	
Administrative expenses.....	2,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,000,000	
Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account.....	27,000,000	52,000,000	52,000,000	+25,000,000	
Total, Maritime Administration.....	94,740,000	308,650,000	116,600,000	+21,860,000	-192,050,000

**DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses.....	206,000	212,000	206,000		-6,000
 Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,000,000	11,400,000	8,500,000	-500,000	-2,900,000
 Commission on Immigration Reform					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,894,000	2,877,000	2,377,000	+483,000	-500,000
 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,090,000	1,122,000	1,090,000		-32,000
 Competitiveness Policy Council					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,000,000	503,000		-1,000,000	-503,000
 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	233,000,000	268,000,000	233,000,000		-35,000,000
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	185,232,000	223,600,000	185,232,000		-38,368,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-118,400,000	-118,400,000	-118,400,000		
Direct appropriation.....	68,632,000	107,200,000	68,832,000		-38,368,000
Federal Maritime Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	18,569,000	18,947,000	15,000,000	-3,569,000	-3,947,000
Offsetting fee collections.....		-2,228,000			+2,228,000
Direct appropriation.....	18,569,000	16,719,000	15,000,000	-3,569,000	-1,719,000
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	98,928,000	107,873,000	98,928,000		-8,945,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	-4,500,000		-16,000,000	-11,500,000	-16,000,000
Offsetting fee collections - current year.....	-39,640,000	-48,282,000	-48,282,000	-8,622,000	
Direct appropriation.....	54,788,000	59,611,000	34,666,000	-20,122,000	-24,945,000
Japan - United States Friendship Commission					
Japan - United States Friendship Trust Fund.....	1,247,000	1,250,000	1,247,000		-3,000
(Foreign currency appropriation).....	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)		
 Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation.....	400,000,000	440,000,000	278,000,000	-122,000,000	-162,000,000
 Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,384,000	1,425,000	1,000,000	-384,000	-425,000
 Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal Holiday Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	300,000	350,000	250,000	-50,000	-100,000
 Ounce of Prevention Council					
Crime trust fund 4/.....		14,700,000			-14,700,000
 Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	297,405,000	342,922,000	297,405,000		-45,517,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-192,000,000		-184,293,000	+7,707,000	-184,293,000
Offsetting fee collections - carryover.....	-30,548,000		-9,667,000	+20,882,000	-9,667,000
Investment adviser fee - offsetting collection.....	(8,585,000)			(+8,585,000)	
Direct appropriation.....	74,856,000	342,922,000	103,445,000	+28,589,000	-239,477,000
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	251,504,000	242,831,000	221,247,000	-30,257,000	-21,584,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-9,350,000	-3,300,000	-3,300,000	+6,050,000	
Direct appropriation.....	242,154,000	239,531,000	217,947,000	-24,207,000	-21,584,000
Office of Inspector General.....	8,500,000	9,200,000	8,750,000	+250,000	-450,000
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	9,596,000	12,428,000	5,000,000	-4,596,000	-7,428,000
Guaranteed loans subsidy 5/.....	274,439,000	50,835,000	145,010,000	-129,429,000	+94,175,000
Micro loan guarantees.....	1,218,000	1,700,000	1,700,000		+484,000
Section 503, prepayment.....	30,000,000			-30,000,000	
Administrative expenses.....	97,000,000	89,910,000	97,000,000		-2,910,000
Total, Business loans program account.....	412,251,000	184,873,000	248,710,000	-163,541,000	+83,837,000

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
 APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 2076)—Continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy 5/.....	52,153,000	34,432,000	34,432,000	-17,721,000	
Administrative expenses.....	78,000,000	80,340,000	78,000,000		-2,340,000
Contingency fund (emergency).....	125,000,000	100,000,000		-125,000,000	-100,000,000
Total, Disaster loans program account.....	255,153,000	214,772,000	112,432,000	-142,721,000	-102,340,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund.....	5,369,000	2,530,000	2,530,000		-2,838,000
Total, Small Business Administration.....	923,427,000	630,906,000	590,369,000	-333,058,000	-40,537,000
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses 6/.....	13,550,000	13,550,000		-13,550,000	-13,550,000
Crime trust fund.....		600,000			-600,000
Total, State Justice Institute.....	13,550,000	14,150,000		-13,550,000	-14,150,000
Total, title V, Related agencies.....					
Appropriations.....	1,897,883,000	2,221,967,000	1,454,582,000	-443,301,000	-787,415,000
Rescission.....	(2,055,883,000)	(2,206,887,000)	(1,454,582,000)	(-601,301,000)	(-752,115,000)
Crime trust fund.....	(158,000,000)			(+158,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....		(15,300,000)			(-15,300,000)
(Liquidation of contract authority).....	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Procurement: General Provisions 7/.....	-11,769,000			+11,769,000	
Total, title VI, general provisions.....	-11,769,000			+11,769,000	
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	26,860,050,000	31,158,679,000	27,585,240,000	-725,190,000	-3,573,439,000
Appropriations.....	(24,673,050,000)	(27,148,479,000)	(23,603,253,000)	(-1,069,797,000)	(-3,545,226,000)
Rescission.....	(158,000,000)			(+158,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....	(2,345,000,000)	(4,010,200,000)	(3,981,987,000)	(+1,636,987,000)	(-28,213,000)
(By transfer).....	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)	(55,500,000)		
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(3,463,000)	(3,559,000)	(3,559,000)	(+96,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(741,000)	(741,000)	(741,000)		
(Liquidation of contract authority).....	(214,356,000)	(162,610,000)	(162,610,000)	(-51,746,000)	
(Foreign currency appropriation).....	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)	(1,420,000)		

1/ 1995 "Salaries and expenses" funds were used for "Administrative review and appeals".
 2/ Includes budget amendment of -\$3,265,000 related to privatization of portions of the National Weather Service. Legislation will be proposed to offset this account from the Marine Navigation Trust Fund.
 3/ The 1996 request and recommendation include funding for Radio Free Asia and Broadcasting to Cuba. In 1995, these activities were funded separately.
 4/ Funding of \$1,500,000 was provided under Office of Justice Programs in FY 1995.
 5/ Assumes legislation to lower the subsidy for these accounts through new fees and increases in interest rates.
 6/ The State Justice Institute is authorized to submit its budget directly to Congress. The President's request includes \$7,000,000 for the Institute.
 7/ The FY 1995 budget authority amount reflects the unspread balance.

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

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

I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak about the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary, and related agencies fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill. I want to again congratulate Chairman HAL ROGERS on his first bill as subcommittee Chair.

Mr. ROGERS has done an absolutely excellent job this year as the new chairman of our subcommittee. His performance is all the more impressive in light of the personal tragedy he has recently faced. I cannot imagine how difficult it must have been to have performed his professional duties so well in the face of those circumstances yet HAL ROGERS' courage shines through. The people of the Fifth Congressional District of Kentucky are fortunate to have HAL ROGERS as their Representative. And we are fortunate to have him as our colleague and chairman of this subcommittee.

He has handled this bill with great skill—beginning with very exhaustive hearings which explored the detail of the agency budgets under our jurisdiction. Hal did not waste time chasing simplistic solutions. Instead he pursued the course of a responsible legislator, following a sound, measured approach in writing this bill.

He has been assisted by a very capable and dedicated staff, as have I. And I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the professionalism and talent of the staffs on both sides of the aisle for this subcommittee.

While I do not agree with every funding level in this bill, there are many areas where the chairman and I see eye to eye:

Crime fighting is a top priority for the Nation and this bill is as generous as possible in assisting the Department of Justice in this regard. We have been able to fund new FBI and DEA positions which we added in the bill last year, and for which Chairman ROGERS fought so hard.

In addition, the bill includes an extremely generous immigration initiative. The approach the chairman has taken attacks the illegal alien program on all fronts—700 new border patrol agents, 400 new inspectors, 945 new detention personnel, and 750 new investigators.

Further, funds provided in this bill will allow INS to continue its automation initiatives so that INS agents can perform their duties in a modern world.

And, of course, we are all happy that the Byrne Law Enforcement Grant Program is funded. I will be offering an amendment to increase funds for the Byrne Grant Program because it is such an effective tool for local law enforcement.

This bill also funds the State Department at levels consistent with proposals to reinvent government.

And, finally, I am pleased the subcommittee funded U.S. contributions to the U.N. and international organizations.

Having said this, there are areas of this bill where I have grave concerns. In this regard, the budget realities facing the chairman should not go unmentioned. The shortage in this subcommittee's 602-B allocation is directly related to the recently passed budget resolution.

The budget resolution is the blueprint for a budget cutting frenzy which is dangerous for our Nation. During Budget Committee considerations I was very distressed to see Members carelessly propose drastic cuts to programs that meant a lot to people, often the less fortunate. They did so without a full analysis of the effect of these cuts on the American people.

And these budget resolution guidelines have dictated chairman ROGERS' allocation in the appropriations process. So I stand here very uncomfortable about the premise under which we are operating: one that forces our Nation's crime-fighting initiatives, our competitiveness agenda, and our diplomatic functions to compete in less than a zero sums game.

And who has been the hardest hit by this exercise? The Commerce Department. Chairman ROGERS has acted responsibly by not dismantling the Department in the appropriations process as some illconceived proposals would recommend.

However, I do have concerns with cuts in civilian technology programs at NIST and the Fisheries and Ocean Programs at NOAA. I will be offering two amendments to address these important policy issues.

Another area of special concern is in the Crime Trust Fund. This bill does not fund the highly effective COPS Program and prevention programs. Let me repeat that, Mr. Chairman. This bill does not fund the COPS Program. We have over 20,000 new police officers, in virtually every congressional district in this country, to whom the Federal Government has committed

multiyear funding. The problem is that there is not one red cent in this bill for the COPS Program. Instead, it funds a block grant program which is not even authorized. Nor will it likely be authorized, since the President, Congress, and the American people have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the COPS Program which is already out there getting police onto the streets. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is irresponsible to stop this program midstream—in effect throwing our investment away. I will be offering an amendment to fund the COPS Program in place of the block grant program.

Other areas which concern me are: The restriction of funds to exclude postconviction defender organization; The slashed funding and restrictions

imposed on the Legal Services Corporation; the conditions placed on the President regarding UN peacekeeping; the cut in funding for international broadcasting; and the large State criminal alien assistance increases, which is a concern I probably hold in the minority in this body.

But, as I have stated, the chairman has done well in such an austere context. I offer my personal congratulations to him. And I look forward to working with him to strengthen this bill through the remainder of the appropriations process.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind and generous remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate both the chairman and the ranking member for the work that both they and their staffs have done. Let me highlight a couple of points that I would like to make about the bill.

First, from my area of representing a border area, I am very pleased with the funding that we have in here for immigration enforcement officers and the outright rejection of a border crossing fee. That is an issue that has raised its ugly head in the other body and is continuing to do so. I hope with our action here, and in the Senate appropriations, that we will lay that issue to rest.

I am very pleased with the emphasis that we place in this legislation on the flexibility for local and State law enforcement. I think it is extraordinarily important that we given that kind of flexibility. I would have preferred to see great cuts in the Commerce Department. There are some areas that I think we should have cut more deeply, but that issue is going to be one that we are going to be dealing with as we get into the authorization issue of what we do with the Commerce Department.

Finally, let me just say, Mr. Chairman, this bill is good evidence of a shrinking pot of discretionary funding that is available. I congratulate the chairman, the staff, and the other Members for the job that they have done in putting together a reasonable bill under the circumstances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] on the job they have done in bringing this very important bill to the floor, but I also rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia on the COPS Program, which will be the first amendment discussed this evening.

The goal was simple when we passed the crime bill, and it is very simple

today: Put more cops on the beat, crime rates will fall, and our families will be safer. The Mollohan amendment will help us meet that goal by providing continued funding for programs like COPS FAST, programs that help police departments hire new officers and develop innovative community policing programs.

Mr. Chairman, my Republican colleagues intend to abolish these programs and replace them with open-ended block grants. I think they miss the point. The Republican block grant proposal does not guarantee more cops on our streets. In fact, under the Republican proposal, grant money could be used for anything from street lighting to road construction.

The COPS Program guarantees more cops on the street, and I challenge the Republicans to make the same guarantee. They cannot. COPS grants flow straight from the Justice Department to the local law enforcement agencies. We cut down on administrative overhead by streamlining the application process and taking other steps to reduce red tape.

□ 1815

The COPS Program empowers local communities to take responsibility for community safety by putting more police officers where they are needed the most. It does not mandate a Federal solution to problems that are often unique to neighborhoods and communities. The COPS Program succeeds because it empowers community police departments to find innovative, new strategies to combat crime and make the best use of available resources.

Neighborhood officers work with volunteers to keep our streets safe and our communities informed. Crime fighting experts and officers on the beat agree that community policing works. The COPS Program is a non-bureaucratic solution to a terrible problem, and the result is a marked decrease in crime, in theft, in burglary, and other more serious crime.

In Sacramento, citizens are involved in this effort, working with local law enforcement and injecting in their efforts a new spirit of cooperation and teamwork.

I want to talk about how this program has worked in communities in my district because it really provides an example of how successful this program can be and how, with some support, we can begin to address fundamental problems with local solutions, not Washington answers. In Sacramento County, CA, several groups of volunteers and local law enforcement officers have joined hands to establish sheriff's community service centers.

In North Highlands, part of my district in the unincorporated part of Sacramento County, we have put together, without fanfare, with tireless devotion, I might add, a group of volunteers and

deputies who have made a tremendous contribution to community safety. This photo to my right shows our sheriff, Glenn Craig, and others at the dedication of this community center. With an all-volunteer staff and a roster of deputies paid through a COPS grant and county matching funds, the North Highlands center is both a thriving community center, and an indispensable component of the county law enforcement team.

Volunteers work side by side with deputies, helping out with many of the day-to-day responsibilities that keep the wheels of justice turning, taking crime reports, providing a safe haven for neighborhood kids, helping others navigate through the sometimes confusing world of law enforcement and county services.

Since January of this year, these volunteers and others have logged 4,000 crime reports. Many of these volunteers spent 40 hours a week at the center. As one volunteer put it, a real sense of pride in their contribution to the neighborhood motivates their involvement.

The spirit of community involvement extends well beyond the walls of this North Highlands center. The office space is donated, so is the furniture, right down to the carpet.

Deputies like Willy Nix have found new ways to approach old problems. Deputy Nix, a patrol cop before coming to work with the North Highlands staff, talked to me just the other day about the advantages of community policing. An officer on patrol usually has just enough time to drive to a location, take a report, and drive away. Now, he said, "I can work with local agencies, the neighbors, the landlords, and all the people in the community to attack crime from every angle."

In some areas, drug dealers have literally trashed the community. Deputy Nix works with community members and service center volunteers to address this problem from the branches down to the roots, towing abandoned cars, cleaning up yards strewn with garbage, and returning the streets to law-abiding citizens. Yes, Deputy Nix is busy. He sets time aside to work with local schoolchildren. Because center volunteers have worked hard to establish after-school programs, many of these kids have more than just a uniform to turn to, they have an entire network of support, from reading and arts programs to safe recreational facilities in the evening.

What may seem like a commonsense solution is only possible if other communities can afford to hire officers like Willy Nix. In cities and towns around the country, volunteers are committed to breaking down barriers and developing a community commitment to law enforcement which will rise to the challenge, but only if given the opportunity.

The Mollohan amendment gives them that opportunity, and I urge its adoption by the Members here this afternoon.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member. In the face of a very difficult challenge and very high-priority programs, they have achieved a \$1.1 billion reduction over the 1995 number and at the same time maintained the high-priority items.

Certainly, this bill fights crime, and that is the No. 1 priority with the American people, and all the programs that will impact on crime prevention are fully funded and in some cases extra money has been put in.

Second, in Legal Services, which it is controversial, it has been reined in. The criteria have been established that ensure that money expended for Legal Services will be directed to helping people with their personal problems. I call it "Legal Medicare" because it does allow the poor to have access to legal representation and avoids the political activities that have happened in the past.

Third, it puts a strong management focus on the Commerce Department. It has features in this bill that will ensure that Commerce does just what that name implies, and that is further the commerce of the United States. We are the world's largest exporter. Commerce is very important to the people of this Nation, both from the standpoint of jobs as well as access to the goods and services that they find highly desirable.

The last feature that I would like to emphasize is that it does fund the International Trade Administration in the Commerce Department. This ITA is very important because it enforces the trade laws. It ensures the playing field will be level. We have just observed this in the issue between ourselves and Japan, and particularly enforces the two features in the trade laws that are very important for the protection of American jobs, anti-dumping and countervailing. It stops injury to U.S. industries, saves U.S. jobs. I think, a very important feature of the bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], for a fine job on a tough bill.

I am here tonight during this general debate because I really take exception to the local law enforcement block grant that the majority party has put in here. They have gutted the Clinton COPS Program. They have put it all into this local law enforcement block grant and funded it with \$3.2 billion. The problem is they called it local law enforcement block grant, but in their bill not one police officer is hired. We have no guarantee of any police officers working the street.

Having been a city police officer, having been a State trooper, the best crime fighting we have is a police officer on the street working with the communities, working with the citizens they should serve.

We have 20,400 police officers under the Clinton COPS Program. We have none under the \$3.2 billion law enforcement block grant proposed.

What does your application look like? Your administrative costs, you admit in your own report, are going to be about 2.5 percent. The other body says it is going to be 15 percent. You are going to have to fill out paperwork after paperwork in order to get a grant for, hopefully, a police officer or a police car.

How much money is being awarded underneath your program will depend upon the crime index. The Department of Justice has done their analysis. They said how much a city will get will depend upon their crime index. The more crime you have underneath your proposal, the more money the jurisdiction will get. The next year, if the crime comes down, as crime is coming down now, they will lose money. Having been a police officer, you have got to fight crime more than 12 months.

Take the city of New York, which has a 31 percent decrease in murders for 1995. Will they get 31 percent less money next year? You cannot have an effective program if every 12 months you are going to renew the amount of money you are going to give them. If they are effective, we should reward them for effective law enforcement and reducing crime, not punish them by taking away money.

When you take a look at it, we have had the Clinton COPS Program for about 8 months. The Police Executive Research Forum actually did an analysis, contacted their members, 220 of them around the country, and said, "What do you like, do you like this proposed local block grant that the Republican Party is putting forth, or would you keep the Clinton program, the Clinton COPS program?" Of those 220 police executives who responded, only 5 percent, 5 percent support a block grant, discretionary block grant that you propose. The rest of them support the Clinton COPS programs.

I am just not up here talking about this because of my 12 years in law enforcement, but every major police or-

ganization in the country opposes what you are trying to do in this bill. The FOP, Fraternal Order of Police, National Association of Police Organizations, Police Executive Research Forum, National Troopers Coalition, National Sheriffs' Association, National Black Police Officers' Association of Mayors, they are opposed to what you are doing with this block grant because they know what happened in the 1960's and 1970's when so much money was wasted on airplanes, on tanks, on real estate, on consultants on studies, and nothing ever went to fighting crime.

So while the bill overall is a good bill, this local block grant that does not guarantee one police officer, that only 5 percent of the police executives in this country support, cannot win over my support and, therefore, we have asked, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has brought forth an amendment. It is going to be the first one up tonight to take \$2 billion and put it back to guaranteed police officers across this Nation with the Clinton COPS program.

Support the Mollohan amendment.
Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR], the very distinguished member of the subcommittee, in fact, the vice chairman of the subcommittee who has helped us a great deal this year, especially.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank, first of all, our chairman and the hard-working staff on both sides of the aisle and our minority ranking member for the work in putting this bill together.

Our chairman has spent a lot of hours, and this is his first time at this, and very trying time, and I especially appreciate the good job that he has done.

Now, there is no bill that is perfect. I, in fact, would like myself to have seen the Legal Services zeroed out, but it was cut, and we moved it in the right direction.

In the area of the police program, and I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and respect him a great deal for what he was saying, that many of the police organizations may question block grants, this is going to give local law enforcement officers a chance to put the money where they will. I talked with a Democrat sheriff now, but he was former president of the National Sheriff's Organization, and he pointed out that the 100,000 COPS Program was a myth.

First of all, you have got a few dollars to start, maybe 10,000, 15,000 police all across the country. Then after each year, money was taken away until after, I think, the third year it was down to zero. He said, "If we had the money to put more people on the force now, we would have already done it. A

program that withdraws the dollars quickly from us is no help at all," and he would not, as a past president of the National Sheriff's Organization, even participate in the so-called 100,000 police program.

We will take monitoring from Congress. We have to work with our local governments, but I think the block grant can be of enormous benefit to individual police departments.

I cannot go back to the 1960's and debate what the gentleman said about areas where there might have been waste. But we can have, with local governments and local forces trying to utilize these funds rather than Washington bureaucrats dictating, we can, I think, get a law enforcement program that will be far more secure, demanding the kind of accountability and giving people what they want, which is a lower crime rate.

I hope that we will support the block grant program and support this bill, and again I thank our chairman and our staff for the work.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER].

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Chairman, I support the Appropriations Committee's recommendation for the Legal Services Corporation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the vital work of Legal Services Programs across the country.

My distinguished colleague, HAL ROGERS of Kentucky, worked long and hard as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee to achieve the recommendation before us. It was a difficult decision that strikes a balance between the demand by our constituents for fiscal austerity and the basic needs of the poor for legal help with their everyday civil legal problems.

Legal Services Programs have a proud record of accomplishment in Kentucky and in my district. Central Kentucky Legal Services has been working since 1977 with low-income residents of central Kentucky, serving an estimated poverty population of 58,000. This program is known for its creative partnerships with other community agencies, such as the law care program it sponsors jointly with the Payette County Bar Association. Law care, which provides pro bono help to county residents, is a model program for donated legal services in Kentucky and in areas of similar size nationally.

Another collaboration, with the Bluegrass Area Development District Area Agency on Aging, resulted in the long-term care ombudsman program. This program has won national recognition for its success in providing services to elderly citizens in nursing homes.

In addition, Central Kentucky Legal Services has been instrumental in helping low-income parents get improved

child support collection services. Over the years it has helped literally thousands of abused women get protection and support for themselves and their children.

Our vote today unfortunately will decrease rather than increase Legal Services' resources. It typifies the harsh budget climate for most federally funded programs. But it will enable the Legal Services Corporation to maintain basic services to the poor and to keep alive the basic American promise of equal justice for all.

□ 1830

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for his excellent work on this bill.

As Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, which authorizes and has oversight responsibility for many of the items in this bill, I can attest to the fact that our committee has worked closely with the gentleman from Kentucky since the beginning of the year.

The bill produced by the gentleman's appropriations subcommittee conforms in most important respects with the House decisions on funding made as part of its consideration and passage of the American Overseas Interests Act, H.R. 1561.

Just as H.R. 1561 was within budget, this bill is also within budget.

Some Members may prefer to cut these programs further.

But when the full House, based on the recommendation of the authorizing committee, has made an authorization decision, and when that decision has been ratified by the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Subcommittee, based on its own expertise, then our colleagues should refrain from overturning those decisions here on the floor.

Accordingly, with the exception of an important item related to restricting spending on our Nation's diplomatic establishment in Vietnam, which I will address at some length later, I intend to support Chairman ROGERS on this appropriations bill.

I strongly urge our colleagues to join me in that support.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Mollohan amendment. It is in my view a probusiness and proenvironment amendment, and I want to speak on behalf of the oldest industry in this country, our commercial fishing industry.

That industry contributes more than \$11 billion annually and provides jobs for 1.5 million Americans.

There are hundreds of communities across America that depend on a healthy fishery for their economic well-being. In recent years many of these communities have spent millions of dollars to help bring back their long-depleted fish populations. The Mollohan amendment corrects this bill's attack on that commitment between Government and communities to restore the local economy.

The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations wrote to me recently along with the Northwest sport fishing industry. They both support the Mollohan amendment. Together they represent over 5,000 businesses and 200,000 jobs on the Pacific coast. According to them these very important groups say fishery management cannot happen unless fishery research and conservation are fully funded, and this bill, they say, cuts at the heart of many important ongoing efforts. It makes no economic sense, and they go on to say on behalf of the men and women who provide jobs for fishing communities, food for America's tables, and high-quality products for export, we urge you to support the Mollohan amendment and restore these funds.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter here from the State of Oregon, the coastal management program, which says that the Governor of Oregon supports the Mollohan amendment saying it would greatly help national coastal zone management programs which would be hurt by this bill if the Mollohan amendment is not adopted. We cannot, we must not, turn our backs on this important sector of our Nation's economy. It is probusiness, and it makes common sense to support the Mollohan amendment.

I urge my colleagues to do that and to be probusiness.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the hard-working chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to congratulate him and the distinguished ranking minority member for their outstanding work on a very important and very difficult bill, and I applaud their efforts and the efforts of all of their staff toward perfecting this bill, and I look forward to its passage, hopefully tonight.

I know that the subcommittee chairman has carefully deliberated the issue of providing initial funding for what would be necessary to fund the first year of the maritime security program. I appreciate the assurances provided by him and the committee in the committee report. I also appreciate the assurances from the chairman that this issue will be revisited once the author-

ization committee, led by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN], takes action on this issue in the full House. I just wanted to assure myself that the gentleman does intend to readdress this once the authorization committee has had an opportunity to take a look at it.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS. I assure my full committee chairman that I will look at this program again as the authorization moves toward enactment into law.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] on this important issue to our U.S.-flag merchant marine.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, in America, profits are soaring, wages are decreasing, and consumer demand is declining.

And, what does the majority want this Congress to do? They want us to retreat, to cut and run.

In light of these conditions, the magazine Business Week recently asked the question—are we headed for trouble?

This appropriations bill reflects an attitude of defeat.

Instead of competing in the global marketplace—where jobs can be found—the bill proposes to cut the Department of Commerce by 17 percent.

Instead of encouraging more small business development and self-sufficiency—the bill cuts the SBA by 36 percent; cuts the Minority Business Development Agency by 27 percent; and cuts the Economic Development Agency by 21 percent.

Instead of providing access to legal services for all Americans, regardless of income—this bill cuts the Legal Services Corporation by 31 percent.

This bill even provides \$35 million less than the President requested for the equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has been made strong because, traditionally we have lifted up our citizens.

We have been able to export democracy by showcasing the values and benefits of our way of life and our standard of living.

This bill puts citizens down, this bill promotes an attitude of isolation from the world marketplace. This bill does not adequately promote competition by small businesses. This bill is a withdrawal from the proud tradition of America and from the very principles that gives the Nation power.

This bill ignores all these valuable economic and social values. Again this is a mindless march to a balanced budget without regards to the merits of the program.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2076.

H.R. 2076 provides for a 25-percent increase in funding of the Immigration and Naturalization Service—a generous increase in a time of budget cutting.

The resources provided in H.R. 2076 will go a long way in assisting INS in securing our borders. Given the size of its mission, INS has been underfunded for many years. I am happy to see that changing.

The resources made available in H.R. 2076 support the enforcement provisions in my immigration bill, H.R. 1915. It adds 1,000 additional border patrol agents next year—plus support personnel—and increases new technology for the Border Patrol and for enforcement initiatives.

H.R. 2076 adds to INS's capability to detain and remove deportable aliens, especially criminal aliens. It includes additional detention space, additional investigators and detention and deportation officers, and provides for the expansion of deportation procedures so that criminal aliens can be deported immediately upon release from prisons.

Additionally, H.R. 2076 increases the resources available for enforcement of employer sanctions, another important tool in controlling illegal immigration.

H.R. 2076 adds additional inspectors so that U.S. ports of entry can run more efficiently and smoothly, facilitating legal entries and prohibiting illegal entries by fraudulent documents.

I strongly support H.R. 2076 and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have mixed feelings about this bill, as so many of us do. But I first want to take a moment to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN], our ranking member, and our terrific staff for the work that they have put in on what's really an impossible task. We basically have a 4 by 4 that we are trying to squeeze into about a 2 by 2 slot. I just hope that the beam that we fashion in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is going to be strong enough to hold up the house that we have got to support.

The task to fully fund this nation's law enforcement, research activities, diplomatic activities, judiciary activities, has really been made impossible by the inadequate funding allowed under the budget resolution. We have done a pretty good job by way of law enforcement and immigration efforts, but I am very concerned about what this bill will do in reducing several im-

portant areas of research, technology development, science, and the programs that also are our responsibility in connection with legal services.

This bill, for instance, eliminates the advanced technology program. I think a very promising one, of the Commerce Department to help us further cutting edge technologies that are really going to be key to the economic well-being in this country in the long haul. We have reduced, although considerably less, the International Trade Administration, which has played an instrumental role in promoting exports, accounting for many hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs that depend upon our international trade. All of this is coming at a time when we face unprecedented challenges in terms of international competitiveness.

I also want to speak for a moment about the important science and research work that goes on at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. They, too, contribute to the productivity of this country, as well as to our health and safety and our understanding, very important to our long-term economic success, our understanding of the planet that we live on, its climate, and the changes in that climate. That is why I am disappointed in the cuts to those programs.

Finally I cannot conclude without commenting and expressing my great concern about the restrictions that are being imposed on the Legal Services Corporation. These restrictions will make it very difficult for Legal Services' lawyers adequately to represent their clients, and these restrictions apply not just to Government funds, but even to moneys raised privately. I think that is a grave mistake.

I just wanted to go on record with these reservations about a bill that has been, as I said, terribly difficult to fashion as responsibly as the chairman of the committee has.

I have mixed feelings about this bill. I must first commend Chairman ROGERS, ranking member Mr. MOLLOHAN and the staff of the subcommittee for their untiring efforts in the face of the impossible task placed before them. That task, to fully fund our Nation's important research, technology, crime fighting, and judiciary activities, has been made impossible by the inadequate funding allowed under the new budget resolution.

In the bill we are considering, H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, and State Departments appropriations bill, the chairman has been able to provide generous funding for the overall Federal law enforcement effort. However, I am very concerned by the reductions in several of the research and technology development programs contained in the bill, as well as the costs to legal services.

This bill eliminates funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's [NIST] Advanced Technology Program [ATP]. The ATP program provides a private industry-Government partnership to nurture cutting edge in-

dustrial technology that is either too high risk or too broad based for a single private company alone to afford to develop. It provides small, competitive grants to companies of all sizes for development of preproduct technology. These grants are matched by private funds and motivate private industry to take risks in product and technology development that otherwise would not occur, not because they lack merit or profitmaking potential, but because the payback in the short term is too problematic for purely private capital. This program promotes America's long-term economic interests and should be supported.

While the International Trade Administration [ITA] has been spared large cuts in this bill, it too is reduced from current funding levels. Commerce export initiatives like those provided under ITA, alone have helped win almost \$50 billion in overseas sales, including \$25 billion in direct American exports. That translates to 300,000 jobs.

These cuts come at a time when our industries face a global challenge as great as at any time in our history. They come at a time when we are finally beginning to win key battles in the war for global competitiveness. And they come at a time when every industrialized nation in the world is working to develop new technologies that would give them a competitive edge. It is important to our Nation's economic future that we continue programs like ATP to encourage and develop new technology and like ITA to support U.S. exports.

Mr. Chairman, this bill also reduces funding for many of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's [NOAA] programs. NOAA's work contributes to a more productive and competitive nation. NOAA's mission is to protect life, property, marine and fisheries resources, and our Nation's coasts and oceans. It accomplishes its mission through research and monitoring of the condition of the atmosphere, oceans, and Great Lakes. NOAA predicts the weather, climate, and fisheries' productivity. In addition to the obvious importance of NOAA to the health of industries tied to coastal and marine life conditions, the work at NOAA is important to agrusiness, industries that have an impact on air quality, and the transportation and communications industries.

In particular, NOAA's Environmental Research Laboratories [ERL] have documented damage to the ozone layer, determined its cause, and worked with industry to find alternatives to the compounds that caused the damage. ERL labs developed doppler radar and designed more accurate hurricane tracking systems to increase warning time to the public, which saves lives and give property owners more time to protect their property. This is valuable research that the private sector won't necessarily do.

This is why I am disappointed in this bill's cuts funding for the Climate and Global Change Program which conducts research to develop long-term climate observation and prediction techniques, particularly for North America. This program also examines the role of ocean conditions on long-term climate changes and provides information to base important policy choices about the necessity or results of environmental and industry regulation.

Mr. Chairman, the women and men at NOAA and NIST work hard and strive for excellence and deserve our full support. Their efforts have helped keep our Nation at the forefront in important areas of research and technology development.

Finally, I can't conclude without mentioning my great concern about the burdensome restrictions placed on the Legal Services Corporation. What these restrictions do is make it difficult for LSC lawyers to fully represent their low-income clients. These restrictions include a prohibition on participating in any administrative rulemaking; on filing suits against any government, no matter how outrageously the government acts toward a client; on representing prisoners, no matter what their legal problems; and a requirement that all LSC services be bid out immediately, which will ultimately cause problems for the poor clients of LSC as legal services are shifted from low bidder to low bidder. These are just a few of the restrictions placed on LSC's ability to represent low-income people and the restrictions should be removed. And, to make matters worse, these restrictions will apply to services paid for with private contributions, if a legal services program takes any Federal funds.

While I believe the chairman should be commended for his diligent efforts in such a difficult budgetary environment, I must say that I have reservations about several parts of this bill.

□ 1845

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman to yield for a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the U.S. Supreme Court recently upheld a lower court decision declaring the 11th Congressional District of Georgia unconstitutional.

This ruling found that Georgia's 11th District violated the Equal Protection Clause because race was the primary factor in its creation.

Mr. Chairman, the district plan that was approved by the Department of Justice, and most recently found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court, was in fact the third redistricting plan submitted to the Department of Justice for approval.

The first of three plans was created during a special session of the Georgia General Assembly in 1991, costing taxpayers over \$1 million. This plan was rejected by the Department of Justice. The second redistricting plan was drawn during a regular session of Georgia's General Assembly in 1992. It was also rejected by the Department of Justice. The third district was created in 1992, according to the specific direction and guidelines offered by the Department, and was consequently approved by Justice officials.

And now, Mr. Chairman, we must once again return to the drawing board, in yet another costly special session of the Georgia General assem-

bly and come up with a fourth redistricting plan that will both meet the approval of the Department of Justice and meet the constitutionality test. This special session, currently scheduled for August 14 of this year, will cost the State of Georgia thousands per day. Depending on how long the session lasts, costs will again approach the million dollar mark for Georgians.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that would require the Department of Justice to reimburse a State for the costs associated with holding a special session of the State legislature in order to redraw district lines that have been previously approved by the Department of Justice, but found unconstitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that my amendment requiring the Department of Justice to provide \$2 million from its general administration account for the purpose of reimbursing States for the costs of special legislative sessions is not in order at this point.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the opportunity to work with you, and our counterparts in the other body, so that we can address this issue in the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I insert for the RECORD the text of my amendment.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2076, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF GEORGIA

Page 28, after line 19, insert the following:
REIMBURSEMENT FOR SPECIAL SESSIONS OF
STATE LEGISLATURES

For reimbursement by the Attorney General of States for costs associated with special sessions of State legislatures where the State is required to redraw congressional districts that have been previously approved by the Department of Justice but subsequently found unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court, \$2,000,000.

Page 2, line 7, strike "\$74,282,000" and insert "\$72,282,000".

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has raised an important issue regarding actions taken by the Justice Department. I agree that this is an issue that warrants further discussion. I will be glad to work with the gentleman to develop the best approach to address that problem.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman I rise today in opposition to this bill, H.R. 2076. The American people have cried out for a real war on crime. Recently, in 1994, we listened to their concerns and we passed a 1994 Crime Act, which promised 100,000 additional officers and funding for real law enforcement. Already over 20,000 additional police officers have been put

on our streets as a result of the 1994 crime bill.

Yet, today, H.R. 2076 does not guarantee one additional police officer to help our communities combat crime. Instead, this bill appropriates funding for a program that is not even authorized. The bill does eliminate the COPS program. I consider that a real mistake. COPS, Community Oriented Policing Services, works. It provides local communities with funds for law enforcement.

Instead, this bill would waste \$2 billion of taxpayer money with no specific goals. Proponents try to tell you it is a block grant approach. In my opinion, it is a block headed approach.

Police departments will have to compete with every other agency that has any far-reaching relationship to public safety. Street lighting would be considered for funds. Street lights are nice, walkie-talkies are nice, roads leading to prisons are nice. But the COPS program establishes a clear priority, neighborhood police.

County programs provide neighborhood police for apartment complexes in high crime neighborhoods, small towns would get additional police, where one or two police officers makes all the difference in the world.

The program is working. My Congressional district alone has received 76 additional police officers to help fight crime in my district. Why should we defund a program that works? The COPS program provides neighborhood police to local communities. It sets a clear priority.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need to talk about roads and lights and walkie-talkies and orange jackets. We need to talk about neighborhoods police. Congress should keep its promise to the American people. The 1994 Crime Act is a superior bill. Community policing works. Let us let local communities have local law enforcement personnel.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I wish to engage the distinguished chairman of the House Commerce, Justice Appropriations Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the proposed language contained in the committee report on H.R. 2076 regarding the hiring and placement of INS investigation, detention, and border patrol agents.

While I strongly support the subcommittee's goal to increase the number of INS personnel along the southern border of the United States, I am concerned that the language of the Committee Report may result in the further weakening of an already inadequate INS and border patrol presence in the Nation's interior agricultural areas.

In my own Fourth Congressional District of Washington, the illegal immigration problem has forced the INS office in Yakima to shut down its telephone service. A local newspaper recently reported that during a raid in the Yakima Valley this spring, the border patrol found that 23 out of 25 migrant workers were illegal immigrants, and 12 of them were using someone else's social security number.

In addition, Franklin county jail estimates that in 1994, an average of 50 percent of its inmate population consisted of illegal aliens, many of whom remained in the county jail at taxpayer expense simply because there were not enough border patrol agents to transfer them for deportation.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation must not only protect its borders from the influx of illegal immigration, but it must also seek to control document fraud and remove those illegal aliens already here. To do that, we need to maintain a strong INS presence in the interior as well as along the southern border.

I would ask the chairman of the subcommittee if interior congressional districts may be assured that Members and INS regional directors will be consulted before final INS hiring and relocating decisions are made?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the committee's recommendation for the transfer of border patrol agents from interior locations assumes that these personnel will be backfilled with INS investigators to ensure that document fraud and the removal of illegal aliens that are already here continues to be addressed.

I can assure you that Members will be consulted before allocation of any new positions or the relocation of any current INS personnel occurs. I will also work with the Commissioner of INS to ensure that the INS regional directors are involved in this process, and that criteria such as detained illegal aliens are used in these decisions.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking Member for yielding time. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking Member for their hard work under difficult conditions, but I must oppose H.R. 2076. There are so many things wrong with this bill that I believe the President is right to say that this bill is dead on arrival if it gets to his desk in this form.

Mr. Chairman, why do the Republicans eliminate the Advanced Technology Program established by President Bush? ATP provides assistance to U.S. businesses to promote commercial

use of cutting edge technology. ATP is designed to increase U.S. competitiveness. Every major industrialized country has private sector government cooperative programs designed to increase their country's competitiveness in this world economy. Incredibly, this bill terminates our own program. That is like unilateral disarmament in the midst of a war.

Mr. Chairman, this bill eliminates funding for the Office of Advocacy in the SBA, which represents the interests of small businesses within the Federal Government. Just this year, just months ago, 415 Members of Congress voted to strengthen the Office of Advocacy's role as a small business ombudsman in the regulatory process. Now, just a few months later, the promise becomes a joke if this bill is passed.

Mr. Chairman, at least the Legal Services Corporation is not eliminated; it is merely cut by 30 percent. But this bill would prohibit for the first time ever the Corporation from spending private funds it raises on activities for which it currently cannot spend funds.

I know how unpopular legal services is to some. It is quite all right to ignore the unconscionable waste that goes on in military contracting, and it is okay for billionaires to renounce their homeland to avoid paying taxes. But Republicans are more than willing to attack a program that dares to help the poor obtain justice in this country.

Women from all walks of life are victims of the violence done to them in this appropriations bill. The Violence Against Women Act was approved by the House last Congress by a vote of 421 to zero. Now, how can all those Republicans, Members who voted yes last year, justify what they are doing less than a year later? Appropriators with mock sincerity say they are actually spending more to combat violence against women than last year. Well, how nice. But this bill appropriates less than one-third of the funding authorized for battered women shelters, rape prevention, child abuse prosecution, and other domestic violence programs.

Finally, this bill defunds the very successful community cops policing program established by last year's crime bill. It instead redirects these funds to a block grant program that is not even law. This again underscores the hypocrisy of the policies being pushed in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, community policing works. Communities big and small want community cops. They like what they have seen with community policing. What the Republicans are doing is simply partisan politics.

Mr. Chairman, I urge fellow Members to vote against this bill so that the appropriators can do the right thing. We can do that now, or we can do that in October or November when we most certainly will have to after the veto.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the very distinguished and hard working chairman of the Committee on Science.

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

I want to begin by congratulating the gentleman for the work he has done here. He has worked very closely with the Committee on Science on this commerce appropriations bill. I want to publicly thank the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for his full and complete consultation, and hold him up as an example of someone who is responsible for making the process work, and also make it work right.

Although it is a tough and thankless mission, HAL ROGERS has made the cuts to start balancing the budget, and he has made them, in my view, in a very wise way.

The NOAA appropriations largely track H.R. 1815, the fiscal year 1996 NOAA authorization bill passed by the Committee on Science last month. The appropriation bill includes \$1.69 billion of budget authority for the NOAA operations research and facilities account, which funds almost all of NOAA's programs. That is exactly the level that was authorized.

With a few exceptions, including funding for modernizing the NOAA fleet, the Sea Grant Program, and the lack of funding for the Coastal Oceans Program, the bill is consistent with the authorization to the amounts that were put into H.R. 1815.

Specifically, H.R. 1815 and H.R. 2076 both include \$472 million for the operations of the National Weather Service, \$132 million for the National Weather Service systems acquisition, \$435 million for NOAA's satellite programs, \$36 million for the satellite data management, and \$128 million for program support.

While the bill includes some increases over H.R. 1815 in both the oceanic and atmospheric research in the national ocean service accounts, the overall appropriation for NOAA is the same, and ensures that NOAA's priority core missions receive continued funding, while NOAA's overall budget is decreased from its 1995 level.

Today, for the first time, we have before us an appropriation for NOAA which is largely consistent with the NOAA authorization. Perhaps, most importantly in this particular bill, the Commerce appropriations bill terminates a targeted \$500 million program, H.R. 2076 zeros out all of the advanced technology program, which is an ill-advised industrial policy program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts made the point a moment ago that it was something done during the Bush administration. That is right. We are willing to take on programs, even some of those created by Republicans. This

House is doing so much more for commercial product and technology development through things like tax cuts, regulation reform, and product liability reform, than any amount of government subsidy of a program like ATP could ever do.

At the same time, the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, funds the core research program at the National Institute of Standards and Technologies as a priority, and I think that also is the kind of thing that helps us increase our competitiveness.

Once again, I would like to thank and compliment the gentleman from Kentucky, Chairman ROGERS, for his good work, and urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2076.

□ 1900

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATOURETTE].

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill and also in favor of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

The Great Lakes Fishery Commission, which was established under the 1955 U.S. Canadian Convention on Great Lakes Fisheries, plays a critical role in protecting the health of the Great Lakes' \$4 billion fishery industry.

The commission consists of eight commissioners, four appointed by the President and four by the Prime Minister of Canada. It is funded through a 69-percent to 31-percent cost share agreement between the United States and Canada respectively. The benefits of this commission are enjoyed by the United States, Canada, and the tribes.

Because the commission coordinates effective fishery management strategies throughout the region and coordinates binational natural resources in the Great Lakes region, it is imperative that the Great Lakes Fishery Commission continue to be funded through the State Department. We have spent many years cultivating a good relationship between nations and tribes.

Although the Great Lakes have definite boundaries on paper, taken as a whole, this is one massive region used and shared by many. Hence, if there is a problem in the Great Lakes in Canada, it becomes the problem of the Great Lakes in the United States.

It was just such a crossing-all-borders problem that actually spurred the formation of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission.

The "problem" of which I speak, Mr. Chairman, has been described as slimy, ruthless, unsightly, heinous, scum-sucking and parasitic, words which ironically have all been used at least a time or two to describe certain Members of Congress. But I assure you Mr. Speaker, these words in this instance are reserved for an eel-like species that is wreaking havoc on the Great Lakes—the sea lamprey.

For those who are not familiar with the sea lamprey, let me assure you this is not something you'd want in your backyard. In the Great Lakes we have seen an invasion of this eel-like, nonindigenous species. And, in addi-

tion to being just a hideous looking thing, the sea lamprey is parasitic and can destroy 10 to 40 pounds of fish during its parasitic period.

This slimy eel-like thing just clamps onto its prey and devours it. If you've ever had the misfortune of seeing footage of the lamprey in action, suffice it to say you should just be thankful it doesn't do to people what it does to fish.

It's the kind of creature you'd expect Steven Spielberg to invent to scare the bejeepers out of us in theaters. It is so vicious, so deadly and leaves behind so horrid carnage that if you made a movie about it, it'd make "Jaws" look like "Free Willy" and "Jurassic Park" look like "Barney." But unfortunately, the sea lamprey is no Hollywood special effects creation, it's real. And it also is a very real threat to the health and future of the Great Lakes.

Before the creation of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, the sea lamprey virtually destroyed the entire region's prosperous recreational and commercial fisheries. It practically wiped it out. However, through the use of lampricide to control larval lamprey in streams, the commission has been able to reduce the lamprey population to 10 percent of historical abundance.

Furthermore, the commission also is examining several nonchemical methods for controlling the sea lamprey, such as sterilization of the male lamprey. Lamprey research, like our fishery management plan, is something best handled jointly between the United States, Canada and tribes.

We cannot backslide on these efforts, as the future health and growth of the Great Lakes' fisheries is dependent upon our efforts to control, and hopefully one day, eradicate forces like the sea lamprey and zebra mussel.

For this reason, and the many other strategies employed by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, I urge that the funding be maintained through the State Department.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. EWING). The gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the chairman and to the ranking member that you two gentlemen are one reason why America is starting to get control of our borders, because a couple of years ago you started increasing the Border Patrol. And you did it in a difficult time. You did it at times over the objection of the administration. And because of that, you have started this trend of taking border patrol men, who are presently stationed in the interior, moving them to the border, forward deploying them, which is one thing the studies done by Los Alamos Laboratory said we should do, one thing the studies by GAO said we should do.

Additionally, this year you are adding some 700 new border patrol agents, those are used in the smugglers corridor between San Diego and Tijuana, the most prolific smugglers corridor in

America, who greatly appreciate your attention to the border.

We have 12 smugglers corridors across the Southwest, from San Diego to Tijuana, all the way to Brownsville, Texas, to Matamoros, Mexico.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], for this attention to the border, and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. Because of you we are finally starting to get control of the border, and those of us in California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona will work with you very closely to see to it that we finish this job.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered under the 5-minute rule by titles, and each title shall be considered as having been read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition to a Member who has caused an amendment to be printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Clerk will designate title I.

The text of title I is as follows:

H. R. 2076

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$74,282,000; including not to exceed \$3,317,000 for the Facilities Program 2000, and including \$5,000,000 for management and oversight of Immigration and Naturalization Service activities, both sums to remain available until expended.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, \$26,896,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City or any domestic or international terrorist incident, (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities, and (3) the costs of conducting a terrorism threat assessment of Federal agencies and their facilities: *Provided*, That funds provided under this section shall be available only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration related activities, \$39,736,000.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS,
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For activities authorized by sections 130005 and 130007 of Public Law 103-322, \$47,780,000, to remain available until expended, which shall 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 provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$30,484,000; 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.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized by law, \$3,446,000.

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 activities authorized by title X of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 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; \$401,929,000; 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 \$22,618,000 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 notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1342, the Attorney General may accept on behalf of the United States and credit to this appropriation, gifts of money, personal property and services, for the purpose of hosting the International Criminal Police Organization's (INTERPOL) American Regional Conference in the United States during fiscal year 1996.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed \$4,028,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund, as authorized by section 6601 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, 1989, as amended by Public Law 101-512 (104 Stat. 1289).

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS,
GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For the expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, as authorized by section 130005 of Public Law 103-322, \$7,391,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws,

\$69,143,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$48,262,000 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 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from the General Fund estimated at not more than \$20,881,000: *Provided further*, That any fees received in excess of \$48,262,000 in fiscal year 1996, shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES
ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Attorneys, including intergovernmental agreements, \$896,825,000, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available until September 30, 1997 for the purposes of (1) providing training of personnel of the Department of Justice in debt collection, (2) providing services to the Department of Justice related to locating debtors and their property, such as title searches, debtor skiptracing, asset searches, credit reports and other investigations, (3) paying the costs of the Department of Justice for the sale of property not covered by the sale proceeds, such as auctioneers' fees and expenses, maintenance and protection of property and businesses, advertising and title search and surveying costs, and (4) paying the costs of processing and 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 and \$4,000,000 for security equipment shall remain available until expended.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED
STATES ATTORNEYS

For activities authorized by sections 190001(d), 40114 and 130005 of Public Law 103-322, \$14,731,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which \$5,000,000 shall be available to help meet increased demands for litigation and related activities, \$500,000 to implement a program to appoint additional Federal Victim's Counselors, and \$9,231,000 for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For the necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, \$101,596,000, as authorized by 28 U.S.C. 589a(a), to remain available until expended, for activities authorized by section 115 of the Bankruptcy Judges, United States Trustees, and Family Farmer Bankruptcy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-554), which shall be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That deposits to the Fund are available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$44,191,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected pursuant to section 589a(f) of title 28, United States Code, as amended, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the \$101,596,000 herein ap-

propriated from the United States Trustee System Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 1996, so as to result in a final fiscal year 1996 appropriation from such Fund estimated at not more than \$57,405,000: *Provided further*, That any of the aforementioned fees collected in excess of \$44,191,000 in fiscal year 1996 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 1996.

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, \$630,000.

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 aircraft, and the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; \$418,973,000, 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.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, UNITED
STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

For activities authorized by section 190001(b) of Public Law 103-322, \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of 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; \$250,331,000, 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, \$85,000,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed \$4,750,000 may be made available for planning, construction, renovation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto for protected witness safesites; 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; and of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation and maintenance of a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(A)(i), (B), (C), (F), and (G), as amended, \$35,000,000 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, \$2,655,000.

PAYMENT TO RADIATION EXPOSURE
COMPENSATION TRUST FUND

For payments to the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund, \$16,264,000, to become available on October 1, 1996.

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, \$374,943,000, 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 expenses necessary for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 1,815 passenger motor vehicles of which 1,300 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; \$2,251,481,000, of which not to exceed \$50,000,000 for automated data processing and telecommunications and technical investigative equipment and \$1,000,000 for undercover operations shall remain available until September 30, 1997; of which not to exceed \$14,000,000 for research and development related to investigative activities shall remain available until expended; of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making payments or 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 relocation of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division and 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 \$50,000,000 for expenses related to digital telephony shall be available for obligation only upon enactment of authorization legislation.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by Public Law 103-322, \$80,600,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which \$35,000,000 shall be for activities authorized by section 190001(c); \$27,800,000 for activities authorized by section 190001(b); \$4,000,000 for Training and Investigative As-

sistance authorized by section 210501(c)(2); \$8,300,000 for training facility improvements at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy at Quantico, Virginia authorized by section 210501(c)(3); and \$5,500,000 for establishing DNA quality assurance and proficiency testing standards, establishing an index to facilitate law enforcement exchange of DNA identification information, and related activities authorized by section 210306.

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; \$59,400,000, to remain available until expended.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including 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; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote the goals of such programs; purchase of not to exceed 1,208 passenger motor vehicles, of which 1,178 will be for replacement only, for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and acquisition, lease, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$781,488,000, of which not to exceed \$1,800,000 for research and \$15,000,000 for transfer to the Drug Diversion Control Fee Account for operating expenses shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$4,000,000 for purchase of evidence and payments for information, not to exceed \$4,000,000 for contracting for ADP and telecommunications equipment, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 for technical and laboratory equipment shall remain available until September 30, 1997, and of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For Drug Enforcement Administration agents authorized by section 180104 of Public Law 103-322, \$12,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including not to exceed \$50,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, and to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of the Attorney General; purchase for police-type use (not to exceed 813 of which 177 are 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 research related to immigration enforcement; \$1,421,481,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 for research shall remain available until expended, and of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be available for costs associated with the training program for basic offi-

cer training: *Provided*, That none of the funds available to the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be available for administrative expenses to pay any employee overtime pay in an amount in excess of \$25,000 during the calendar year beginning January 1, 1996: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may transfer to the Department of Labor and the Social Security Administration not to exceed \$30,000,000 for programs to verify the immigration status of persons seeking employment in the United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to operate the Border Patrol traffic checkpoints located in San Clemente, California, at Interstate highway 5 and in Temecula, California, at Interstate highway 15.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For activities authorized by sections 130005, 130006, 130007, and 190001(b) of Public Law 103-322, \$303,542,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, of which \$44,089,000 shall be for expeditious deportation of denied asylum applicants, \$218,800,000 for improving border controls, \$33,133,000 for expanded special deportation proceedings, and \$5,500,000 for border patrol equipment.

CONSTRUCTION

For planning, construction, renovation, equipping and maintenance of buildings and facilities necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, not otherwise provided for, \$11,000,000, to remain available until expended.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 853, of which 559 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles; and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments; \$2,574,578,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Prison System (FPS), where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the FPS, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the FPS: *Provided further*, That uniforms may be purchased without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000,000 for the activation of new facilities shall remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided further*, That of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed \$20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements and

other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980 for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS

For substance abuse treatment in Federal prisons as authorized by section 32001(e) of Public Law 103-322, \$13,500,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; leasing the Oklahoma City Airport Trust Facility; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; \$23,728,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$14,074,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 10 percent of the funds appropriated to "Buildings and Facilities" in this Act or any other Act may be transferred to "Salaries and Expenses," Federal Prison System upon notification by the Attorney General to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in compliance with provisions set forth in section 695 of this Act: *Provided further*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed \$2,351,000 shall be available for the renovation and construction of United States Marshals Service prisoner holding facilities.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase of (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed \$3,559,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by

title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Missing Children's Assistance Act, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, and with the Victims of Crime Act of 1994, as amended, \$97,977,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524).

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the "Justice Assistance" account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103-322 ("the 1994 Act"); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended ("the 1968 Act"); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended ("the 1990 Act"), \$102,400,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which \$6,000,000 shall be for the Court Appointed Special Advocate Program, as authorized by section 218 of the 1990 Act; \$750,000 for Child Abuse Training Programs for Judicial Personnel and Practitioners, as authorized by section 224 of the 1990 Act; \$2,750,000 for Grants to Combat Violence Against Women, as authorized by section 1001(a)(18) of the 1968 Act; \$28,000,000 for Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies, as authorized by section 1001(a)(19) of the 1968 Act; \$7,000,000 for Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Enforcement Assistance Grants, as authorized by section 40295 of the 1994 Act; \$27,000,000 for grants for Residential Substance Abuse Treatment For State Prisoners, as authorized by section 1001(a)(17) of the 1968 Act; and \$900,000 for the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, as authorized by section 240001(d) of the 1994 Act: *Provided further*, That any balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, for State and Local Narcotics Control and Justice Assistance Improvements, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act, \$50,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 1001 of title I of said Act, as amended by Public Law 102-534 (106 Stat. 3524), which shall be available only to carry out the provisions of chapter A of subpart 2 of part E of title I of said Act, for discretionary grants under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs: *Provided further*, That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION PROGRAMS, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For assistance (including amounts for administrative costs for management and administration, which amounts shall be transferred to and merged with the "Justice Assistance" account) authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Public Law 103-322 ("the 1994 Act"); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended ("the 1968 Act"); and the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as

amended ("the 1990 Act"), \$3,333,343,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund; of which \$2,000,000,000 shall be for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, pursuant to H.R. 728 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 14, 1995; \$25,000,000 for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized by section 106(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993, as amended, and section 4(b) of the National Child Protection Act of 1993; \$475,000,000 as authorized by section 1001 of title I of the 1968 Act, which shall be available to carry out the provisions of subpart 1, part E of title I of the 1968 Act, notwithstanding section 511 of said Act, for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs; \$300,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 501 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, as amended; \$19,643,000 for Youthful Offender Incarceration Grants, as authorized by section 1001(a)(16) of the 1968 Act; \$500,000,000 for Truth in Sentencing Grants pursuant to section 101 of H.R. 667 as passed by the House of Representatives on February 10, 1995 of which not to exceed \$200,000,000 is available for payments to States for incarceration of criminal aliens pursuant to section 508 as proposed by such section 101; \$1,000,000 for grants to States and units of local government for projects to improve DNA analysis, as authorized by section 1001(a)(22) of the 1968 Act; \$10,000,000 for Improved Training and Technical Automation Grants, as authorized by section 210501(c)(11) of the 1994 Act; \$200,000 for grants to assist in establishing and operating programs for the prevention, diagnosis, treatment and follow-up care of tuberculosis among inmates of correctional institutions, as authorized by section 3220(c)(3) of the 1994 Act; \$1,500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 22002(h) of the 1994 Act; \$1,000,000 for Gang Investigation Coordination and Information Collection, as authorized by section 150006 of the 1994 Act: *Provided*, That funds made available in fiscal year 1996 under subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, may be obligated for programs to assist States in the litigation processing of death penalty Federal habeas corpus petitions: *Provided further*, That any 1995 balances for these programs shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation.

WEED AND SEED PROGRAM FUND

For necessary expenses, including salaries and related expenses of the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, to implement "Weed and Seed" program activities, \$23,500,000, of which \$13,500,000 shall be derived from discretionary grants provided under the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs and \$10,000,000 shall be derived from discretionary grants provided under part C of title II of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, to remain available until expended for intergovernmental agreements, including grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts, with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of violent crimes and drug offenses in "Weed and Seed" designated communities, and for either reimbursements or transfers to appropriation accounts of the Department of Justice and other Federal agencies which shall be specified by the Attorney General to execute the "Weed and Seed" program strategy: *Provided*, That

funds designated by Congress through language for other Department of Justice appropriation accounts for "Weed and Seed" program activities shall be managed and executed by the Attorney General through the Executive Office for Weed and Seed. *Provided further*, That the Attorney General may direct the use of other Department of Justice funds and personnel in support of "Weed and Seed" program activities only after the Attorney General notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with section 605 of this Act.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, as amended, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, \$144,000,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 299 of part I of title II and section 506 of title V of the Act, as amended by Public Law 102-586, of which: (1) \$100,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by parts A, B, and C of title II of the Act; (2) \$10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by sections 281 and 282 of part D of title II of the Act for prevention and treatment programs relating to juvenile gangs; (3) \$10,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by section 285 of part E of title II of the Act; (4) \$4,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by part G of title II of the Act for juvenile mentoring programs; and (5) \$20,000,000 shall be available for expenses authorized by title V of the Act for incentive grants for local delinquency prevention programs.

In addition, for grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990, as amended, \$4,500,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 214B, of the Act: *Provided*, That balances of amounts appropriated prior to fiscal year 1995 under the authorities of this account shall be transferred to and merged with this account.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

For payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796), as amended, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100-690 (102 Stat. 4339-4340), and, in addition, \$2,134,000, to remain available until expended, for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of said Act.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed \$45,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses in accordance with distributions, procedures, and regulations established by the Attorney General.

SEC. 102. Subject to section 102(b) of the Department of Justice and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993, as amended by section 112 of this Act, authorities contained in Public Law 96-132, "The Department of Justice Appropriation Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1980," shall remain in effect until the termination date of this Act or until the effective date of a Department of Justice Ap-

propriation Authorization Act, whichever is earlier.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 105. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 104 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$10,000,000 of the funds made available in the Act may be used to pay rewards and shall not be subject to spending limitations contained in sections 3059 and 3072 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided*, That any reward of \$100,000 or more, up to a maximum of \$2,000,000, may not be made without the personal approval of the President or the Attorney General and such approval may not be delegated.

SEC. 107. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act, including those derived from the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any appropriation made available in title I of this Act under the heading, "Office of Justice Programs, Justice Assistance": *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 108. For fiscal year 1996 and each fiscal year thereafter, amounts in the Federal Prison System's Commissary Fund, Federal Prisons, which are not currently needed for operations, shall be kept on deposit or invested in obligations of, or guaranteed by, the United States and all earnings on such investments shall be deposited in the Commissary Fund.

SEC. 109. Section 524(c)(9) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding subparagraph (E), as follows:

"(E) Subject to the notification procedures contained in section 605 of Public Law 103-121, and after satisfying the transfer requirement in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, any excess unobligated balance remaining in the Fund on September 30, 1995 shall be available to the Attorney General, without fiscal year limitation, for any Federal law enforcement, litigative/prosecutive, and correctional activities, or any other authorized purpose of the Department of Justice. Any amounts provided pursuant to this subparagraph may be used under authorities available to the organization receiving the funds."

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) no transfers may be made from Department of Justice accounts other than those

authorized in this Act, or in previous or subsequent appropriations Acts for the Department of Justice, or in part II of title 28 of the United States Code, or in section 10601 of title 42 of the United States Code; and

(2) no appropriation account within the Department of Justice shall have its allocation of funds controlled by other than an appropriation issued by the Office of Management and Budget or an allotment advice issued by the Department of Justice.

SEC. 111. (a) Section 1930(a)(6) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking "a plan is confirmed or";

(b) Section 589a(b)(5) of such title is amended by striking "and inserting, "until a reorganization plan is confirmed";"

(c) Section 589a(f) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking "and inserting, "until a reorganization plan is confirmed";", and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) 100 percent of the fees collected under section 1930(a)(6) of this title after a reorganization plan is confirmed."

SEC. 112. Public Law 102-395, section 102 is amended as follows: (1) in subsection (b)(1) strike "years 1993, 1994, and 1995" and insert "year 1996"; (2) in subsection (b)(1)(C) strike "years 1993, 1994, and 1995" and insert "year 1996"; and (3) in subsection (b)(5)(A) strike "years 1993, 1994, and 1995" and insert "year 1996".

SEC. 113. Public Law 101-515 (104 Stat. 2112; 28 U.S.C. 534 note) is amended by inserting "and criminal justice information" after "for the automation of fingerprint identification".

This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice Appropriations Act, 1996".

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Are there any amendments to title I?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MOLLOHAN

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

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOLLOHAN: On page 24, line 6 strike, "\$2,000,000,000", and all that follows through "1995" on line 9, and insert the following:

"1,767,000,000 shall be for Public Safety and Community Policing Grants authorized by section 10003 of the 1994 Act; and \$233,000,000 shall be for carrying out the crime prevention programs authorized under sections 30202, 30307, 30702, 31904, 31921, 32101, 41012, and 50001 of the 1994 Act."

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and that the time be equally divided.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

First, I would like to comment on the appreciation expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] and myself for our efforts with regard to INS and our funding last year and this year to enhance border enforcement and to work to try to secure our border. We certainly have worked in that regard.

Mr. HUNTER last year was very much in the forefront of that. I appreciate his kind of remarks, and we appreciate his efforts in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to title I of H.R. 2076, the fiscal year 1996 appropriate bill for the Department of Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, and related agencies.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, this amendment is not the amendment that I wanted to offer at this time. At the full committee, it became apparent, it became apparent in subcommittee, as we were marking it up, but we were not going to put any money on the COPS program, the program that is out there right now working for America, the program that has brought approximately 20,000 police officers to local communities virtually in every congressional district in this country, that is doing a good job, by all accounts, both administratively and substantially in fighting crime on the streets. It became apparent in subcommittee that we were not going to fund the COPS program. Although we had passed it in the crime bill last year. Although the Justice Department has implemented it by any account in a very efficient, effective way, although many communities are relying on it, have spent time, filed their grants, and expect for those grants to be funded for the next three years because they had been granted by the Federal Government, we are not funding it in this bill.

So today as it stands, tonight, throughout the country, as the law enforcement community looks at our efforts here, looks at this appropriation bill, looks at title I, the Justice funding, they do not see any funding next year for the COPS program.

Recognizing that we were not doing that in subcommittee, I thought about that. How do we posture this so that we take into consideration the interests of the majority now, we take into consideration the fact that earlier in the year they passed a crime bill which repealed in effect the COPS program and substituted a block grant program but also which takes into consideration that block grant program is not law; the COPS program is. How do we handle that?

So I came up with an amendment in the alternative, a funding in the alternative. I offered that in full committee. The amendment simply said that we will fund the block program as it is contained in the subcommittee's mark,

if the block program becomes law. Because if it becomes law, it in effect replaces the COPS program. But if the block program does not become law, then we will take that same amount of money and fund the COPS program and \$233 million out of the fund prevention programs so that police officers and the law enforcement community and the American people would not have to be in this state of insecurity about Federal funding for community policing.

That was a reasonable amendment. I almost thought it was bipartisan. I thought it might be accepted, but it was not. It was opposed on a partisan basis and defeated in the full committee.

I went to the Committee on Rules, made the same appeal. Let us fund block grants, if they become law, but let us not not fund the COPS Program in the event that the block program does not become law. Let us tell the police community out there, the American people, let us tell them that we are going to keep this program going in some form.

We were denied at the Committee on Rules. Therefore, we are left with the only alternative and that is to strike the funding for the block grant program in this bill and offer an amendment in substitute of that to fund the COPS Program and to fund \$233 million in prevention programs.

That is where we are tonight. I hope that we pass this amendment, because if we do not go the other way, funding in the alternative, then surely we should let the communities across this country know that this very effective COPS Program is going to be funded into the outyears, that our promise to police agencies, law enforcement across the country, our promise that we are going to fund this COPS Program for 3 years, that that promise is kept.

Let me take a moment to speak to the success of the COPS Program, which obviously is the substance, it is the reason it merits continuing funding.

The COPS Program was first funded last year in the Commerce, Justice Committee, was funded at \$1.3 billion. This funding passes through a variety of grant programs, and jurisdictions of all sizes participated in it.

There is the COPS Ahead Program that helps fund officers in larger jurisdictions. There is the COPS Fast Program, that directs funds towards smaller jurisdictions, and there is even a program Troops to Cops that provides funds to jurisdictions which hire former members of our armed services, which ought to be very attractive, particularly when we are downsizing the military.

Thus far, Mr. Chairman, we have 20,473 more officers funded under this program that have been authorized by

COPS that are out there on the beat. And Mr. Chairman, soon, I believe tomorrow, the Department of Justice will be announcing 3,434 more cops on the beat.

I want to assure my colleagues that we are right on schedule with this program. We will see 100,000 more police officers on the beat by the year 2000, if we just fund the program. But the numbers do not tell the whole story.

COPS is a popular program. It is popular with chiefs and sheriffs and mayors, as well as rank-and-file officers. COPS grant applications are short; they are simple. They are easy to fill out, one page in many instances. It is virtually an unparalleled administrative success program in the Federal Government.

Let us talk about the impact of the COPS Program on crime. During the first half of 1995, homicide rates in America's largest cities, including New York, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, have dropped. That is certainly welcome news. Is it all because of the COPS Program? I do not know. But it is certainly making its contribution. And if it were rising, those who are critics of the COPS Program would probably say, Look, it is falling the crime rate is going up. But the crime rate is not going up. It is going down. The COPS Program is contributing to that. That is a wonderful success, and it is welcome news.

In combination with community-based initiatives, this is a terrific program having a terrific impact.

A recent article in the Washington Times detailed the successes of community policing efforts in Fort Worth, TX. The article states that since community policing began in Fort Worth, burglaries have gone down by 51 percent, and they started their community policing 4 years ago, grand thefts by 38-percent down, auto thefts by 60-percent down, robberies by 31 percent and aggravated assaults by 56 percent. Mr. Chairman, community policing works.

If you vote against this amendment here tonight, there is no guarantee that the COPS program will continue. There is no guarantee that one new officer will make it to the streets of this Nation. If you vote for my amendment, you will ensure that the COPS program continues, that this proven work goes on.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about prevention programs, Mr. Chairman. As H.R. 2706 stands, our bill zeros out funds for a number of important prevention programs such as drug courts and assistance for delinquent and at-risk youth.

While some of these programs may be eligible for funding under the \$2 million local law enforcement block grant, my amendment reserves \$233 million specifically for these prevention programs, for these intervention programs. And they are working across

the nation. Intervention and community policing, it is a nice combination. Mr. Chairman.

By specifically reserving a pool of funds for these programs, I am preventing these programs from having to compete with COPS or other programs for funding.

Let me remind my colleagues that there is a large teenage population coming up into crime-prone age, late in this century and early in the next century. Our best defense is to focus right on them, and prevention programs do that, focusing on drug awareness, education programs, and at-risk youth.

□ 1915

Mr. Chairman, who knows what we will get for \$2 billion on the local law enforcement block grant programs. We will get some good, but in the meantime we will undermine a proven program, one out there that America is depending upon and one out there that is playing its part in reducing crime across this Nation. Let us support this amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us be straight about this. The bill includes almost \$2 billion for local law enforcement block grant applications. It replaces the President's COPS program. The President's COPS program is a top-down Washington based program. It requires local communities the first year to put up 25 percent of the cost, the second year 50 percent of the cost, the third year 75 percent of the cost, and the fourth year 100 percent.

Local communities say, if I had 25 percent to match, I would hire a cop today on my own. I would not need the Federal match. Our program, Mr. Chairman, only requires the local communities to put up 10 percent, and they can use the money not just for cops but for cop cars and cop radios and cop supplies and other needs of the local law enforcement community. Whatever they say they need. That is the beauty of this program.

The Mollohan amendment puts its money on the Washington-based crime fighting strategy of the President. We put our trust in local communities' abilities to decide on their own where and how they want to spend the money to fight crime. I want you to know, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues, that midnight basketball is back if the Mollohan amendment passes along with other Washington prescribed crime prevention programs.

I received a letter yesterday, Mr. Chairman, from the National League of Cities. It is signed by the current Democratic president, Carolyn Long Banks, and the incoming Republican president, Gregory Lashutka. It is a bipartisan response to the local law en-

forcement block grant program. Here is what it says. "We are writing on behalf of 135,000 municipal elected leaders from cities and towns across the Nation to express our strong support for provisions in the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill requesting \$2 billion to fund the House passed LNC supported local law enforcement block grant." They say, "We urge all Members to vote in support of your efforts to fund a strengthened Federal local anticrime partnership." They go on to say, "The types of crimes and violence and the appropriate responses to them vary from city to city. We know that no one-size-fits-all approach directed by Washington could work nearly as effectively and efficiently as providing local discretion and responsibility to local elected officials."

That is the quote, Mr. Chairman, from the president of the National League of Cities, Carolyn Long Banks, who happens to be a member of Mr. MOLLOHAN's party, but it is also signed by the Republican incoming president, and so this is bipartisan support for the local law enforcement assistance grants.

I would put my money and we are putting our money in this bill on local communities any time, day or night, over providing the President his prescription from Washington for how local communities should act to fight crime in their community. We put our faith in local communities, in local elected officials, in local law enforcement people. The Mollohan amendment puts its faith in the White House.

I strongly urge our Members to vote "no" on the Mollohan amendment and I hope that the Members will stay with us on the bill, because we provide almost \$2 billion for local law enforcement, not Washington-local law enforcement.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to preserve the funding for community policing grants and prevention programs as prescribed by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.

Last year the Congress passed a crime control bill that adopted a balanced approach of prevention to stop crime before it starts; prisons to punish criminals; and police to enforce the laws on our streets. This approach is working, and particularly with regard to police.

For example, the Justice Department has been extremely successful in awarding thousands of grants to small towns, medium-size towns, and to our Nation's cities. Nearly 17,000 new police

officers are or will be hired—over 150 in my home State of Connecticut alone. These new police officers are welcome relief in my hometown of Hartford, where new officers on the street will fight the gangs and drugs that have become so commonplace there.

Funding in this appropriations bill assumes enactment into law of H.R. 728, and funds \$2 billion for the Law Enforcement Grant program. But it does not continue the successful COPS program; in fact, it does not guarantee that one additional police officer will be placed on the street. We can try criminals, we can put them in prison, but without additional police we do not have the resources to arrest them and start the judicial process.

In addition, the bill provides no funding for any of the prevention programs like drug courts, that were enacted into law as part of last year's crime bill. Without funding for prevention programs we will not have the chance to keep our young people off the streets, and away from the temptations of crime.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for police and prevention programs. Let's continue the intelligent approach enacted to reduce crime across the Nation. Support a balanced approach to fighting crime in our counties, and support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the very able gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime and Criminal Justice of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I come tonight to rise in strong support of the provisions in this bill that have law enforcement block grants.

Funding this initiative represents a vital step in my judgment in this Congress to keep one of the pledges in the Contract With America that we made as we came to office on this side of the aisle this past November, and a pledge that we took a large step in keeping when we passed a bill earlier this year, in January, H.R. 728, where we rejected the Washington-knows-best concept that is embodied in the Mollohan amendment.

The reason I like what is in the underlying bill and do not like Mollohan is the same reason we debated out here back in January. We talked about the fact that at that time we had a situation where a bill that had been passed in the last Congress devoted a specific amount of money to Cops on the Streets Program, a very large sum, and another very large sum to a bunch of prevention programs that many of us thought was more social welfare. In order to be able to get any of this money, you had to comply with the specific restrictions in that legislation

which was passed last year in the last Congress.

What we found in the Cops on the Streets Program as it has been unearthed and developed out there is that some communities, particularly those that were going to hire cops, anyway, think those programs are terrific in a sense because the money that is given to them by the Federal Government subsidizes a program of hiring that they were already planning on doing anyhow. In a few cases you are getting a few new cops on the streets in places you would not otherwise have, but there are hundreds, and I would say thousands of local communities around this country who have rejected the idea of these new cops under this program already. Many of them have contacted many of the Members of this Congress and this House in particular to express those rejections and the reasons why. The reasons were clear to us then as they are clear to us now. That is, because especially in smaller communities, there is simply not the ability to fund the additional amount for the police officer.

As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] explained a minute ago, what happens in this COPS Program right now as it exists is that the police officers can be hired provided you put up a certain amount of funding at the beginning, and the Federal Government puts up about 75 percent, I guess, at the beginning. But that goes all the way down, in 3 years, all the way down to zero. After that you have the total responsibility of paying the entire cost of a police officer if you are going to keep them after that time, and most of that cost at the end of the first year.

The fact of the matter is that what the Federal Government pays, too, is not the full cost of the first time out, even the first year, because it does not take into full account the cost of equipping and training that new officer to go out on the street or perhaps the new police car he has got to have to have him.

What we also had with the prevention programs in the actual grants, not block grants but the regular grants they have out there now, is a limited amount of choices. You had certain programs specifically fixed, many of them designed to prefer in a sense some of the larger cities like New York City that would like to get specific money for a particular program. None of that, the American public thought, was a very good idea.

So what came out in the bill that passed this House, the crime bill earlier this year and what is embodied in this appropriations bill today was a complete change in that, a movement to a block grant program for the local communities to take all of this money that can be available, which is made available under this bill tonight, and instead of having somebody tell them

that they have to hire a police officer in order to get the money or that they have to meet a certain program standard of a particular program we have dreamed up here, the local communities, based upon the highest crime rates around the country, and based on their populations, will get the moneys in their communities for the county and city governments to decide how to spend that money to fight crime, with no other restriction except that it has to be used to fight crime and that it cannot be used to substitute for moneys that otherwise already would be there to hire the existing police or whatever.

In other words, the block grant money concept that we have, that we are going to be voting on in a couple of minutes tonight that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to do away with with his amendment would allow the cities and the counties of this country to decide how to spend the Federal money that is available in a way that they individually believe best fights crime in their communities. If they want to hire a new police officer or two, they are perfectly capable of doing that, spending every penny of their money on it. If they want to bid a new police car instead or another piece of equipment, they could use it for that instead. If they want to put the money into drug prevention programs or into midnight basketball, they could do that. That would be their choice at the local level rather than Washington telling them how to do it as exists in the present law and as exists in what the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to return to with this money.

We do not want, on our side of the aisle, to be dictating to the cities and the counties of this Nation how this money is to be spent. We want to let them decide, because we think local governments know best how to fight crime in their communities.

This block grant approach is supported by a lot of groups around the country. These groups include the National League of Cities, the National Association of Chiefs of Police, the Law Enforcement Alliance of America, the Memphis Police Association, the Southern States Police Benevolent Association, the American Federation of Police, the Police Superior Officers Association and numerous lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police.

It is also significant of note that the police chief of Washington, D.C. recently testified before Congress and voiced his strong support for the block grant approach giving him the flexibility of getting equipment and doing other things rather than having to have a cop or doing one of the prevention programs specifically dictated in the bill that passed last year or would exist under the approach of the gen-

tleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN]. Washington, D.C. lacks the resources and the ability to take advantage of the COPS program just like a lot of communities around this country lack that ability.

What the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] wants to do does not make sense. He is turning back the clock to the old Democrat version of how we ought to do it, with Washington knows best.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" against the Mollohan amendment, embrace the local community block grant program in the underlying bill. Let the cities and the counties of this Nation decide who knows best what is good for them because what is good in Eugene, Oregon for fighting crime is not necessarily good in Jacksonville, Florida.

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

I would like to reply to the distinguished gentleman from Florida for just 1 minute. He got into at the end of his remarks a little bit of hyperbole about the old way of doing business and all that.

Actually the COPS program is very modern, it is very new, it is good thinking. It is an efficient operation, creating efficient relationships between the Federal Government and localities and States across this Nation. It does it in a very direct way, focusing on a very real problem and getting a directly focused program, cops out there on the beat.

The gentleman from Florida mentioned organizations who were supporting the community block grant program. Perhaps they are supporting it in the abstract, as a possibility. There are a number of fraternal organizations who support the COPS program and support it strongly. Just to mention a few and not take up very much time, the Fraternal Order of Police support COPS. I say to the distinguished gentleman. The National Association of Police Organizations, the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, the International Union of Police Associations, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the National Troopers Coalition. The list goes on. I have only gone down through about half of it. There is considerable support out there for this very successful program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for the COPS community policing and prevention programs.

The amendment provides \$1.8 billion in community policing grants so that States and local governments can hire more police officers. It also restores

\$233 million for much-needed crime prevention programs. The Mollohan amendment would make sure that community policing and prevention programs are funded, instead of leaving these vital initiatives to chance under the local law enforcement block grants. Despite what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say, these block grants do not guarantee that even one new police officer would be on the beat or that children and families would benefit from needed crime prevention initiatives.

Streets are becoming safer because we are putting more police officers on the beat and are improving programs that give young people a positive alternative to the streets.

In 1990, my hometown of New Haven, CT, had the unfortunate distinction of having the highest crime rate of any city in Connecticut. Then police and community leaders came together and implemented a community policing program. Three years later, New Haven has a much prouder distinction—crime was reduced by 7 percent in the first year of the program and by 10 percent in the second year. In fact, New Haven's community policing program has become a model for the Nation.

We need to keep the pledge made in the 1994 crime bill to put 100,000 new police officers on the streets by the year 2000. In my district, 32 new police officers are already on the job in 10 municipalities. And the results are in. According to the F.B.I.'s Uniform Crime Reports for the first 3 months of 1995, aggravated assault is down by 40 percent, robbery is down by 21 percent, and murder is down by 5 percent.

I urge my colleagues to support our police and communities by keeping our commitment to the COPS and prevention programs in the 1994 crime bills. These programs are making our streets and our people safer.

Take a stand in support of our cities, our police, our families, and our youth: support the Mollohan amendment.

□ 1930

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR].

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding and I appreciate being recognized to speak about this very important provision.

Listening to the comments on the other side, I am reminded of an author, and I must admit I do not know whether it was Shakespeare or Tom Clancy that said, in response to somebody protesting about something else, "Methinks y'all doth protest too much." Translated to those of us out in the real world, that means, "What are y'all scared of?"

Mr. Chairman, we have a program here that takes taxpayer dollars and goes to our communities, our county commissioners, your city councilmen,

your police, your cops, your sheriffs and says: Would you rather have these moneys coming for your community going back to your community? Would you rather have them controlled by Washington, as benevolent as Washington may be, or would you rather have control of those moneys in your community to use for purposes that you know are best in your communities?

Yes, the COPS program may be a good program, but why be wedded to a program that can be improved? This program can be improved.

If the gentlewoman from Connecticut needs police officers in her community, needs a cop on the beat in the neighborhoods, this proposal in this bill says, Go for it. Go to it, if that is what you need.

It gives ultimate flexibility to our law enforcement officers, our county commissioners, our city council people. That is it where the power should be, because that is where the power is coming from. We are returning it to the people. We are returning it to the people and to our officers, and what they need is what we ought to give them.

Mr. Chairman, they do not need red tape. They do not need forms. They need the funds to do what they believe in their community needs to be done to protect our citizens. This bill does it: this amendment takes it away.

I ask this amendment be defeated and the bill supported.

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

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the gentleman's closing remarks that this amendment takes it away, this amendment indeed takes nothing away; this amendment preserves the COPS program. It keeps the funding going as the Government promised it would keep it going into the outyears.

Actually, the bill language takes it away, changes the program in mid-stream and creates a lot of instability out there. This amendment restores that and keeps the COPS program going.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] for his leadership on this bill, and I feel more deeply about it, as somebody who authored the COPS Program.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia asked the question a minute ago; he said, "What are you afraid of?" Let me tell you what we are afraid of. We are afraid of local and State politicians taking this money and wasting it, not putting it for cops on the beat, but for doing whatever they darn choose.

We are afraid of them doing what they did in the 1970s, spending money

on a tank or, like the Governor of Indiana, spending it on an airplane that he used to fly around saying he was protecting law enforcement. Or in other ways we are afraid of the LEA program, spending billions of dollars and wasting as they did in the 1970s.

There is a simple choice here, my colleagues. Who do you want to get the money? The police, as in the Mollohan amendment, or the politicians, as in the Republican bill?

We have this myth here, the Federal politicians will waste the money, but the State and local politicians will use it wisely. Well, I have seen more State and local politicians waste money. If my colleagues would just look at each of their local newspapers, there will be a story day by day. Ask this question: Why are all the major rank-and-file police organizations supporting the Mollohan bill: FOP and the NAPO, the hard-working policemen and women who walk those beats and whose lives are in danger? Because they know that our amendment says: Put the money for cops on the beat, not for whatever some little local politician decides he or she wants. It is that simple.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues were to ask my constituents, hard-working people in the outer boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens, what they want more than anything else from their government, it is the cop walking the beat.

Our bill provides them that. The Republican bill, the proposal, does not. It allows the local mayor, county commissioner, or whoever else, to spend the money on any kind of frivolous scheme they want.

Vote for the police. Vote for safety. Vote for the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as a former assistant district attorney of Pennsylvania and a Town Watch organizer, I can tell you that the existing 1995 crime bill earmarks \$10.2 billion for crime prevention programs and police programs.

Whether it is police officers or a drug corps, a Town Watch, police vehicles or police training, this existing bill does everything we need, including having more police officers, and the 1994 existing grants for police officers are fully protected.

In my view, the Federal Government, which is \$4 trillion in debt, does not handle its funds well, but local government knows what it wants. Leave the discretion, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] says, to local law enforcement initiatives by our local communities, and we will take care of the law enforcement with the police officers and the public safety initiatives.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the majority party's response at this

point to the COPS program? It is a cop-out. A block grant. A block grant that assures no more cops on the beat: not a single additional cop guaranteed.

The issue is not about flexibility. This bill provides a lot of flexibility. I say this to the gentleman from Florida, it is about priorities. There is a national priority in terms of more police in local communities. And the gentleman mentions about small and large. I do not understand why small communities in his district, and in others represented here, have not taken advantage of this program.

The local communities in the 12th District, small and large, have. Center Line has an application. It has a small population; less than 10,000. We have a letter, on the other hand, from Warren from the city police chief, 145,000. He says, "Save this program. It has added six police in the community and now we hope to obtain more."

The same is true of Berkeley and Huntington Woods, small communities in the 12th District. And the bill, the COPS bill, allows communities to combine together, under an amendment that I proposed, to have regional task forces to get at the needs within those communities.

Mr. Chairman, what does the majority proposal at this point suggest? Throw it to the winds. There is no accountability. I am proud to stand here and say there is a national priority and that is more police in our communities; flexibility for communities to use it as they want.

Mr. Chairman, I am not saying Washington knows best, but what I am saying is, listen to the local communities who have applied and who support this program. The formula of the majority party is going to hurt suburban communities like I represent. They have an ingredient in there that is going to hurt suburban communities like I represent.

The COPS Program is working; their program is a cop-out. I am glad for the Mollohan amendment. Let us go across partisan lines for once and support it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO].

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] has just called every sheriff, every police official, every mayor in this country, a little local politician, when he said that the Members of this body, that the Members of the U.S. Congress, know more about fighting crime than local sheriffs, and that is a lie.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me a letter from Donny Gasparini, a Democrat, who is the sheriff of Winnebago County, one of only 32 counties in the entire United States to be accredited by the Commission of Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. He is saying this: We need flexibility in this pro-

gram. Sure it is good to have money for cops on the beat, but each new officer accounts for an average of 15 arrests per month.

He sent a letter to President Clinton saying, Give the sheriffs of this country flexibility. Do not box us in, because we need money not only to hire cops if we need them, but for drug courts, day reporting centers, community-based drug rehab programs, work release options.

Mr. Chairman, this is a professional law enforcement officer. He is the head of the Illinois Sheriffs Association. He knows more than the U.S. Congress. He is the one saying give the local police enforcement agencies the flexibility to spend the money to develop the tools that they know best in order to fight crime. Take power away from Congress and give it back to the local communities. That is why the block grants is the best program.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following letter:

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF,
WINNEBAGO COUNTY,
Rockford, IL, June 15, 1995.

Hon. DONALD MANZULLO,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I am sending to President Clinton regarding the difficulties with appropriations for the Crime Bill.

Can you suggest any additional steps we in corrections should be taking to assist with the decision-making process?

This matter is of grave concern to our community. We have invested much time and money in trying to jump through the federal hoops for funding assistance, only to have the rules change in mid-jump.

Can you help?

Sincerely,

DONALD J. GASPARINI,
Sheriff.

OFFICE OF THE SHERIFF,
WINNEBAGO COUNTY,
Rockford, IL, June 15, 1995.

Hon. WILLIAM CLINTON,
President of the United States,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: This letter is to call your attention to certain aspects of the "Crime Bill" that I'm sure you recognize need to be addressed.

The situation in county corrections is at crisis proportion. Everyday we face overwhelming stress on our system. We have desperately needed alternatives to incarceration, and some very good programs have been developed (i.e. drug courts, day-reporting centers, community-based drug rehab programs, work-release options), but the problems are escalating with such speed that we can't afford to fund the alternatives.

We had great hopes of receiving federal assistance in the form of grants, but many of the alternatives-to-incarceration grant programs we were eligible to apply for, have had their funds pulled to support the Community Policing Grant program. We have submitted a Drug Court Grant application, which now awaits some sort of decision on appropriations, following the rescission bill veto.

I fully support the concept of more law enforcement on the streets as a deterrent to crime, but each new officer accounts for an

average of 15 arrests per month, adding to the dangerously high crowding in our jails, and the premature release of dangerous criminals back onto the streets to be arrested again. The criminal justice system is like a line of dominoes; adjustment of one affects the rest. There must be a more comprehensive approach.

Daily in Winnebago County, we face the problem of a jail packed like a tin of sardines, averaging 387 inmates in space built for 226. Many days, especially following a weekend of arrests, we number well over 450 in that same space.

Believing that the public would support the badly needed expansion of our facility, we presented a referendum to the community on the November 1993 ballot. This referendum covered all four affected areas within the criminal justice system—state's attorneys and public defenders, courts, probation, and incarceration—allowing us to begin clearing up the large number of inmates awaiting trial and to put teeth into sentencing by providing the necessary jail space. The referendum was defeated three-to-one, by a public who said they will not approve any additional property tax.

We are accountable to the communities we serve, and in our efforts to maintain an efficient and precisely run Agency, we have recently successfully completed the onerous and rigorous process of Accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA). We are proudly one of only 32 accredited Sheriff's Departments in the nation. What this really means is that in spite of the budget restrictions, increasing crime, and reduced personnel levels, we have maintained above average solve rates, achieved the highest honors our industry can bestow, and reinforced public confidence in the job we do best.

The reason for this lengthy explanation of our situation is to add our voice to the many communities across Illinois and the nation who are in the same frustrating position. Our hope is that this information will strengthen your argument for more emphasis on funding for local rehabilitation and meaningful sanctions that will return credibility to law enforcement, whether it is in the form of federal grants, or block grants to states, that would allow for more local considerations.

Personally I would like to see Crime Bill funding returned intact for this fiscal year, and gradually phase in the minimally restrictive block grants that would complete the intent of the Crime Bill over a three-to-five year period.

Please let me know if there are any steps we can be taking at the local level that would expedite this possibility.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD J. GASPARINI,
Sheriff.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the base bill is a reduction in local law enforcement. The Mollohan amendment restores that reduction.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] had it right. If we want to help your city councilmen, and we want to help your county commissioners, and we want to help your mayors, go with the block grant. If we want this money to go into local law enforcement, matched by local dollars to

get the biggest bang for the buck, if Members are sick and tired of the threats to public safety, the depressant on people's psychology, the hindrance it poses to economic recovery in any major urban area, and they want to get more cops on the street, the Cops on the Beat Program is the best way to do it.

□ 1945

Every councilman has had a different idea of what is good for public safety. This is not money that goes to local law enforcement, it goes to local government. The Cops on the Beat Program is a local law enforcement program. It expands Cops on the Beat. This has a thousand different diversions without any local match with a reduced local effort.

This works against the President's goal, the administration's goal, of more Cops on the Beat. It works against the interests of Los Angeles. It works against the interests, I suggest, of almost every major urban area in the country.

I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment.

I rise in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore \$1.8 billion for the highly effective COPS program. At a time when violent crime and its consequences for our quality of life is of great concern to us all, it defies logic that we would decimate our most effective means of addressing this scourge.

The COPS Program works. It has already resulted in the assignment of 20,000 additional police officers in neighborhoods around the country in the first 12 months of the program.

By way of contrast, the block grant funding provided in the bill can be used for any purpose that would enhance public safety. I can envision some mighty creative uses to which such unrestricted funding can be put—uses that do not guarantee a single additional officer on our streets.

I am appalled by the rising rate of violent crime. Our parks have become off-limits, increasing numbers of the elderly are afraid to venture out of their homes, women find their freedom restricted, and children—and their parents—can no longer enjoy peace of mind about the safety of our schools.

I am convinced that the single most effective step we have taken to confront this problem is to put more cops on the beat in our communities through the COPS Program.

What is more, I can personally vouch for the flexibility and efficiency of that program. I have met with Director Brann and his staff, and have the greatest admiration for the lengths to which they have gone to accommodate local needs and circumstances, but at all times making certain that the acid test is met: will the funds sought by the locality result in putting more cops on the beat?

With the funding appropriated thus far, we have made a splendid start on our commitment to put 100,000 additional cops to work in our neighborhoods and streets. Let's not renege on that commitment.

The first obligation of government is to ensure the safety and security of its citizens. By

returning tax dollars to our communities not in the form of an ill-defined block grant but for the explicit purpose of hiring an additional 100,000 police officers, we are making a major stride toward ending the scourge of crime in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat something that I said at the beginning of this debate. The bill language that we have now provides nearly \$2 billion for a local law enforcement block grant program to replace the President's COPS Program. The COPS Program is Washington based—Washington telling the local community what they can or cannot do with their money.

The COPS Program requires local communities in the first year to provide 25 percent of the cost, 50 percent the second year, 75 percent the third year, and 100 percent in the fourth year. Local communities simply cannot afford that.

The funds under the COPS Program can only be used to employ police men and women. It cannot be used for police cars or radios or equipment or perhaps another program that the local community thinks is more important than adding another policeman or policewoman.

We say we are giving local communities, whether it be the police force or the county commissioners or the city council, the mayor or the county executive, we are giving them a local option. You might even call this a coption program; they can use the money for cops, if they want, and other options, their options, not ours.

If you vote for the Mollohan amendment, you are putting a Washington straitjacket on local communities, cops only, and you have got to pay for it all after 3 years.

If you vote for the program that is in the bill, your share is only 10 percent, local community, and we are going to let you decide how you want to use it. We are going to keep track of it; no longer will you be able to use this money in a wasteful or inefficient manner, and yet you have the local option to decide what program or programs work best for you.

I urge our Members to continue to oppose the Mollohan amendment. Give the local communities a break. Give them the option. Do not let Washington again impose its will on local communities.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the COPS program and the Mollohan amendment.

Earlier today I showed the faces of county policing in Sacramento County, CA. We showed the people and the sher-

iffs' deputies in North Highlands, one of the unincorporated areas in our community, who work together, filing 4,000 crime reports that probably otherwise would not have been filed. Those crime reports allow those sheriffs' deputies to concentrate their fire, their effort, their activity in areas where it can do the most good.

It is the epitome of what we are talking about when we say let us put the cops out there on the street, on the beat, in the communities, in the storefronts, where they can do the most good.

The sheriff of Sacramento County understood this. He came, applied and received, and community policing occurred. We are talking about a 1-page application. This is not the traditional Federal bureaucracy run amok. This is a streamlined process that puts an emphasis on giving the communities the opportunity to put very small sums into the investment of an application with big returns in the fight against crime.

Please, support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman, the subcommittee chairman, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentleman. I think we ought to be clear what is going on here because I think, frankly, what we are witnessing is a very cynical effort on the part of the administration and their allies in the Congress to save political face.

What I would like to do is sort of reconstruct the sequence of events, if you will. Earlier this year, this session of Congress, during the first 100 days, we passed the local government law enforcement block grant with strong bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. Shortly thereafter, the President threatened a veto of the bill. Then we flash forward a few more months. Then what do we have? Lo and behold, the President, through his reelection campaign, is making a \$2.7 million TV advertising buy to portray the President as a born-again crime fighter.

Tonight we have the Mollohan amendment out on the floor. The gentleman from West Virginia is simply saying, "Look, we ought to go forward with the COPS program because our alternative, what I feel is a vastly superior alternative, the local government, the law enforcement block grants, has not yet become law. Let us call a spade a spade, there are real problems with the Cops on the Beat program. Part of it is the cost. We debated that the other day in the Committee on Appropriations.

At \$60,000 to \$80,000 to hire a new police officer, the funding the gentleman

proposes would come up far short of the 100,000 new Cops on the Beat we heard about. Many of us have heard from local government jurisdictions in our congressional districts complaining about the local match requirements, and those local match requirements have prevented those financially strapped local governments from participating in the Cops on the Beat program.

Lastly, with our approach, what we have tried to do is frankly acknowledge that crime is first and foremost a local concern. We are trying to give local jurisdictions the flexibility to combat crime in local communities.

I have heard from jurisdictions in my congressional district that have said, "We do not want more money to hire additional police officers. What we prefer instead is the flexibility you can give us under the local government law enforcement block grant to expand our DARE program in local schools, to build on community-based crime prevention programs and the like."

So I strongly urge my colleagues to reject the gentleman's amendment. Stay with the bill. It is a vastly superior approach that recognizes that crime is, in fact, first and foremost a local concern. Our approach is to try to help those local communities to address those local crime problems.

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

Mr. Chairman, I assure the gentleman there is nothing cynical in our efforts at all. We have an ongoing, very successful program supported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, major city chiefs, and there is nothing cynical at all about it.

As for the jurisdiction of Washington, DC, and its financial problems, it has a waiver, which there is a provision for.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds to the gentleman from Philadelphia, PA [Mr. FOGLIETTA], a very distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the Mollohan amendment and to stand with police officers in my home city of Philadelphia who are fighting the problem which is most compelling for all of our constituents: crime. Crime, which is robbing us all of our very freedom to walk our neighborhood streets.

There are some cases where block grants may work. There are some instances where it could be giving more flexibility to our state and local governments. But if it ain't broken, let us not fix it, and the COPS Program is far from broken.

Community policing is working. In Philadelphia, crime is down considerably. In many of our big cities, crime is down by 4 percent and, astoundingly,

New York has experienced a 30-percent drop in its murder rate. People feel safer when they see a cop walking their beat, or riding their beat in a cruiser or even on a bicycle.

The cops like this program. A survey taken last month showed that only 5 percent of police executives want a block grant. COPS is working for the cops. If other departments are looking for a way to reinvent themselves in terms of working with local governments, they should use COPS—with their one or two page applications and quick turnaround time—as their model.

On a personal note, the Attorney General was receptive to me when I pleaded for consideration for the desperately poor city of Chester in my district. The Justice Department was sensitive, expeditious and responsible. I thank you, Janet Reno.

The numbers speak for themselves. The COPS program has a slight 1.5-percent administrative cost. That means that more cops will go out on the street. A block grant program would add bureaucratic fat.

So what is going on here? I think it's clear. The President was absolutely right when he sounded the call to put 100,000 new cops on the street. And the lean and mean bureaucracy he set up to do the job is doing the job. For no other reason than brazen politics, Republicans want to steal this success away from our President.

That is dead wrong. We should not be playing politics on crime. And the American people know that. We're 20,000 towards our goal. Let us not stop until every one of those 100,000 police officers are on the streets in every community of America. Vote for the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY].

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in opposition to this amendment and follow up on some comments that have been made earlier concerning statements by the police chief here in Washington, DC. These statements were made at a hearing that was held just a month ago, on June 22, 1995, a hearing on combatting crime in the District of Columbia. At that hearing, Mr. DAVIS asked the police chief this: "Let me ask you this, would you prefer to put that money into technology as opposed to new officers at this point?" Chief Thomas responded. He said, "Yes, I would. I think that is a better use of our dollars to improve the infrastructure of the department, buy the equipment, have money there for overtime. I think that by adding officers, we do not really get at the problem, because after we add the officers, we still have all of these antiquated processes within the department where we have manual report-taking, et cetera."

I think we should pay some attention to what the police chief right here in Washington, DC, says.

I think we should also pay some attention to the fact that more than 200 COPS grants were rejected by local communities around this country.

What we have done with this program is create a straitjacket. Now, it may be that in many communities, perhaps a majority of communities, that is where they want the money to go, into officers on the street. We give them the flexibility to do it. But that is not the answer in every community.

We need not impose that as an answer. We need to give flexibility. We need to pay attention to law enforcement officers around this country and local governments. We do not have all the wisdom.

We need to understand the reality of fighting crime differs from community to community. We need to pay attention to that. We need to reject this amendment and continue to give flexibility to local communities through this block grant program. I believe that is a program which will allow all of the communities to meet the needs of the communities in a way that is most appropriate based on the local circumstances.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida would not yield, and the other gentleman from Florida mentioned the same thing, how Washington, DC, wants your block grant program because you have admitted those with the high crime rates will get the money. Those with lower crime rates will not get it.

What happens at the end of the year when the crime rates go down? Underneath your formula, next year Washington, DC, will not get as much money, so if you are effective in fighting crime, the next year you will receive less money.

Crime cannot be on a 12-month cycle where one year you have the money, the next year you do not.

Get the facts straight. Your program is up and down. It is only funded for one year.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM], the chairman of the Crime Subcommittee.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to a lot of this debate tonight. I think a few things need to be made clear.

First of all, the underlying bill we have here today going to a block grant program will not in any way affect those communities that already have commitments with Cops in the Streets. They have their money cordoned off under the existing system, so any of the grants already given will not be affected by continuing to support the

block grant program as you would be doing tonight by voting against the Mollohan amendment, which I urge you to do.

Second, I heard a lot of folks suggest somehow or another we are not going to be able to get trust into the local communities to do what is right. I think that is just pure, unadulterated nonsense. The fact of the matter is I think anybody thinking about this understands that the local communities are going to make the best decision, not us, about what is best for their community.

The idea that if they need a police officer, they will not provide it, I just believe, as I said, is nonsense. Under the scheme we worked out, there will be a board that will have to advise the city commission and the county commission, whichever it is, and on that board will be an appropriate representative of the police and the community or the sheriff, as the case may be, also the local judiciary will be represented, the local school system will be represented, the local social work organizations that get involved with criminal justice will be represented, and so on.

□ 2000

So that in essence those decisions will be made not just simply by politicians, quote unquote. They will be made by local community representatives advising the local government leaders on what is best for their community, and, if a community wants to spend all of its money on police, and many will want to do that, there is going to be more money available under the proposal of the block grant program than there is under the existing cops on the street program or the prevention program of Mr. MOLLOHAN's program to be spent. There could conceivably be more police officers hired in this country under these programs. We want to do it the block grant route that exists under the existing program.

But in the process of looking at how this is going to work, Mr. Chairman, we ought to also understand that there are a lot of folks like the D.C. police chief who do understand that where the money should be spent is where the crime is, and there is no greater, higher rate of crime anywhere in the country, unfortunately, than the District of Columbia, and I heard the last speaker suggest that, gee whiz, if we use this formula, there may be some communities that do not get as much money as other communities because they have a higher crime rate. Well, I assure my colleagues, and I assure the gentleman, that under the formula that virtually every community, I would say every community, is not too small, gets a sum of money, a sizable sum of money, under this block grant concept all over the country, but it is true that the higher crime rate communities will get more in any given year, and they

ought to get more in any given year because that is where the crime problem is, and that is what indeed is envisioned by this.

I would suggest that this is the fairest and the most responsible way to deal with fighting crime in this country and to hiring police officers, and if a community, as many do, has no desire whatsoever to hire a new police officer, and they need some new equipment of some sort, they can spend it on that, or they can spend it on drug courts, or they can spend it on drug treatment programs, or they can spend it on some new innovative program that they have created that in their local community can be tailored just to fight the crime problem in that community, and there are a lot of very original ideas out there that have never come under any of these congressionally created kinds of prevention programs that we have been seeing in the Democrat-controlled Congresses of the past and President Clinton's crime bill that passed. Let us let the local community decide.

I can guarantee my colleagues what is happening that is good for fighting crime in Texas is not necessarily going to be good in Rhode Island, or in Oregon, or wherever. The local community-based concept will work. We are not detracting a minute from this. We are not taking away from anything. We are just suggesting on the Republican side of the aisle that local government knows best. We believe in reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government as a matter of principle. We believe in divesting these decisionmaking processes out to the State and local communities, and that is what we are doing in this bill, and I would encourage a "no" vote on the Mollohan amendment for those reasons.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, Mr. MOLLOHAN, I applaud your efforts, and, if these young men and women could be here tonight, new law enforcement officers sworn in last Friday night in Austin, TX, they would want to applaud your efforts also because Austin, TX, has 25 new police officers on the beat tonight as a result of this cops program, and tomorrow they'll have another \$600,000 available to put more officers on the beat and to provide them with some of the equipment they need under the flexibility that our Republican colleagues ignore under the Cops More Program.

Mr. Chairman, they tell us they are against redtape. They tell us they want to allow local decisionmaking. Let me tell my colleagues every one of these police officers is on the beat tonight with a grant approved in less time, in less time, than the 45 days they are going to allow Republican Governors to comment on these applications under

their program. I say to my colleagues, if you want to eliminate redtape, if you want to stand up for local law enforcement officials, you'll listen to them as the experts.

I heard the almost frivolous comments of the gentleman from Illinois suggesting that we were against local sheriffs. Well, the National Sheriffs Association, along with every other major law enforcement association, was there today standing along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] supporting the Mollohan amendment. They are supporting it because they recognize that just as the Republicans want to cut Medicare, they are cutting the commitment to 100,000 police officers.

Mr. Chairman, I am unyielding in support of my local law enforcement association and unyielding in opposing the kind of cutback in this commitment which was for 100,000 new police officers. Can my colleagues tell me things are different in Florida or in Illinois from Texas? I defy my colleagues to find a community in this country that cannot benefit from having more law enforcement officers out there to protect that community.

That is what this amendment is all about. If my colleagues believe in standing with the men and women who are willing to risk their lives for our community, they will support the Mollohan amendment and reject this kind of bureaucracy that is being proposed.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few seconds. I am sorry that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee did not yield to me. I say to the gentleman, I simply wanted to make a point, BILL, that you made a comment that under the block grant program it was conceivable that you would have more policemen on the beat. That's really the problem with the block grant program. It is also conceivable that you will not have as many policemen on the beat. And the other point is that we already have this tremendous cops program out there, as Mr. DOGGETT just pointed out, that is working, and that communities have had commitments from the Federal Government that they're going to be funded for 3 years, and under the block grant program that commitment of the Federal Government is going to be undermined.

The Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MENENDEZ].

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, as a former mayor who started a community policing program, I strongly support the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to restore funding for the COPS Program. The COPS Program is

responsible for 95 new cops and the redeployment of 44 other cops in my congressional district along.

But as I understand it, this bill guts the COPS Program and instead appropriates \$2 billion for a law enforcement program that does not even exist.

That's right, it does not even exist. The fact is that, H.R. 728, the Local Governments Law Enforcement Block Grant Act, which this bill provides \$2 billion for, has not even been considered in the Senate Judiciary Committee nor does the committee even have plans to hold hearings on H.R. 728.

But let me tell you what this fictional law enforcement program would do. It would allow communities to use their funding for nonlaw enforcement purposes, including hiring secretaries and purchasing new uniforms or new cruisers. Secretaries, uniforms, and cruisers that will not lower the crime rate in your district or mine.

The Mollohan amendment restores funding to put more cops on the streets of every congressional district, Democratic and Republican, and to make those districts safer. The COPS Program works. How do I know? I know because there are 139 more cops on the streets of my district and I know because in communities nationwide, these cops are walking their beat protecting our homes, protecting our schools, and protecting our children.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished minority leader is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I urge Members to vote for this Mollohan amendment.

What we passed in the crime bill just a few months ago is working. It is working. We said we wanted 100,000 new police on the streets. Just 25 percent of those police are on the streets today. So a fourth of our goal only has been realized in terms of putting blue shirts on the streets.

Mr. Chairman, I have been out with my community police that were hired under this program in the city of St. Louis. I have walked the precinct with them. I have seen the work that they are doing to prevent crime, to stop crime before it happens, which is what community policing is about, and guess what has happened in my city of St. Louis? The crime rate? Down by 2 percent. The murder rate? Down by 24 percent in St. Louis. The violent crime rate? Down by 11 percent in St. Louis with just a few months of this activity on the ground.

I visited with the chiefs of police from all over the country in St. Louis last week, and they said to me, "Surely, with the results that we're getting, the Congress is not going to take this money away that is targeted at police," and then they said, "You know what will happen if we have a block grant. It will go to all kinds of things.

It will get subverted by mayors and by other departments in city government and will be taken for things that don't count as much as the stoppage of crime that comes from police."

Then we hear that in 25 cities across the country the violent-crime rate is down, the murder rate is down, the crime rate is down. Why in the world, with these statistics and these correlations that we are seeing, would we now stop what has already begun to work and go back to funding tanks, and funding bazookas and funding all kinds of crazy things?

My colleagues, vote for this Mollohan amendment. Keep the money in blue shirts and keep the people of this country safe and secure.

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

A moment ago, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] held a picture up of the 25 new police officers hired, he said, under the COPS Program in Austin, TX. I have got a better deal. Those 25 officers cost Austin, TX, and its taxpayers some 25 percent of the total cost. We are going to give it to them for 10 percent in our bill. That is all we require in the local law enforcement block grant program, which they can use for cops, if they want. It only costs 10 percent. Now next year those 25 cops in Austin are going to cost Austin taxpayers 50 percent of the cost. The third year it is going to cost them 75 percent of the cost, and after 3 years it is going to cost Austin taxpayers all of their salaries. In this bill, we will do it for 10 percent from here on, and they have the option to hire cops. If they need cop cars, they can use it for cop cars. And if they are out of radios, we will let them use it for radios. We will let them use it for whatever they want to do within reason.

Now the Mollohan amendment also provides, and I want to emphasize this, also provides \$230 million for those old programs I thought we got rid of when we adopted the House-passed bill in February. Remember midnight basketball and all of those crazy things we heard about? We voted those out in February by a large margin in the House-passed crime bill which we are funding tonight in this bill. Under the Mollohan amendment those programs are back upon us, midnight basketball and all. I urge the Members to vote as they voted in February. As a matter of fact, it was February 14, 1995, that a great majority of this body voted to pass the crime bill that supplanted the COPS Program.

Our people back home told us we do not want those crazy programs. We cannot afford the local cost share for COPS. We want the local option on how we use our money. We want our sheriff, our police force, our mayor, our county executive, our local city council—we

want them deciding where the money goes, not some bureaucrat in Washington, and especially the Congress of the United States, and the White House.

So I urge the Members to vote as they did in February. My colleagues are on record as supporting an alternative to the COPS Program. Tonight we fund the alternative to the COPS Program, the local block grant for law enforcement officials to do the job of fighting crime in our communities recognizing the diversity of these towns and cities that we represent. What works in New York City may not work in Burnside, KY. In fact, I guarantee it will not work there. Give us the option of using the money as we need it in our local communities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote on the Mollohan amendment.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment.

The goal was simple when we passed the crime bill, and it's simple today. Put more cops on the beat, crime rates will fall, and our families will be safer.

The Mollohan Amendment will help us meet this goal by providing continued funding for programs like COPS-FAST—programs that help police departments hire new officers and develop innovative, community policing programs.

My Republican colleagues intend to abolish these programs and replace them with open-ended block grants. They miss the point.

The Republican block grant proposal does not guarantee more cops on our streets. In fact, under the Republican proposal, grant money could be used for anything from street lights to road construction.

The COPS Program guarantees more cops on the street. I challenge the Republicans to make the same guarantee. They cannot.

COPS grants flow straight from the Justice Department to local law enforcement agencies. We have cut down on administrative overhead by streamlining the application process, and taken other steps to reduce redtape.

The COPS Program empowers local communities to take responsibility for community safety by putting more police officers where they need them most. It doesn't mandate a Federal solution to problems that are often unique to neighborhoods and communities. The COPS Program succeeds because it empowers community police departments to try innovative new strategies to combat crime and make the best use of available resources.

Neighborhood officers work with volunteers to keep our streets safe and our communities informed. Crimefighting experts and officers on the beat agree that community policing works.

The COPS Program is a non-bureaucratic solution to a terrible problem. And the result is a marked decrease in crime: in theft, burglary, and other more serious crimes.

In Sacramento, citizens are involved in this effort, working with local law enforcement and injecting—in their efforts—a new spirit of cooperation and teamwork.

I want to talk about how this program has worked in communities in my district because it really provides an example of how successful this program can be, and how, with some

support, we can begin to address fundamental problems with local solutions, not Washington solutions.

In Sacramento County, California several groups of volunteers and local law enforcement officers have joined hands to establish Sheriff's Community Service Centers. One of the first was in my district in North Highlands, an unincorporated area of the county.

Without fanfare, but with tireless devotion, this group of volunteers and deputies have made a tremendous contribution to community safety.

With an all-volunteer staff and a roster of deputies paid through a COPS grant and county matching funds, the North Highlands center is both a thriving community center and an indispensable component of the Sacramento County law enforcement team.

Volunteers work side-by-side with deputies, helping out with many of the day-to-day responsibilities that keep the wheels of justice turning: taking crime reports, providing a safe haven for neighborhood kids, and helping others navigate through the sometimes confusing world of law enforcement and county services.

Since January of this year, volunteers have logged 4000 crime reports. Many of these volunteers spend 40 hours a week at the center, motivated—as one volunteer put it—by “a real sense of pride in their contribution to the neighborhood.”

The spirit of community involvement extends well beyond the walls of the North Highlands Center. The office space is donated. So is the furniture—right down to the carpet.

Deputies like Willie Nix have found new ways to approach old programs. Deputy Nix—a patrol cop before coming to work with the North Highlands staff—talked just the other day about the advantages of community policing.

An officer on patrol usually has just enough time to drive to a location, take a report, and drive away. “Now,” he said, “I can work with local agencies, neighbors, landlords, and the community to attack crime from every angle.”

In some areas, drug dealers have literally trashed the community. Deputy Nix works with community members and service center volunteers to address this problem from the branches down to the roots: towing abandoned cars, cleaning up yards soiled with garbage, and returning the street to law abiding citizens.

Deputy Nix is busy, but he sets time aside to work with local schoolchildren. Because center volunteers have worked hard to establish after-school programs, many of these kids have more than just a uniform to turn to—they have an entire network of support, from reading and arts programs to safe recreational facilities in the evening.

What may seem like a common sense solution is only possible if other communities can afford to hire officers like Willie Nix. In cities and towns around the country, volunteers who are committed to breaking down barriers and developing a community commitment to law enforcement will rise to the challenge—but only if they are given the opportunity.

Just today, I learned that other communities in my area will get that opportunity. A grant to the Sacramento County Sheriff's Department

will free 22 deputies from administrative duties and redeploy them into community policing.

And police departments in Colusa, Davis, Glen County, Gridley, Red Bluff, Rio Vista, Sutter County, West Sacramento, Willows, Williams, Winters, Woodland, Yolo County, and Yuba City have already received grants that will allow them to put additional officers on the street.

If we pass the Mollohan amendment, and if we continue our commitment to the COPS Program, we can duplicate the efforts of the North Highlands Community Service Center a hundred-thousand times over, and make our streets, our neighborhoods, and our communities a whole lot safer.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to rise today in strong support of the Mollohan amendment to H.R. 2076, the fiscal year Commerce, Justice, State & Judiciary Appropriations Act, and the COPS Program.

The Mollohan amendment would restore crucial funding for COPS Program, or the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, which has been highly successful in Buffalo and throughout Western New York.

Since the program was first authorized in the Crime Bill of 1994, law enforcement authorities throughout Western New York already have received funding to hire 28 additional officers.

Nationwide, the COPS Program has authorized funding for 18,159 community policing officers. This is in addition to the 2,080 new officers funded under the 1994 Police Hiring Supplement (PHS) Program, bringing the total to 20,239 more officers on the beat across the country. In 1993, the Buffalo Police Department received funding to hire more than twenty officers under the PHS Program.

One of the COPS Programs' most successful programs is COPS MORE. MORE puts additional officers on the street by funding equipment, technology, hiring of civilians and overtime.

Last summer, the Commissioner of the Buffalo Police Department requested the flexibility to use grant funding where it is most needed. Under COPS MORE, the Buffalo Police Department recently received \$1.3 million. The funding has enabled the Department to get cops out of the precinct and back onto the street where they belong.

Like you, I am appalled by the following statistics: A murder occurs every 21 minutes; a rape every 5 minutes; a robbery every 46 seconds; an aggravated assault every 29 seconds; a burglary every 20 seconds; and a larceny theft every 4 seconds.

If we keep those alarming facts in mind, this vote is very simple. More cops on the street, means more hoodlums behind bars. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Mollohan amendment in order to restore necessary funding so that the successful COPS Program may continue.

Ms. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Mollohan amendment to H.R. 2076, to preserve a program that is a success in communities such as my own, and throughout the land.

Community policing programs are supported by policy professionals and public officials of both parties. Cops on the beat enables com-

munities to combat crime in a cost effective way.

For people living in the grip of fear, for people peering out barred windows into once-friendly streets, community policing offers results. The familiar figure of a neighborhood officer, who knows the residents and cares about them and for them on a personal level, is the best tool we can employ in our fight against crime.

Many communities in my district, including Kansas City, Blue Springs, Lee's Summit, and Raytown, have filled out the 1-page application and joined the Federal Government in a partnership to fight crime. They have come to the Justice Department with innovative community policing plans and have been rewarded. But these cops on the beat are just the beginning in our efforts to take back the streets. Eventually, the President plans to place 100,000 police officers on America's streets. That means even more police on the streets of the communities I represent.

We need targeted programs with the set mission of preventing crime; community policing is a proven program that reduces crime. With the will of this body, it can continue to be a cost-effective crime buster. Please join me in supporting our cops on the beat: support the Mollohan amendment.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Mollohan amendment. This amendment is probusiness and proenvironment. There are hundreds of communities across America that depend on healthy fisheries for their economic well-being. In recent years, many of these communities have spent millions of dollars to help bring back their long-depleted fish populations. The Mollohan amendment will correct this bill's attack on the commitment between the government and communities to restore their local economies.

The Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Association, along with the Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association, both support the Mollohan amendment. They represent over 5,000 businesses and over 200,000 jobs all along the Pacific Coast. According to these two important groups, “Fishery management cannot happen unless fishery research and conservation are properly funded . . . [the bill] cuts at the heart of many important ongoing research efforts that help our industry be more effective and protects our industry's economic future . . . It makes no economic sense to eliminate them.”

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bill before us today. I especially want to commend Chairman ROGERS for his excellent work through difficult budgetary and personal times. Despite the hurdles, the chairman and subcommittee have brought to the House a bill worthy of support.

Downsizing Government means making choices among spending priorities, and this bill does just that by channeling funds to programs that are in the taxpayers' interest. While I don't agree with every single funding decision, on balance this is a responsible bill with which I am proud to be associated.

This bill takes a giant step toward addressing the issue of border enforcement. Even with

an outright rejection of the administration's ill-conceived border crossing fee, H.R. 2076 provides funding to put an additional 1,400 Border Patrol agents and inspectors on the front lines of the border. Overall funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service is increased by 20 percent which will help border communities like those I represent.

The bill also provides \$500 million for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program that reimburses States for the costs associated with incarcerating criminal aliens. The General Accounting Office estimates that the nationwide costs incurred by States for this could exceed \$650 million. This appropriation takes a huge step towards addressing that problem.

The committee also recommends to the INS that they participate in a pilot program designed to increase cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies at ports-of-entry. I am convinced this pilot program will prove that ports can be run more efficiently, thus better facilitating trade and commerce along the border.

This increase in funding is justified. We must recognize that illegal immigration is a national problem, not a State problem. This Congress must reaffirm its commitment to States and local communities because they are the ones who must contend with failed illegal immigration policies of the past. To turn our backs on that responsibility would be wrong.

The recent tragedy in Oklahoma City is a horrific reminder of violence in our society, but sadly, it occurs all too often—if not as dramatically—in communities across this land. So, I'm supportive of the actions this bill takes to combat crime.

The Federal Government does not have all the answers when it comes to combating the crime we are most concerned about. I do not believe the Congress should try to manage State and local law enforcement agencies. Rather, we need to support measures that empower local law enforcement—H.R. 2076 does just that. This legislation gives maximum flexibility to local law enforcement officials to administer \$2 billion for law enforcement and prevention programs instead of mandating that money be used for specific purposes. The bill will allow local officials to use funds to put more police on the streets, purchase needed equipment, fund youth prevention programs, provide drug court programs, or other urgent needs, according to the priorities determined by 39,000 State and local entities—not Washington. Additionally, H.R. 2076 provides nearly \$500 million for the Byrne Grant Program that has been used very effectively by local law enforcement. In my own district, very successful law enforcement alliances have succeeded because of the availability of Byrne Grant money.

Let me shift gears for a moment to address what this bill does with funding for the Commerce Department. I support the restructuring of the Commerce Department. Over the years, this agency has become the dumping ground for every new function of the Federal Government that didn't fit someplace else. While this bill does not dismantle the Commerce Department, it cuts it by nearly 20 percent—a clear signal to Congress to reorder its functions. I will support amendments to this legislation

making further cuts in certain areas of Commerce, and will soon introduce with others a version of how dismantling the Department might be accomplished.

I am pleased the committee funded the Small Business Administration's microloan program which has helped create hundreds of jobs in Arizona at little or not cost to the Government. Organizations like Project PPEP help to effectively administer these startup loans in areas where this type of assistance is effectively used and where loan defaults are almost nonexistent.

The bill provides resources for the State Department to continue its vital functions across the globe. While H.R. 2076 does cut funding 9 percent below last year's spending levels, the cuts are fair and sensible. Contributions to U.N. peacekeeping operations are kept in check while affording the executive branch maximum flexibility and the legislative branch maximum oversight. The bill closely resembles the provisions of the American Overseas Interests Act passed by the House earlier this year.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation that is both fiscally responsible and attentive to the needs of the American people.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment offered by Mrs. MYERS on behalf of the two of us. And I want to commend her for this initiative, although I do want to note that I would have preferred that the amendment not cut as deeply as it proposes to do. I believe a cut of almost 30 percent is more than can be accommodated without damaging the Office of Advocacy. Possibly the conferees on this bill can find another four or five hundred thousand dollars to add to the amount being added by the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, of all of the functions of the Small Business Administration, the Office of Advocacy undoubtedly helps more small businesses for less dollars than does any other office within SBA.

This is the Office whose testimony before the Congress has been requested 200 times. Why have our committees requested input from Advocacy? Simply because the office tells it like it is even if it puts Advocacy at odds with the administration.

This is the Office to whom this House of Representatives assigned new responsibilities of reviewing proposed regulations by Federal departments and agencies to identify those with anti-small business impact. Why did the House enlarge the duties of the Advocate? Simply because we know how effectively the Office has functioned as an advocate before other Federal offices.

Some critics have charged that Advocacy has been an abysmal failure in reducing the regulatory and paperwork burden.

Tell that to the small businesses which use simplified registration filings with the Security and Exchange Commission.

Tell that to the 4 million firms with less than 10 employees which will be able to use one simplified tax form for all wage and tax reports instead of up to 15 separate forms.

Tell that to the millions of small businesses which have a lesser burden in dealing with the Government.

And, when you tell them of this criticism, small businesses will tell you that the criticism is wrong. These small businesses will tell you that the Office of Advocacy is effective. They will tell you that is why that last month the White House Conference on Small Business as one of the top recommendations said that the Office should be permanently maintained as an independent entity.

I also want to point out that some of the criticism is not simply a difference in opinion. In some cases the facts used to support the criticism are wrong.

Criticism. Advocacy staffers helped created a brochure to lobby for President Clinton's health-care plan;

Fact. GAO reported that this is not true.

Criticism. Advocacy sent a letter to Congress arguing against tax relief for small businesses.

Fact. Advocacy opposed elimination of a special tax incentive to encourage investments in small firms. Advocacy did conclude, however that if the trade-off for the proposed reduction in capital gains tax rates was the elimination of the small business preference, small business would be better off if the rates were not reduced. The Office did support other parts of the tax bill which helped small business, such as increasing expensing, increased estate and gift tax credit and clarification of deductions for an in-home office.

Criticism. Advocacy "spent last Friday . . . faxing a 9-page 'Game Plan' to congressional offices outlining a lobbying strategy" to save the office, an activity characterized as illegal lobbying;

Fact. The document in question was an internal office document which was never used nor authorized for release to any congressional office. As far as we know, it was not sent to anyone, except for the one copy that was surreptitiously made available to a congressional critic of the office; and SBA's Inspector General has determined that the memo was not a violation.

A letter from the inspector general attached a memo from the assistant inspector general for investigations which concluded:

"Because there is no evidence of actual lobbying and no evidence contrary to the stated intent of the preparation of the document by Mr. . . . , it is my recommendation this case be closed without a referral for prosecutive opinion."

Finally critics have asserted that small business associations are the "real independent voices for small business" and "do a better job of monitoring small business policy than the Office of Advocacy." These small business associations disagree.

Major small business organizations unanimously support continuation of the Office of Advocacy, including the National Association for the Self-Employed, the National Federation of Independent Business, National Small Business United, Small Business Legislative Council and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

The Office of Advocacy has performed as a champion for small business interests when it has been given a chance to do so. This chance, however, was denied when President Bush left the Chief Counsel job vacant for

years at a time. When it has received strong presidential support as it did from President Carter, who appointed Milt Stewart as the first Chief Counsel for Advocacy, or from President Reagan, who appointed Frank Swain as Chief Counsel, or from President Clinton, who appointed Jere Glover, the office truly serves as a champion for small business.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the 1996 Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act is a clear, non-nonsense declaration of what this Republican Congress stands for. Time and time again the American public tells us that the main concern is crime, and for too long this concern has fallen on deaf ears. In our Contract With America we promised to act on that concern and I am proud to stand here today and say to the American people "We have taken action."

The Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations Act reflects the priorities of the American public. We have slashed wasteful bureaucracies, we have downsized low priority programs, and we have cut foreign aid and put the money back in America. Why should taxpayers pay for international efforts to stop killing abroad when in their own backyard people are murdering each other? We can't fight a war abroad until we've won the war at home. Make no mistake about it, this is a war. Crime in America has killed millions and ruined the lives of many more. Our anti-crime initiatives represent a major offensive in this war against crime. We recognize that crime cannot be defeated by politicians and bureaucrats in Washington. It is up to the local communities and States to lead the assault and that is why we have given them the means to fight crime directly, in the best way they see fit. This is only the beginning, we have a long fight ahead, but one we are committed to winning.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to thank the 179 Members of this body who signed on to my letter asking Speaker GINGRICH to preserve the Legal Services Corporation [LSC]. Additionally, I would like to thank those Members—AMO HOUGHTON, STEPHEN HORN, DAVID SKAGGS, HOWARD BERMAN, JACK REED, and CONNIE MORELLA, among others—who personally talked to other Members of Congress to help stave off further cuts to the Legal Services Corporation.

Legal services is literally the last line of defense against destitution for many deserving Americans. Last year, LSC-funded programs provided assistance to over 50,000 women seeking protection against abusive spouses, 240,000 elderly seeking help ranging from fraud to Medicare, 2,600 veterans seeking help with veteran's benefits, and 9,000 abused and neglected children. There are many in this country who would find themselves trapped in disastrous often life-threatening situations were it not for legal services attorneys.

I would also like to make several points about the contention that the private bar could somehow replace legal services attorneys. I began my career in public service running the Oregon Legal Services Program for the elderly. I came away from my experience with a strong belief that there is a critical role for the private sector to play in providing legal assistance to the poor.

During the time I worked with Legal Services, I organized hundreds of private attorneys to assist in expanding access to the courts for the elderly. Today, 250 private attorneys donate time to the senior law centers in Oregon. In Portland last year, these attorneys donated 1,640 hours. More than 1,000 lawyers in Oregon, and 130,000 lawyers nationwide participate in pro bono activities organized by legal services programs.

However, I know most of the attorneys I worked with would agree that in spite of their hard work, they could not even begin to fill the shoes of the legal services attorneys who could give full time attention to the problems of seniors. The American Bar Association estimates that less than 20 percent of the legal needs of the poor are met. Even with current funding and massive involvement by the private sector, LSC-funded programs are forced to turn away 43 percent of eligible clients. Most legal aid programs turn away women in divorce cases unless they are in danger of their lives from an abuser, and they turn away eviction cases unless the family will go homeless.

Second, the legal problems of the poor, and in my experience, particularly the poor elderly, often require a depth of expertise and a time commitment that is rarely available on a pro bono basis by private attorneys.

Cases that legal service lawyers take up for older Americans range from navigating the bureaucratic maze of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security to working through problems with consumer fraud, age discrimination, pension income, property assessments, and wills and probate.

The fact of the matter about legal services is that in most communities they are the only knowledgeable advocate for poor people who find themselves up against a convoluted Federal bureaucracy or abusive members of their family or community. For every anecdote about a legal services attorney taking up a questionable case, there are a thousand where they helped a poor person just get a fair shake.

Again, I would like to thank the many Members of Congress who recognized the importance of legal services in ensuring this country provides equal justice for all, and fought to ensure the continuance of this program.

The Members who signed onto my letter are the following: STEPHEN HORN, AMO HOUGHTON, FRANK PALLONE, JIM MORAN, TIM JOHNSTON, MILLER, BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS, SHERROD BROWN, MIKE WARD, JOHN SPRATT, JOSE SERRANO, DICK GEPHARDT, SAM GIBBONS, ROBERT TORICELLI, ROBERT MENENDEZ, LOUIS STOKES, RONALD DELLUMS, CHARLES RANGEL, CHARLES SCHUMER, OWEN PICKETT, HAROLD FORD, NITA LOWEY, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, SAM FARR, ANDY JACOBS, ELIZABETH FURSE, HOWARD BERMAN, JOHN BALDACCIO, RICK BOUCHER, BOBBY RUSH, BOB CLEMENT, BOBBY SCOTT, JIM FOX, PETER TORKILDSEN, JOHN EDWARD PORTER, GLEN POSHARD, JAMES LEACH, ALAN MOLLOHAN, JERRY COSTELLO, JIM CHAPMAN, KAREN THURMAN, BRUCE VENTO, MARTIN FROST, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, NANCY JOHNSON, MAXINE WATERS, MICHAEL FORBES, ALBERT WYNN, CORRINE BROWN, SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, JOHN DINGELL, ROBERT MATSUI,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, CYNTHIA MCKINNEY, JACK QUINN, EARL HILLIARD, SANFORD, BISHOP, RICK LAZIO, MARCY KAPTUR, STEVEN SCHIFF, FLOYD FLAKE, SCOTTY BOMERLER, TONY BELENSON, ANNA ESHOO, EARL POMEROY, GARY ACKERMAN, CAROLYN MALONEY, TIM ROEMER, MARTIN OLAV SABO, JOHN OLVER, WILLIAM CLAY, ZOE LOFGREN, EVA CLAYTON, CARDISS COLLINS, BEN CARDIN, BARNEY FRANK, ROSA DELAURO, BOB BORSKI, SIDNEY YATES, L.F. PAYNE, ELIOT L. ENGEL, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, STENY HOYER, KAREN MCCARTHY, DALE KILDEE, NEIL ABERCROMBIE, BOB FILNER, PETER DEUTSCH, TOM FOGLIETTA, PETER DEFazio, RICHARD NEAL, PATSY MINK, LYNN RIVERS, JAMES TRAFICANT, BILL LUTHER, NICK RAHALL, PAUL MCMALE, JANE HARMAN, HENRY GONZALEZ, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, CHAKA FATTAH, CARRIE P. MEEK, JOHN LEWIS, PETE PETERSON, WILLIAM COYNE, HARRY JOHNSTON, PETE STARK, NORM DICKS, PAT WILLIAMS, DAVID BONIOR, VIC FAZIO, ROBERT ANDREWS, WILLIAM JEFFERSON, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, PETER VISCOSKY, BART STUPAK, MAURICE HINCHEY, JACK REED, PAUL KANJORSKY, MARTIN MEEHAN, NORMAN MINETA, SHELJA JACKSON-LEE, THOMAS BARRETT, JERROLD NADLER, BILL RICHARDSON, ESTEBAN TORRES, BERNARD SANDERS, LLOYD DOGGETT, THOMAS SAWYER, TONY HALL, KEN BENTSEN, DAVID SKAGGS, HAROLD VOLKMER, GERALD KLECZKA, NORMAN SISISKY, ED PASTOR, SAM GEDDENSON, JAMES CLYBURN, NANCY PELOSI, BOB WISE, LUIS GUTIERREZ, KWEISI MFUME, JIM McDERMOTT, RON COLEMAN, BARBARA KENNELLY, MELVIN WATT, PATRICK KENNEDY, XAVIER BECERRA, GEORGE BROWN, ALCEE HASTINGS, CHET EDWARDS, LYNN WOOLSEY, ED MARKEY, HENRY WAXMAN, WALTER TUCKER, DICK DURBIN, PAT SCHROEDER, GERRY STUDDS, TOM MANTON, ED TOWNS, MAJOR OWENS, JULIAN DIXON, JOHN BRYANT, LEAN EVANS, JIM OBERSTAR, JOE KENNEDY, DAVID MINGE, NYDIA VELAZQUEZ, LEE HAMILTON, CONNIE MORELLA, FRANK RIGGS, SOLOMON ORTIZ, FRANK TEJEDA, RAY THORNTON, DONALD PAYNE, CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, BEN THOMPSON, BLANCHE LINCOLN.

In addition, Representative HAL ROGERS, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, made clear early on that he would not support the elimination of the Legal Services Corporation and for that, and for his patience and kindness, we are grateful.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to restore funding in the State-Commerce-Justice appropriations bill for the State Justice Institute. Since filing the amendment, I realized that a number of Members are not familiar with the work of the State Justice Institute, thereby leading me to conclude that it was not an opportune time to debate SJJ funding. I withdrew the amendment.

But I want to let my colleagues know that there is a clear Federal interest in supporting programs like SJJ, which promotes a just, effective, and innovative system of State courts. State courts have been the beneficiaries of more than 800 projects improving the quality of the justice they deliver, and the Federal judiciary has worked closely with SJJ to improve the working relationship between the State and Federal courts.

Federal assistance to State courts is as appropriate as Federal assistance to State law

enforcement, prosecution, and corrections agencies. By helping the State courts to deliver justice more efficiently and effectively, SJI promotes their greater use by litigants, thereby reducing the number of cases filed in Federal court. Continued funding for SJI would provide the administration and Congress with the opportunity to improve the State courts' response to important issues, such as family violence, the rights of children, drug abuse, and crime.

As a Member of Congress who has been active on the issue of domestic violence, I can attest to SJI's many contributions in improving the State courts' response to family violence. For example, the State Justice Institute is the entity responsible for implementing my legislation, approved by Congress in 1992, to develop training programs for judges and other court personnel about domestic violence, especially its impact on children, and to review child custody decisions where evidence of spousal abuse has been presented. The Judicial Training Act addresses problems that many battered women have when they step into the courtrooms in this country to fight for custody of their children or to fight for equal justice in criminal cases. The response of our judicial system to domestic violence has been one of ignorance, negligence, and indifference, often with tragic consequences. The State Justice Institute has moved expeditiously to implement this act, and it has provided important assistance in improving the State courts' response to family violence.

Federal policies can have serious consequences for the State courts and often impose substantial responsibilities on the State courts. The State Justice Institute has provided important Federal assistance to help the State judiciaries cope with federally imposed burdens, such as the Child Support Enforcement Act of 1984, the Family Support Act of 1986, and the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980. These Federal programs should be accompanied by Federal assistance for State courts to meet these increased demands. The State Justice Institute has filled this important role.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 232, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 571]

AYES—184

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Brown (CA)
Ackerman	Berman	Brown (FL)
Andrews	Bevill	Brown (OH)
Baessler	Bishop	Bryant (TX)
Baldacci	Blute	Cardin
Barclay	Bonior	Chapman
Barrett (WI)	Borski	Clay
Becerra	Brewster	Clayton
Bellenson	Browder	Clement

Clyburn	Johnson (CT)	Peterson (FL)
Coleman	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Collins (IL)	Johnston	Pickett
Condit	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Conyers	Kaptur	Poshard
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Quinn
Coyne	Kennedy (RI)	Rahall
Cramer	Kennelly	Rangel
Danner	Kleczka	Leach
de la Garza	Kleeza	Richardson
DeFazio	LaFalce	Rivers
DeLuca	Lantos	Roemer
Dellums	Levin	Roybal-Allard
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Rush
Dicks	Lincoln	Sabo
Dingell	Lipinski	Sanders
Dixon	Lowe	Sawyer
Doeggett	Luther	Schroeder
Doyle	Maloney	Schumer
Durbin	Manton	Serrano
Edwards	Markey	Sisisky
Engel	Mascara	Skaggs
Esholt	Matsui	Masada
Evans	McCarthy	Slaughter
Farr	McDermott	Spratt
Fattah	McHale	Stokes
Fazio	McKinney	Studds
Fields (LA)	McNulty	Stupak
Fliner	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Flake	Mikulski	Tebbs
Foglietta	Menendez	Thompson
Ford	Mfume	Thornton
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Frost	Minteta	Torkildsen
Furse	Minge	Torres
Gephardt	Mink	Torricelli
Gibbons	Mollohan	Towns
Gonzalez	Moran	Tucker
Gordon	Morella	Velazquez
Green	Murtha	Vento
Gutierrez	Nadler	Visclosky
Hall (OH)	Neal	Ward
Hamilton	Oberstar	Waters
Harman	Obeyesekere	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Olver	Waxman
Hayes	Ortiz	Williams
Hefner	Orton	Wilson
Hinchee	Owens	Wise
Holten	Pallone	Woolsey
Hoyer	Pastor	Wynnen
Jackson-Lee	Payne (NJ)	Wynn
Jacobs	Payne (VA)	
	Pelosi	

NOES—232

Allard	Collins (GA)	Gilchrest
Archer	Combest	Gillmor
Armey	Cooley	Gilman
Baker (CA)	Cox	Goodlatte
Baker (LA)	Crane	Goodling
Balenger	Crapo	Goss
Barr	Creameans	Graham
Barrett (NE)	Cublin	Greenwood
Bartlett	Cunningham	Gunderson
Barton	Davis	Gutknecht
Bass	Deal	Hall (TX)
Bereuter	DeLay	Hancock
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hansen
Billrakis	Dickey	Hastert
Bliley	Doolittle	Hastings (WA)
Boehler	Dorman	Hayworth
Boehner	Dreier	Hefley
Bonilla	Duncan	Helmen
Bono	Dunn	Herger
Boucher	Ehlers	Hilleary
Brownback	Ehrlich	Hobson
Bryant (TX)	Emerson	Hoekstra
Bunn	English	Hoke
Bunning	Ensign	Horn
Burr	Everett	Hossettler
Burton	Ewing	Houghton
Buyer	Fawell	Hutchinson
Callahan	Fields (TX)	Hyde
Calvert	Foley	Inglis
Camp	Fowler	Istook
Canady	Fox	Johnson (SD)
Castile	Franks (CT)	Johnson, Sam
Castle	Franks (NJ)	Jones
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Kasich
Chambliss	Frisa	Kelly
Chenoweth	Funderburk	Kim
Christensen	Gallely	King
Chrysler	Ganske	Kingston
Clinger	Gekas	Klink
Coble	Geren	Klug

Knollenberg	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Kolbe	Nussle	Smith (WA)
LaHood	Oxley	Solomon
Largent	Packard	Souder
Latham	Parker	Spence
LaTourrette	Paxon	Stearns
Laughlin	Petri	Stenholm
Lazio	Pombo	Stockman
Leach	Porter	Stump
Lewis (CA)	Portman	Talent
Lewis (KY)	Pryce	Tanner
Lightfoot	Quillen	Tate
Linder	Radanovich	Tauzin
Livingston	Ramstad	Taylor (NC)
LoBlondio	Regula	Thomas
Loftgren	Riggs	Thornberry
Longley	Roberts	Tiahrt
Lucas	Rogers	Trafilant
Manzullo	Rohrabacher	Upton
Martini	Ros-Lehtinen	Vucanovich
McCaul	Roth	Waldholtz
McCoy	Roukema	Walker
McDade	Royce	Walsh
McHugh	Salmun	Wamp
McInnis	Sanford	Watts (OK)
McIntosh	Scarborough	Weldon (FL)
McKeon	Schaefer	Weldon (PA)
Metcalfe	Schiff	Weller
Meyers	Scott	White
Mica	Seaman	Whitfield
Miller (FL)	Sensenbrenner	Wicker
Molinari	Shadegg	Wolf
Montgomery	Shaw	Young (AK)
Moorhead	Shays	Young (FL)
Myrick	Shuster	Zellmer
Nethercutt	Skeen	Zimmer
Neumann	Smith (MI)	
Ney	Smith (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—18

Bachus	Hilliard	Reynolds
Bateman	Hunter	Rose
Collins (MI)	Jefferson	Saxton
Dooley	Martinez	Stark
Flanagan	Moakley	Volkmer
Forbes	Myers	Yates

□ 2032

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Bachus against.

Mr. Moakley for, with Mr. Forbes against.

Messrs. TAUZIN, HORN, and DAVIS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 571, I was unavoidably delayed by an urgent matter concerning my district.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, July 25, I missed rollcall vote No. 571 during consideration of H.R. 2076, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriation bill for fiscal year 1996. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOYER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOYER: Page 25, line 13, strike "\$1,500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 22002(h) of the 1994 Act" and insert "\$1,000,000 for Law Enforcement Family Support Programs, as authorized by section 1001(a)(21) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 as added by section

210201 of the 1994 Act; \$500,000 for Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Programs, as authorized by section 220002(h) of the 1994 Act".

Mr. HOYER (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. EWING). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply provides \$1 million in funding for the Law Enforcement Family Support Program. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the chairman, who has had the opportunity to review this. I understand it is acceptable to him.

I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia in working with me to fashion this so it could be effected.

Mr. Chairman, under the Law Enforcement Family Support Program, the Attorney General makes grants to States and local law enforcement agencies and law enforcement organizations to provide family support services to law enforcement personnel. This important program was authorized by the 1994 Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. These grants will allow local law enforcement agencies to provide counseling for law enforcement families, stress reduction programs, post shooting debriefing for officers and their spouses. Law enforcement family services and counseling for families of police killed in the line of duty.

The pervasive nature of job related stress in law enforcement was highlighted in 1986 when a nationwide assessment of law enforcement training needs found that State and local officers in all types and sizes of agencies ranked the need for training in personal stress management as the highest priority.

The law enforcement family support programs places heavy emphasis on family well-being.

All too often, the work of the law enforcement community is overlooked. Everyday, they risk their lives to keep our neighborhoods safe. Everyday, they struggle to uphold justice fairly and equitably. Every day, they work vigorously to remove those who work to terrorize our communities. This hard work places a heavy personal burden on them and their families.

Law enforcement is the single most stressful and dangerous occupation, requiring life and death decision all in a days work. Last year, nearly 160 officers were killed in the line of duty and another 300 took their own lives.

Our police dedicate their lives to and serving our communities. We must do what we can to aid these brave citizens and their families who sacrifice so much for us.

My amendment is fairly funded by reducing the Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Program to the level it was funded in fiscal year 1995. The committee had zero-funded the family law enforcement programs and I believe this is a more equitable distribution of funds in this time of fiscal constraints. I appreciate the support of the chairman and the ranking member for

this amendment and hope my colleagues will join us in aiding the families of our Nation's police.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I accept the amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. If the gentleman will yield, we have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYWORTH) having assumed the chair, Mr. EWING, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TOBACCO AND AMERICA'S YOUTH

[Additional statements to Mr. WAXMAN's Testimony, in the RECORD of Monday, July 24, 1995.]
January 8, 1969.

OBJECTIVES AND PLANS—1600

[By Dr. P.A. Elchorn and W.L. Dunn, Jr.]

OBJECTIVE 1

To establish different thresholds for menthol level in cigarettes and identify optimum menthol level or levels.

Plan

Complete study already initiated by April 1.

OBJECTIVE 2

Attempt to develop research addressed to following questions:

(a) How much reduction in TPM delivery can we expect the typical smoker to tolerate over the next five years?

(b) Can we forecast the stabilization level in the percentage of the U.S. population who smoke cigarettes?

(c) Is there any product that can potentially replace the cigarette in need-gratification?

Plan

Non-schedulable. The task is one of problem solution in research design.

OBJECTIVE 3

To develop instrumentation and procedures for monitoring the

psychophysiological state and responsivity of the free-roaming human and apply this technology to a study of the psychophysiological state and/or responsivity of cigarette smokers relative to non-smokers.

Plan

(1) Instrument acquisition and calibration by May 1, 1969.

(2) Hard-line preliminary runs with human subjects completed by December 31, 1969.

OBJECTION 4

To attempt to teach a rat to seek the inhalation of cigarette smoke.

Plan

An informal small-scale (no budget) exploration in which principles of operant conditioning will be applied to teaching the rat to inhale smoke first through reinforcement of the act by food or shock avoidant reward and ultimately through the reinforcing effect of the psychopharmacological effects of the inhaled smoke. No definite conclusion anticipated in 1969.

To: Dr. H. Wakeham
From: W. L. Dunn, Jr.
Date: August 1, 1969

Subject: A Trip Report—Discussions with Prof. Lazarsfeld on the Study of Discontinuing Smokers

I spent six hours with Dr. Paul Lazarsfeld on Wednesday. Following lunch together, I sat with him in his office in the Sociology Dept. of Columbia University, later attending as his guest a status conference on the on-going drug addiction study for New York State. The conference was held in the off-campus building housing the Bureau of Applied Social Research. I met several of his doctoral staff members and observed the graduate student interviewing staff as they participated in the conference proceedings. I was favorably impressed.

We have made great strides towards initiating the exploratory study of the experiences of smokers in their efforts to discontinue the habit. The agreed upon calendar of events calls for Dr. Lazarsfeld to submit a proposal to P.M. R&D prior to August 15. In turn I agreed to make immediately available to him copies of pertinent articles from the R&D Smoking and Health library, to be followed by a background bibliography of broader scope. Thereafter, pending acceptance of his proposal, dialogue between P.M. R&D and BASR staff will be addressed to the development of interview format and content.

I anticipate that his proposal will consist of a study of recidivists and cohort groups of abstainers, the latter consisting of one month, three-month, six-month and one-year abstainers. Subjects will be selected on a post-hoc basis, that is, their efforts to abstain will precede their entry into the study. Interviews will be retrospective probings into their daily lives during the period from the date of discontinuation to the date of the interview. The initial interviews will be loosely structured, with subsequent waves increasingly structured and focused. The progressive sharpening of the interview is to be achieved through Prof. Lazarsfeld's characteristic research style; a series of conferences in which interview material from new batches of interviews is studied in great detail for clues to pay-dirt, with subsequent interviews altered accordingly. I saw this approach in operation in the drug-addiction

conference. In its current application it appears to be highly effective. I can see no reason why it should not be as effective for the proposed study.

We also discussed the idea of a steering committee. We noted the various forms this might take:

1. An unstructured group of consultants to Prof. Lazarsfeld as principle investigator.

2. A formally structured advisory group to the project.

3. The Board of the Stress Institute (in this case the Stress Institute would likely be the sponsor of the project).

He seemed equally amenable to all three, though expressing fascination with the third alternative. He pointed out that the task of creating an institute would require heavy commitment of time on someone's part over a period of many months.

As men of repute to advise, he is agreeable to Hans Selye (whom he does not know) and he suggested Prof. Stanley Schacter, a social psychologist of Columbia University who has recently been studying the effects of adrenalin on perceptual processes. We further agreed upon the wisdom of an additional psychologist closer to the physiological front. I named Dr. Frank Finger of the University of Virginia, widely known among psychologists and active in various governing bodies of the American Psychological Association. Another prospect that just occurred to me is Joseph D. Matarazzo, Chairman, Dept. of Medical Psychology, University of Oregon Medical School and writer of the source review of smoking psychology in 1960.

He displayed pleased surprise at our interest in the development of theory, although at this point it would be difficult to say whether this was diplomacy or genuine interest.

I also met and spoke briefly with George Brooks, his staff man formerly with Elmo Roper, confidante of Jet Lincoln, and key man in the series of smoker attitude surveys conducted in the early '60s by Roper for Philip Morris.

RYAN/DUNN ALTERNATE—THIRD VERSION OF BOARD PRESENTATION—DELIVERED WITH ONLY MINOR CHANGES (FALL 1969)

Gentlemen of the Board and guests:

Once again it is my pleasure to appear before you and to make this traditional annual presentation of Philip Morris Research Center activities. Before talking about that particular aspect of the program that I have selected for this year's presentation, let me make a few remarks about the Research Center in general. You have before you a new brochure on Research at Philip Morris. In it are details about our people and the facility, but here are some figures I think you will find of interest. Our present staff numbers about 330 persons. We occupy 125,000 ft. of floor space. Our budget for this year is \$6 million, of which about 25 percent goes into research, 50 percent into product development and 25 percent into technical services to other departments.

I have selected our psychology program to talk about this year. In terms of people and budget it is relatively inconsequential, which partly explains why it has never been mentioned before. We are proud of the fact that we are the only company in the industry that has the discipline of psychology represented amongst its research staff; and we think it only proper, in view of the climate of the times, that we concern ourselves with the topic of the psychology of smoking.

In order to bring you up to date, let me first review the highlights of accomplish-

ments on this front during the past few years.

1. We have established a consumer research facility called our Product Opinion Laboratory. This consists of about fourteen people, mostly pretty girls, who have as their chief task the collecting of opinions and judgments about our new products. The judgments are made by different types of people, depending on the stage of product development and the degree of expertise required. Thus, preliminary taste and flavor profiles are supplied our chemists and development engineers by three small groups of highly trained experts. Products slightly further along the development trail are evaluated by a larger group of less expert Research Center employees, supplemented by a group of about eighty Richmond housewives who smoke cigarettes in an office near a shopping center. Further screening is available from about 1500 members of civic clubs and community organizations who are called on when we want a quick test from a more representative group of non-experts. And finally, products approaching the test market stage of development are evaluated by a national cross section of American consumers, chosen from some 35,000 people who represent 15,000 families.

So, funneled through our little group of consumer research people, there is a continuous flow of consumer responses to guide the Research Center and Marketing people of making product decisions.

Apart from their routine product testing, they have also reported a number of interesting findings that are worthy of mentioning.

2. Some Highlights:

A. One study has demonstrated that a cigarette manufacturer presumably P.M.—can increase the reconstituted-tobacco component of the cigarette blend to 30 percent without significantly altering the taste and subjective properties of the smoke. The implications of dollar savings here are obvious.

B. Another study demonstrated rather dramatically that the menthol coolness ascribable to our competitor's Kool cigarette is attributable to its name and brand image rather than to the taste of the smoke, per se. When the Kool cigarette was compared to our Marlboro Menthol with the brand identity concealed, menthol smokers, including regular Kool smokers, could not tell the difference. When these same smokers smoked these same cigarettes in their regular packages, most of the menthol smokers chose the Kool cigarette to be the cooler smoking.

C. In a third study a thousand smokers were asked to compare cigarettes made of aged tobacco with cigarettes of unaged tobacco. They had no preference, suggesting that the aging process does not significantly alter the taste of the cigarette from the consumer's point of view. This means we have more latitude in maintaining a tobacco inventory than was heretofore appreciated.

D. All the medical research on how much people smoke has used the smoker's estimate of how many cigarettes he smokes a day. We've always known this to be a crude measure, but a recent P.M. study has made it possible to show how very crude it is. Our chemists have developed a means of measuring residual nicotine in the filter of a cigarette. From this can be precisely calculated how much TPM passed through the filter and into the smoker's mouth. We had 2500 filter smokers save their butts for us for one week, and from the residual nicotine measurements, obtained an average daily TPM intake value for each smoker: The slide before

you shows the relationship of the daily intake value with the smoker's estimate of how many cigarettes he smokes per day.

There are two important political as well as scientific implications from this study.

1. The index of smoking level in health surveys as determined by the number of cigarettes people say they smoke is a very unreliable measure of actual smoke intake, and

2. The prediction of smoker intake from the FTC tar value for the brand smoked is also very unreliable.

E. From the study of smoke intake we developed the hypothesis that a smoker will tend to seek his own level of smoke intake whether he smokes filter cigarettes, long cigarettes or skinny cigarettes. A study to test this hypothesis has just been completed. We had about 150 filter smokers volunteer to smoke only the cigarettes we gave them for six weeks. For the first two weeks they all received cigarettes delivering 20 mg of TPM. Beginning the third week, half the group were supplied with cigarettes delivering 25 mg and the other half were given cigarettes delivering 15 mg. They were not informed of the switch nor did they know anything about the purpose of the study. They were kept on the high and low TPM cigarettes for four weeks. During the entire six weeks they saved their butts. Daily intake values were calculated from the residual nicotine in the butted filters.

The slide tells the story. Initially there was an increase in daily intake for those shifted to the 25 mg cigarette, and a decrease for those shifted to the 15 mg cigarette. But notice that they returned toward their original level of intake after 2 weeks on the new cigarette. It would appear that smokers do modify their smoking habits in order to maintain a preferred intake level. [Illegible]

So much for the past. Recently the psychology program has added a new emphasis. Most of our attention in the past has been focused upon the cigarette. Now we are beginning to concentrate on the smoker himself. We are addressing ourselves to that simple but fundamental question, "Why do people smoke?"

I must admit to some embarrassment when I say I don't know the answer to this question. It is even more embarrassing to the psychologists on my staff. But I can tell you this . . . despite the voluminous research and pseudo-sophisticated theories, there is not a scientist alive who can give an explanation backed up by fact.

First we have to break the question into its two parts: (1) Why does one begin to smoke? and (2) Why does one continue to smoke?

There is general agreement on the answer to the first part. The 16 to 20 year-old begins smoking for psychosocial reasons. The act of smoking is symbolic; it signifies adulthood, he smokes to enhance his image in the eyes of his peers.

But the psychosocial motive is not enough to explain continued smoking. Some other motive force takes over to make smoking rewarding in its own right. Long after adolescent preoccupation with self-image has subsided, the cigarette will even preempt food in times of scarcity on the smoker's priority list. The question is "Why?"

One of the obvious ways to approach the problem is to ask the smoker himself why he smokes: When you do this (and Leo Burnett did this about 10 years ago for P.M.) the smoker will either parrot an advertising slogan or give you one of these responses: (1) It relaxes me.

(2) It stimulates me.

One way to interpret this is to conclude that different people are affected in different ways by the inhalation of smoke. We are inclined, however, to ascribe this apparent duality of effect to an inability on the part of the smoker to describe smoke-produced sensations.

Another obvious way to approach the problem is to search for differences between smokers and non-smokers. This strategy has been more fruitful. The research effort in England and the U.S. over the past 15 years has yielded the following findings:

A. Personality Differences—Smokers are:

- (1) More gregarious.
 - (2) More extroverted.
 - (3) More business oriented.
 - (4) Greater sense of time urgency.
 - (5) More competitive.
 - (6) More mobile (jobs, residences).
- Generally more aggressive and risk oriented.

B. Physiological Differences:

- (1) Smokers have faster heart rate.
- (2) Eat more.
- (3) Drink more—beer, whiskey, coffee.
- (4) Have higher oxygen metabolism.
- (5) Weigh less.

C. Generally more active, faster living.

C. Psychological Differences—Smokers exhibit:

- (1) More anxiety.
- (2) More emotional disturbance.
- (3) Higher accident and injury rate.
- (4) More suicide.
- (5) Lower grades in school.

Generally more tense and emotional.

A third way to approach the question is to search for the immediate effects of smoke inhalation upon the smoker. This approach also has been fruitful. Here are the changes in human body function which follow smoke inhalation. All of these changes have been reported by at least two independent researchers:

Cigarette smoke effects:

Increased pulse rate; Increased cardiac output and coronary flow; Lowered skin temperature in hands and feet; Adrenalin released into blood stream; Increased blood flow in skeletal musculature; Reduction in patellar reflex magnitude; Nerve impulse transmission facilitated through autonomic nervous system; Arousal center in brain stem excited, causing arousal patterns in the electrical activity of the cortex; Blood sugar level increases.

Now what can be said about all of these findings?

As for the differences between smokers and non-smokers, one might summarize with these three general observations:

1. Cigarette smoking is more often a habit among more responsive, more arousable, more anxious people than among the less responsive or more tranquil people.

2. More cigarette smoking is to be found among people whose life careers expose them to pressures and crises.

3. A smoker smokes more during the more stressful moments of his day or during stressful period of his life.

One might expect from these differences to find that people are attracted to smoking because it acts as a tranquilizer in a stressful situation, as some told Leo Burnett. Indeed this reason for smoking has been hypothesized by a number of other investigators. But in our experimentation whenever we

have attempted to confirm this hypothesis, we have found exactly the opposite effect. For example, in studies using excessive muscle tension as a measure of psychological arousal we have observed that smoking increases rather than decreases muscle tension.

We are of the conviction, in view of the foregoing, that the ultimate explanation for the perpetuated cigarette habit resides in the pharmacological effect of smoke upon the body of the smoker, the effect being most rewarding to the individual under stress.

We cannot view the smoke as a tranquilizer; most of its effects on body function suggest arousal. We can see on all the benefits of smoking when bored, not yet fully awake, etc.—It arouses you when you need to be aroused. However, we do not yet understand how an additional source of stimulation could be rewarding to an aroused person in a stress situation. We are beginning to work on this problem.

Currently we are making exploratory measures of bodily indices of emotion and arousal. We are measuring heart rate, respiratory rate, the electrical resistance of the skin and muscle tension. At the moment our subjects are wired to a polygraph recorder; we plan to develop the techniques and instrumentation to measure these indices remotely by radio signal.

Our ultimate intent is to monitor the smoker under real life conditions, under conditions of experimentally induced stress and under conditions of tobacco-deprivation.

This is basic exploratory research, but we would hope for fallout in the way of information applicable to the design of our smoking products and also information that could be used in a public relations program to counter that of the American Cancer Society.

To: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

From: F.J. Ryan

Date: December 23, 1969.

Subject: Proposed Research Project: Smoking and Anxiety

It seems likely that cigarette smoking is affected by stressful situations, but we have little experimental evidence of such a relation. We reason that stressful situations produce states of anxiety within the smoker, and know that he seeks anxiety-reducing palliatives in order to feel more comfortable. Smoking may be one of these palliatives. However, not only are the mechanisms by which tobacco smoke might serve as a palliative not completely clear, but we do not even know whether people smoke more under stress than under nonstress. We wish to conduct the research outlined below in order to clarify the matter and lay the ground work for later study. It is discouraging to realize that we have so little data available that we must start at the very beginning but start we must.

Title: Smoking Under Conditions of Shock Produced Anxiety

Purpose: To show cigarette smoking is more probable in stress situations than in nonstress situations.

Importance: Most research in smoking emphasizes its negative qualities. This project is interested in one of the advantages of smoking, its use as an anxiety reducer.

Nontechnical Summary: We will warn people that they're going to get a harmless but annoying shock while we note changes in (a) amount of smoking, compared to no shock days and in (b) frequency of puffs during the interval between warning and shock. The

smoking, the warning, and the shock will all be embedded in a simple discrimination task. Our cover story will be that we are interested in "smoking and judgment." (We need to disguise our real interests in order to prevent subjects from telling us what they think we want to know.)

Predicted Results: (a) Number of puffs on cigarettes will be highest on days when shock is administered, lowest on days when shock is not administered. (b) The distribution of puffs on shock days should be different from the distribution of puffs on no shock days. E.g., either a greater percentage of puffs may occur between the warning and the shock on shock days than in a similar interval on no shock days, or it may be that we will find puffing is postponed until after shock administration.

The Subjects: We prefer to use non-employees for this research. A ready supply of college age subjects can be had from VCU and the University of Richmond. We will pay for the services of both males and females, all volunteers over 21 years old. Each subject will be asked to sign a paper stating that he understands the general conditions of the experiment, and it will be made clear that the subject can withdraw from the experiment at any time, including the middle of a session. They will be paid \$2 for participating in each session, plus about \$1.50 in rewards for correct responding. In the course of several sessions they can earn \$15, including a bonus for completing a series of sessions.

Shock Intensity: Shock intensity will be adjusted for each subject according to the subject's pain threshold. The shock will be painful, but tolerable. Depending on the subject, this will require shock currents of from half a millamp up to three and a half milliamps. Shock administration will be via a constant amperage shock source controlled by relay equipment. Safety precautions include (1) an isolation transformer, (2) fuses in both shock leads, and (3) a limited time of administration through the contacts of a precautionary timer. The latter unit would limit shock duration to T₁ seconds in case the shock administration circuit should fuse shut.

The Discrimination Task: A series of slides containing different shapes will be presented by a modified Carousel projector. Odd numbered slides will contain a single shape, even numbered slides two shapes. The subject's task will be to decide which of the two shapes presented on the even numbered slide most closely resembles the shape shown on the preceding odd numbered slide. (The shapes can be varied in number of enclosed dots, number of sides, color, area, etc., and there may or may not be irrelevant characteristics also present.) Whenever the correct choice is made, the subject will be rewarded with a token. At the conclusion of the session the accumulated tokens can be exchanged for money over and above the amount paid for participation. Whenever an incorrect choice is made, a warning tone will sound. The tone will last for T₂ seconds. Tone offset will, on shock trials, be accompanied by a brief presentation of shock to the subject's fingers.

NoShock-day Procedures: On days when the subject is to receive no shock he will be treated exactly as on shock days, but he will be told truthfully that he will receive no shock. No pretesting shocks will be administered on these days, and incorrect choices will produce only the tone.

Shock-day Procedures: The subject will receive pre-test shock to find his appropriate shock intensity. His incorrect responses will

produce the warning tone. The probability, p , that the tone will terminate in shock will always be above zero, but need not be 1.00 (certainty). It might be more anxiety producing to have p values of less than 1.00, for we suspect that uncertainty of punishment may be more disturbing than certainty of punishment. Accordingly, we will have two different shock-day procedures, one of which $p=1.00$ and one in which $p=.50$, or some other value less than 1.00.

The Subject's Response: The subject's overt task is to throw a left switch or a right switch to indicate that the left or right stimulus is most like the previous stimulus. Action of these switches will produce electrical impulses which in turn will deliver shock or reward, depending on the state of other routing switches. The routing switches will be set by photocell relays, operated by lights shining through holes in the plastic slide mounts of the modified Carousel projector. The relays and switches will start and stop various timers, which will in turn control the sequence of events. Subjects will be asked to abstain from smoking for a period of time prior to the test session, and will be asked to smoke during the test session. Puffing will be observed by the monitoring experimenter, who will throw a switch to mark each puff. The placement of puffs within the intervals between other events can be read directly off a polygraph record. (If a satisfactory puff monitor can be produced by the electrical engineers at U. Va. then its output can replace the experimenter/observer's switch.)

Later Research Plans: It is possible for us to monitor a number of concurrent physiological variables during the test session, such as Heart Rate, GSR, perhaps EMG, depending on our developing interests.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Consumer Psychology

Project Leader: W. L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: September 16-October 15, 1971

Project Title: Psychology of Smoking

Project Leader: W. L. Dunn, Jr.
The Conference on Motivation in Cigarette Smoking is on schedule.

Project Title: Miller Brewing Work

Project Leader: Anne Ferguson

A new augmenting smoking panel is being selected and the beer panel is receiving refresher instruction. Both activities are being undertaken with the consultative assistance of Barbara Hall Ellis.

Project Title: Methods Studies

Project Leader: W. L. Dunn, Jr.

Replication of SIC-1 (preference justification effect) is in the field. The study of alternative field test designs was mailed out but has been aborted and will be rerun due to package coding errors.

Project Title: Smoking Profiles: A Pilot Study

Project Leader: Frank Ryan

Several improvements in the puff monitoring system have made it less obtrusive. Some preliminary measures have been made on college students in the shock research project, and additional measures have been made on R & D personnel to aid in calibration of the system. When five additional models are made, they will have slightly different specifications. The range of flow rates by the orifice is such that we will have to use different models for different smokers,

but we should be able to handle 910 of the smokers we are likely to meet. (See the reports of the Program on Human Smoking Simulation, Charge Number 4008)

Project Titles: Shock I, II, III, and IV

Project Leader: Frank Ryan

We continue to gather data on the puffing behavior of local college students (Shock IV). The first study of this type (Shock I) indicated that personality affected the puff rates of the 16 students in a shock and heart rate experiment. The second study (Shock II) replicated the procedures of the first but omitted the heart rate measures. Assigning 21 new students to one of three groups on the basis of their personality scores and the data of the first study, we predicted that the three groups would rank low, moderate, and high in number of puffs. The data supported the hypothesis, the means being 9.1, 10.6 and 12.0 puffs for the three groups.

At third variation (Shock III) of the procedures has now been completed and the data analyzed for 23 new students. The results suggest that personality factors, particularly the Anxiety factor, account for most of the puffing in our test situation under our tests conditions (note the qualifiers.) The correlation between the personality factors and puff rate is very high, and further research will undoubtedly lead to lower but more stable figures.

We are very much encouraged by the trend of these findings, because they bear on the hypothesis that different types of people have different tar and nicotine intakes.

Project Title: Preferred Tar Reduction Procedure

Project Leader: Frank Ryan

Planning is underway for a study of consumer preferences among the different procedures which lower FTC Tar delivery. Cigarette models will be chosen in November, and mailout target date is February 20, 1972.

Project Title: Cigarette TPM Difference

Limens

Project Leader: T.R. Schori

Twenty R & D employees have been run as subjects in this study which was designed to determine what constitutes a just-noticeable-difference in cigarette TPM. The data suggest that smokers are very poor at making such discriminations. We are instigating a slight change in our approach to the problem to see whether our procedure is insensitive or whether in fact smokers are unable to discriminate.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Consumer Psychology

Project Leader: W. L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: January 15-February 15, 1972

Project Title: Preferred Delivery Reduction

Written by: Frank Ryan

We are comparing five cigarettes, each delivering about 14 mg. tar from a Marlboro 85 blend. Each achieves its tar reduction in a different fashion. The models are: No air dilution, high RTD; moderate air dilution, moderate RTD; high air dilution, low RTD; a paper/CA filter; and an extended tipping paper. Prototypes have been made which are reasonably homogeneous and close to the 14 mg. target, and mailout cigarettes have been ordered. Panelists will be selected from known Marlboro smokers after POL National repolling is complete.

Project Title: Shock V

Written by: Frank Ryan

(a) Additional subjects will be screened to test our personality-puff rate data with new slides.

(b) We plan to reintroduce electric shock in studies this spring.

(c) The apparatus is currently tied up in the smoking profiles pilot work.

Project Title: Smoking Profiles Pilot Study

Written by: Frank Ryan

Students with known puffing patterns (e.g., number of puffs and puff intervals) are evaluating the difficulty of the slides used in Shock I-V while smoking with the human smoking recorder. We are looking for differences in puff behavior attributable to the cigarette holder mouthpiece, tubes, recorders system, etc.

The first test we plan to run with this apparatus will compare puffing behavior on two different types of very different cigarettes. Our present plans are first to test a high delivery 85 mm against a low delivery 85 mm vs. 100 mm of comparable draw.

Project Title: Puffing vs. Judgment

Written by: Frank Ryan

We will ask our students to rate two vastly different experimental cigarettes, using standard SEF callots, to see whether those who take many puffs are as responsive to smoke characteristics as those who take few.

Project Title: Perceived Attributes of Cigarettes

Written by: T.R. Schori

This study was designed to determine major cigarette characteristics as perceived by smokers by means of a factor analytic technique. Ballots are in process of being mailed to a representative panel of 800 smokers.

Project Title: Smoking and Low Delivery Cigarettes

Written by: T. R. Schori

This is a two part study. Cigarettes for Part 1 (TNT-2) are in the process of being mailed out. Cigarettes for Part 2 (TNT-3) are currently being developed.

Project Title: A Comparison of the Effect of Caffeine and Cigarette Smoking

Written by: T. R. Schori

Smokers were tested in each of 3 conditions: placebo, caffeine, and cigarette smoking. Eleven measures of arousal were collected. A discriminant analysis indicated that these three groups differed from one another in terms of the eleven measures considered simultaneously. A report will be written shortly.

Dr. P.A. Elchorn

W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Quarterly Report—Projects 1600 and 2302

October 5, 1972

SEX-III

Twelve hundred of the original 2400 filter smokers who participated in the SEX-I study in 1968 are, at the time of this writing, saving butts for R&D analysis. We will be attempting to relate change in smoke intake to other variables, notably change in available TPM in the cigarette smoked.

Publication of Smoking Behavior: Motives and Incentives.—Because of editing difficulties with one author, the volume is now likely to be delayed until January, 1973.

Participation in Ford Motors Keep-Well Campaign.—The Medical Department of Ford Motor Co. will be launching an exploratory study of a Prophylactic Program to Reduce Cardiovascular Illness among Employees. We will collaborate in the design and data collection. The study is in the early planning stage.

Miller Brewing.—We are providing ongoing consultation and testing services to this subsidiary in the evaluation of its beer products.

The Schachter Studies.—We are collaborating closely with this investigator and providing technical support to the research activities in the Psychology Dept. of Columbia University. A significant theoretical contribution to the understanding of cigarette smoking is believed imminent from this effort.

Puffing Behavior.—We have begun gathering puffing data among student college smoking various brands of cigarettes and little cigars. Intake variables (puff frequency, inter-puffing intervals, puff volume, etc.) should prove related to product preferences, FTC tar and nicotine delivery, etc. The human smoking recorder is used to monitor the puffing while subjects watch slides.

Personality and Puffing.—We continue to observe differences in puffing behavior related to personality variables. The effect seems clearer among male subjects than among females.

Shock and Smoking.—Data collection will resume in October at a new location (POL). We need to develop a different stressor as fear of shock is scaring away some of our more valuable subjects.

Sustained-Performance and Smoking.—In this two-part study, we are evaluating psychomotor performance of smokers, deprived smokers, and nonsmokers over time (3 hours). Part I, concerned with complex task performance, has been completed. The subject's task consisted of five subtasks which had to be performed simultaneously. These subtasks were: a meter monitoring subtask (6 meters), a light monitoring subtask (4 lights), a visual choice reaction time subtask, an auditory choice reaction time subtask, and a mental arithmetic subtask.

In terms of all five subtasks, the subjects showed significant improvements in performance over time. No significant differences in performance were found between the three smoking conditions except in the auditory subtask where smokers displayed the best performance. This latter finding suggests the possibility that smoking enhances auditory sensitivity and we are currently looking into this possibility. As we had found in previous studies, smokers had fewer significant mood changes (as measured by the Nowlis Mood Scale—a paper and pencil device to measure transient mood states) than did nonsmokers or deprived smokers. This suggests that smokers are more emotionally stable in this sort of test situation than are nonsmokers or deprived smoker.

MULTIPLE DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS: A REPEATED MEASURES DESIGN VIRGINIA JOURNAL OF SCIENCE, 23, 62-63, SUMMER, 1972. SCHORI, T.R., AND TINDALL, J.E.

Menthol Cigarette Studies.—Two menthol cigarette studies are underway. The first is designed to delineate the images possessed by various of the menthol cigarettes currently on the market. This is a questionnaire type study using national roster panelists.

The second type is a smoking test. It is designed to identify nicotine and menthol parameters which make for optimal acceptability of menthol cigarettes. This study has a three-stage design. The first stage is designed to identify those nicotine delivery levels which we might reasonably wish to consider for menthol cigarettes. Having identified these nicotine delivery levels, in stage 2 we will determine combinations of nicotine and menthol which make for optimal acceptability. And then in stage 3, cig-

arettes with these combinations will be tested against current brands of known quality and sales potential.

Bay Area Study.—Marketing, for the past few months, has been trying to improve the image of Multifilter in the San Francisco Bay Area and San Jose. In this study, we are trying to determine whether this attempt to improve Multifilter's image has been successful. We are doing this by means of a mallout to smokers in these areas.

Tar and Nicotine Studies.—We have done a number of nicotine to tar ratio studies. Development is continuing to try to make cigarette models with various levels of tar and nicotine using our low nicotine tobacco. When we get successful models, we will go out to a national panel in an attempt to determine combinations of tar and nicotine which make for optimal acceptability.

In addition, a local panel of smokers will test these cigarettes for nine weeks in order to determine the effect of tar and nicotine on cigarette consumption when both tar and nicotine deviate downward from that to which the smokers are accustomed. This is a follow-up of TNT-1.

Dr. P. A. Elchorn

W. L. Dunn, Jr.

Five-year Objectives and Plans for Project 1600

September 25, 1970

OBJECTIVE I

Identify as many as possible of the short-term psychological and psychophysiological phenomena attendant upon the smoking of a cigarette.

Plans.—To expand the scope of the present psychology research program to include studies of the immediate, short-term effects of cigarette smoking as manifested through changes in autonomic, perceptual, cognitive and central nervous system processes and motor performance.

OBJECTIVE II

Advance scientific knowledge of the motivation sustaining the cigarette smoking habit.

Plans.—(1) To further observe the smoking-induced changes identified under Objective I under varying degrees of psychological tension, from relaxed calmness to anxiety, in order to study the interaction effects of smoking and tension upon psychological function.

(2) To conduct studies in which the dependent variable is rate of smoking and the independent variable is a situational factor affecting the smoker's level of vigilance or tension, testing the hypothesis that rate of smoking is a function of vigilance or tension level.

(3) To research the question, "Can the smoking habit be sustained in the absence of nicotine?" Other strategies may be developed, but one now being explored is to attempt to identify which components of the smoke, in gross fractions, effect the heart rate change associated with inhalation of whole smoke.

(4) To coordinate the industry-sponsored conference on the motivational mechanisms of cigarette smoking scheduled for January, 1972.

(5) To prepare a review paper on the psychodynamics of cigarette smoking.

OBJECTIVE III

Forecast trends in cigarette smoking behavior and preferences for guidance in cigarette development.

Plans.—(1) To design a test for determining the smoker's tolerance for reduction in tar delivery over time in terms of rate, increments and limits of reduction.

(2) To elucidate the role of nicotine as a factor in determining cigarette acceptability in terms of absolute levels and relative to other smoke components.

(3) To more systematically observe puffing profiles of smokers across various cigarettes via use of the mobile recording system developed for P.M. by the Engineering School of the University of Virginia.

OBJECTIVE IV

Establish the psychological units of detectable difference for the basic dimensions of cigarette smoking including tar, nicotine, RTD, menthol and TFP.

Plans.—Since methodological obstacles have severely limited our progress on this front to date, we must concentrate on devising research procedures for circumventing these obstacles.

OBJECTIVE V

Improve the validity and reliability of our standard product testing procedures, and reduce the lagtime between service request and report of findings.

Plans.—(1) Continue, as in the past, to test out new research designs and procedures.

(2) Incorporate data retrieval, processing and reporting innovations into our routine procedures as they become available and appropriate.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Consumer Psychology

Program Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: October 16-November 15, 1971

Project Title: Psychology of Smoking

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

The Conference on Motivation in Cigarette Smoking is continuing on schedule.

Project Title: Methods Studies

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

The study of alternative field test designs (TRI-2) is in the field. SIC-2 (preference justification effect) is now in analysis.

Project Title: Shock IV

Project Leader: Frank Ryan

Data collection continues in this series of experiments on student smoking behavior. Nearly 100 students have been tested in the four series to date. We are seeking additional tasks for them to perform in order to broaden the scope and generality of our findings.

Project Title: Desire to Smoke

Project Leader: Frank Ryan

All available college subjects will fill out a questionnaire rating their desire to smoke in each of 22 hypothetical situations. One of Eysenck's colleagues has postulated that there are two types of smokers: one smoker smokes in quiet situations to raise the level of his central nervous system arousal, a second smokes in tense situations in order to reduce their arousal level. The published data suggest that males had their highest desire in quiet situations, females in stressful situations. This may be related to male extroversion and female introversion factors, so Eysenck has suggested that extroverts smoke to increase arousal, while introverts smoke to reduce arousal. We'll compare the rated desire to smoke with our existing personality profiles of these students to check out the hypothesis.

Dr. P. A. Elchorn

W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Quarterly Report—Projects 1600 and 2302
January 5, 1973

SEX-III—Data collection completed. Analysis in progress. Preliminary analysis reveals a 10% reduction from 1968 to 1972 in available tar among cigarettes smoked and commensurate reduction in mean daily intake.

Ford Motor's Keep-Well Campaign—No progress to report. The study at Ford has been delayed.

The Schachter Studies—A pilot study at the Columbia University laboratory has revealed a 30% increase in cigarette consumption (number smoked) over normal consumption when on a regimen of high level Vitamin C dosage. A comparable regimen with sodium bicarbonate did not result in the predicted reduction in consumption.

The Neal Miller Studies—A pilot study at the Rockefeller University laboratory suggests that the elicited attack behavior in cats is markedly moderated when the animal has been injected with nicotine. The high nicotine dosage level, however, demands caution in any interpretation.

Puffing Patterns—Data continues to be collected on puffing behavior relative to the type cigarette being smoked.

Bay Area Study—Discontinued. The study was judged to be of a non-R&D nature and Marketing Research funds were not available for its support.

The Effects of Smoking on Heart Rate Variability—Three studies are in the initial stages for determining what effect, if any, smoking has upon the magnitude of shifts in arousal level, with heart rate being used as the index of this psycho-physiological state. The study involving the telemetry of heart rate, delayed because of technical problems and laboratory relocation, is about to enter the recording phase. Heart rates of R&D smokers, under smoking and abstinence conditions, will be sampled over working hours. A second study is being initiated in which a small sample of R&D employees will record their heart rates on portable tape units while driving to and from work under smoking and extended abstinence conditions. A third study is being formulated in which volunteer subjects will be subjected to intensive and varied activity programs designed to be fatiguing and/or frustrating and extending over a 24-hour period in which no sleep will be permitted. The effects of deprivation of food, of water and of smoking will be observed in terms of heart rate measures and performance efficiency. The scheduling of these latter two studies is contingent upon the assembly of the portable heart rate recording device, the critical element of which is the sensor-transducer component. The critical measure is the variance of heart rate over time.

Tar & Nicotine Studies—Cigarettes are scheduled to become available for these studies in January.

Fourteen Choice—There are various ways for lowering TPM to 14 mg. Which yields the preferred cigarette? After extensive experimentation, adequately controlled samples of the six selected cigarettes have been provided in sufficient quantity for local testing. This testing will begin in January, to be followed by national field testing.

Black Menthol Panels—Recruitment of both local and national black menthol smokers is underway.

Menthol-tar Combinations—Experimental models of the cigarettes needed for this study are being made. When the specifica-

tions are met, the cigarettes will be produced and the study initiated.

Tar-nicotine Combinations—Here also the execution of the study is contingent upon the design and production of cigarettes which meet the specifications demanded.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Smoker Psychology

Project Leader: W. L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: January 1-January 31, 1973

Date of Report: February 9, 1973

Project Title: Smoking and Rate of Learning
Alpha Control (A new study)

Written by: W. L. Dunn

Alpha brain wave (8-12Hz) dominance is associated with states of tranquility and meditation. Alpha is recordable with appropriate electronic circuitry (EEG) and can be used to trigger auditory or visual stimuli as signals of alpha presence above predetermined threshold levels. These biofeedback signals can facilitate the learning of alpha control in human subjects.

As part of our continuing search for the motivationally relevant effects of smoking, we are investigating the influence of smoking upon the rate of acquisition of alpha wave control. Using smoking subjects and alternating smoking and non-smoking learning sessions (daily sessions of 3 to 5 minutes) we will test for differences between the two conditions in terms of cumulative time of alpha dominance.

Project Title: Richmond Product Placement Panel

Written by: M. E. Johnston

Plans for establishing a local roster of 1500 to 2000 smokers, including much needed Marlboro, hi-fi and black menthol smokers, are being put into effect.

Project Title: The Delivery of Inhalation Impact via Other Vehicles than Nicotine

Written by: W. L. Dunn

It has been observed that when the filler of a commercial type cigarette is denicotinized, the inhalation impact of that cigarette is lost. In collaboration with Hind and Gellatly, we are investigating the capability of a denicotinized 100% uncased burley cigarette to deliver impact. If there is found to be residual impact, we will attempt to build an acceptable cigarette around denicotinized uncased burley.

Project Title: Optimum Mode of Tar Reduction

Written by: Frank Ryan

A five-pack handset is now in local distribution. Results will be used to determine feasibility of national mailout.

Project Title: Arousal and Smoking

Written by: Frank Ryan

The effect of smoking or non-smoking on the arousal mechanisms of the central nervous system is being monitored throughout the day by measuring heart rate activity. Samples of activity are taken throughout a week of smoking, and then throughout a week of non-smoking. Several employees have volunteered to quit smoking for a week and then resume, but not all will be usable.

In addition, heart-rate recordings while commuting to work will be collected under smoking and extended abstinence conditions.

Project Title: Puffing Behavior on Different Brands

Written by: Frank Ryan

Final subjects are now being run. Preliminary data indicates puffing at little cigars is different from puffing at cigarettes and that

Marlboro and Winston are smoked similarly. This appears to be a useful procedure, but it takes a long time to gather any significant amount of data. We may change our standard task to enable us to use the same smokers more often.

Project Title: Cigarette Variability

Written by: Frank Ryan

A pack handset will be made in late February to test the effect of cigarette variability on consumer response. Warren Claffin's group has provided the cigarettes.

Project Title: Personality and Puffing Behavior

Written by: Frank Ryan

A report is being prepared on this topic covering progress to date.

Project Title: *Smoking and Spare Mental Capacity*

Written by: T. R. Schori

This is a study in which we are looking for differences in spare mental capacity between smokers, smokers-deprived, and nonsmokers using a cross-adaptive loading task technique. With this technique, subsidiary task difficulty is dependent upon primary task performance in such fashion that primary task performance is made comparable over groups while subsidiary task performance becomes an indication of spare mental capacity.

Project Title: *SEX-III Analysis*

Written by: T. R. Schori

Data analysis continues. The first draft of the report will be complete February 14.

Project Title: *JND-2*

Written by: T. R. Schori

This is a follow-up of JND-1 in which we are interested in whether smokers can detect differences in two cigarettes varying in tar delivery by 5 mg. They were unable to do so in the original study. The cigarettes are in the field. Ballots are starting to trickle in.

Project Title: *Smoking and Sustained Performance*

Written by: T. R. Schori

Report in progress.

Project Title: *Menthol Cigarette Image (HN-1)*

Written by: T. R. Schori

Report in progress.

Project Title: *Acceptability and Low Delivery Cigarettes (II)*

Written by: T. R. Schori

Awaiting cigarettes.

Project Title: *Economic Analyses*

Written by: Myron Johnston

The following analyses were completed:

1. Projections of Weighted Average Tar Deliveries (requested by Steve Fountaine). Extrapolations of trend lines of weighted average tar deliveries based on three different time periods and two methods of computation (logarithmic and arithmetic).

2. Weighted average tar deliveries of 85mm and 100mm filter cigarettes calculated separately (requested by Al Udow).

3. Calculation of simple average tar delivery and range of delivery levels available to the American public, 1954-1972 (requested by Dr. Wakeham).

4. Percent who smoke cigarettes by occupation and age (requested by Dr. Fagan and Mr. J. Lincoln).

5. Attitudes of R&D professionals to the speakers at the evening seminars for the past two years (requested by Dr. Fagan for the Evening Seminar Committee).

Project Title: *Smoking Patterns as Related to Status Inconsistency*

Written by: Myron Johnston

Several computer runs have been made and we are in the process of analyzing and writing up the results of our findings to date. Status Inconsistent smokers report higher consumption rates than status consistent smokers according to preliminary data. Our panel data confirms the findings of other studies that smoking is inversely related to income, occupation and educational attainment (the components of socio-economic class).

Project Title: *Acquisition of Marlboro Smokers from Market Research Department*

Written by: Myron Johnston

HTI has been having computer problems but we have been promised delivery of the names and addresses of 500 Marlboro smokers by February 12.

Project Title: *Product Usage—Pipe Tobacco (requested by Marketing Department through Bill Corsover)*

Written by: M.E. Johnston

Several computer tabulations have been run and I am ready to begin the analysis of the data.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Smoker Psychology

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: May 1-31, 1974

Date of Report: June 10, 1974

Project Title: *Alpha Brain Waves and Smoking*

Written by: W.L. Dunn

Data collection complete. Analysis in progress.

Project Title: *Inhalation Controls*

Written by: W.L. Dunn

Instrumentation is nearly complete. Electronic problems have been resolved and mechanical valving of airways appears to be in working order. The nose mask is causing some delay in that we recently became aware of a shrinkage problem with the silicon rubber material used in fabricating the mask. An alternate curing agent (on order) is supposed to solve the problem.

Project Title: *Puffing Behavior*

Written by: F.J. Ryan

We have begun gathering data on the effects of inter-cigarette interval on puffing behavior. Students smoke cigarettes either 10 or 60 minutes apart while working on paper and pencil tasks and reading into the delayed feedback tape recorder. We expect to see differences in behavior as a function of the inter-cigarette interval. It is not clear whether these differences will be in average puff volumes, durations, and flows, or in number of puffs, total puff volume, and interval between puffs. Our previous research suggests that average puff volume, puff duration, and flow rate of the smoke are relatively insensitive to external conditions, each smoker having his own preferred response pattern which interacts with the physical characteristics of the cigarette rod at the time of the puff to determine the puff volumes, etc. Therefore we suspect that the major differences will appear in the number of puffs taken, inter-puff interval, and total volume of smoke.

Project Title: *Relationship Between Smoking and Personality*

Written by: F.J. Ryan

Some children are so active (or "hyperkinetic") that they are unable to sit quietly in school and concentrate on what is being taught. In recent years it has been found that amphetamines, which are strong stimu-

lants, have the anomalous effect of quieting these children down and enabling them to concentrate in the face of distractions which otherwise would have disrupted their attention. Many children are therefore regularly administered amphetamines throughout grade school years. The wisdom of such prescription is open to question, and some published reports have suggested that caffeine, in the form of coffee or tea for breakfast, would produce the same end result. We wonder whether such children may not eventually become cigarette smokers in their teenage years as they discover the advantage of self-stimulation via nicotine. We have already collaborated with a local school system in identifying some such children presently in the third grade; we are reviewing the available literature on the topic; and we may propose a prospective study of this relationship. It would be good to show that smoking is an advantage to at least one subgroup of the population. Needless to say, we will not propose giving cigarettes to children.

Project Title: *Smoking and Mental Concentration*

Written by: F.J. Ryan

Embedded in the puffing behavior study mentioned above is the study of the effects of smoking on performance with the delayed feedback tape recorder. The students read passages into a microphone connected to a tape recorder while hearing their own voice over earphones either as they say each word or slightly after they say each word. The latter (delay) condition disrupts normal speech patterns, sometimes causing stuttering, word blocking, slurring, dropped final word-endings, etc., and seems to slow reading rate by 15% or more. One strategy adopted by readers under delay circumstances is to ignore the sound of their own voices and hence to pay no attention to what they are reading. We test for this by asking questions about the material read. To the extent that smoking aids in concentration we should see performance improvement when reading in the delay condition after having had a cigarette compared to reading when no cigarette has been smoked for an hour.

Project Title: *DL-2*

Written by: T.R. Schori

Panelists smoked a Marlboro Control and three low delivery cigarettes, averaging less than 10 mg tar, at three levels of RTD varying upwards from 4.8 inches. The most interesting finding was that these low delivery cigarettes were as acceptable as the Marlboro Control. A report is being written.

Project Title: *Smoking, Arousal, and Mood*

Written by: T.R. Schori

The data acquisition phase of this study is nearly over.

Project Title: *MN-3*

Written by: T.R. Schori

This is the second in a series of studies designed to determine what nicotine and menthol parameters will optimize consumer acceptability (of various subsets of the menthol smoker population) of menthol cigarettes. These cigarettes are ready to go out to a national panel.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Smoker Psychology

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: February 1-28, 1975

Date of Report: March 10, 1975

Project Title: *DTR-2*

Written by: W.L. Dunn

A dual field study of RTD/tar interaction and assessment of three modes of presentation. Data in analysis.

Project Title: *Inhalation II*

Written by: W.L. Dunn

An attempt to monitor all of the behavioral mechanisms available to the smoker for regulating exposure to smoke under conditions of varied delivery levels. The study will require the simultaneous recording of (a) the puff profile, (b) nose/mouth inhalation ratio, (c) total inhalation volume and (d) retention time. We are engaged in solving the instrumentation problems.

Project Title: *Puffing Following Deprivation*

Written by: Frank Ryan

Data collection continues, will end this month.

Project Title: *Constant Volume Puffing*

Written by: Frank Ryan

To see what cues govern the size of puffs we will ask smokers to attempt to take puffs of identical volume at different places on the rod, while manipulating delivery and RTD of the products being smoked.

Project Title: *Hyperkinesis as a Precursor of Smoking*

Written by: Frank Ryan

The size of our prospective study should be increased to a base of about 6,000 children when a local school system extends its student evaluations three more grades this spring.

Project Title: *Annual Monitoring of Cigarette Acceptability*

Written by: Frank Ryan

The tentative design of this study is as follows: once a year we will have five different products evaluated by a large panel of smokers.

The evaluation will be on a 9-point acceptability scale, ranging from Dislike Extremely to Like Extremely.

The products will range from 8 mg FTC tar to 20 mg FTC tar in 3 mg steps. All will be nonmenthol.

The panelists will be chosen from the POL National Roster. Both sexes and a wide variety of ages will be used, with over-sampling of younger smokers whose preference criteria may not yet be well established. We do not have data on the number of years panelists have been smoking, so we will ask that question on the ballots, and then make analyses by age, number of years smoking, as well as delivery range of current own product. Myron Johnston is cross tabulating the POL panel now to get us up-to-date information on the number of panelists in different age and sex categories in the available subject population. (Nonfiltered menthol smokers will be excluded.)

Test is tentatively scheduled for late October to early November.

Project Title: *Smoking and Risk-taking in a Simulated Driving Task*

Written by: T.R. Schori

The data acquisition phase is complete. We have started to analyze the data.

Project Title: *The Beta Study*

Written by: T.R. Schori

Having gotten our first group of fish, we are preparing to determine nicotine dosage effects. Subsequently, we plan to test 30 Bettas at each of 3 nicotine levels (the lowest being 0 nicotine). We will make observations of exploratory activity and hooding behavior (aggressive behavior) on each Beta at each dosage on several occasions.

Project Title: *Miscellaneous*

Written by: T.R. Schori

Menthol Cigarette Preferences of Blacks: cigarettes are in storage awaiting the availability of the RP Black menthol panel. Low Delivery Cigarettes: Another Look at the Influence of Delivery Information on Subjective Evaluations: cigarettes are ready and should go out shortly to a National POL panel. There are two conditions in this study. In the first panelists will make blind ratings of a Marlboro control and a 9 mg tar cigarette while in the second condition the cigarettes will be identified as to their tar and nicotine deliveries.

PHILIP MORRIS RESEARCH CENTER—BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH ANNUAL REPORT APPROVED BY W.L. DUNN & DISTRIBUTED TO H. WAKEHAM ET AL.—JULY 18, 1975

We have arranged the 1600 activities for this report into the three status sections: Completed, In Progress and Planned.

Under each status section the individual studies are grouped under the three objectives of the Behavioral Research Laboratory: I. To learn more about why people smoke. II. To learn more about how people smoke. III. To further identify what people want to smoke.

COMPLETED STUDIES

I. The effect of smoking on risk-taking in a simulated driving task (Jones and Schori)

Smokers are reported to have more traffic accidents than nonsmokers. There are several possible explanations. First, the studies that have been conducted have made no attempt to control certain important extraneous variables. For meaningful comparisons of smokers and nonsmokers, it is essential that quantity and quality of driving exposure be considered. The higher alcohol consumption of smokers is another example of an uncontrolled variable that could influence accident data. Second, it could be that smoking adversely affects driving performance. The results of studies in this area are not conclusive. Furthermore, it is not known whether inferior motor performance significantly increases accident rates. Our interest has been in a third possibility: That smokers are more willing to take risks than nonsmokers, resulting in higher accident rates among smokers. Therefore, an investigation was conducted to determine experimentally whether smoking condition (smoking, smoking-deprivation and nonsmoking) affects an individual's degree of willingness to take risks. The task used was designed to simulate an actual car passing situation, varied as to the degree of risk involved in making the pass.

The subject was seated in front of a panel on which lights represented the movement of cars in the inner and outer lanes of a race track. The subject's task was to pass the car ahead of his car (lead car) without crashing into an approaching car. It was emphasized to the subject that in order to do well on the task it was necessary to take risks. The necessity of risk-taking was increased by the random increases in the speed of the approaching car. A performance contingent monetary bonus was used to motivate the subject to perform well on the task.

There were 15 college students subject in each of the three smoking conditions. Smokers were randomly assigned to either the smoker or smoker-deprived condition. Performance data were collected on the follow-

ing dependent variables: response latency, number of pass attempts, number of bailout attempts, number of successful passes, number of crashes, and amount of good time (the amount of time not immediately behind the lead vehicle or in a crash condition).

The performance data were analyzed by means of a two-way multivariate analysis of variance in which both Smoking Condition and Trials were treated as independent variables. We analyzed for treatment effects in terms of all dependent variables simultaneously while taking into consideration their interrelationships.

Significant differences were detected as a function of trials. The nature of the trials effect was such that it can be concluded that the accuracy with which subjects evaluated potential risk improved with practice, a finding which may have practical implications for driver training programs. However, no differences were detected as a function of smoking condition or the smoking condition trials interaction. Thus, it can be concluded that in this simulated car passing task nonsmokers, smokers-deprived, and smokers did not differ in their willingness to take risks.

1. Delayed audio feedback (Ryan and Lieser)

In the last annual report we commented briefly on a then recent study not yet completely analyzed. It had been undertaken to see whether cigarette smoking, which should have stimulating and frustration reducing characteristics, would improve vocal performance under conditions of delayed audio-feedback.

In delayed audio feedback subjects speak or read aloud into a microphone connected to a special tape recorder. The subject's voice is relayed to his earphones either as he speaks (immediate feedback) or a fraction of a second after he has spoken (delayed feedback). Most people are unaware of the fact that our speech behavior depends in part on hearing what we are saying as we say it. Even fraction of a second delays can therefore cause stammering, speech blockage, slurred words, slower speech, louder speech, etc.

The speech problems cause speakers to become more tense, and the extra tension seems to make the problem even worse.

We reasoned that smoking cigarettes might reduce tension and speed up behavior, so that after a smoke speakers would read faster and make fewer errors under delayed feedback than they made before smoking.

We found that as expected:

(1) smoking increased post-cigarette speech rate (by about 8%) under both feedback conditions; and (2) smoking decreased the total number of speech errors under the delayed feedback condition, but (3) the magnitude of the effect was not great because (4) our headphone speaker volume was not loud enough.

Because this is an easy experiment to conduct, we will replicate it piecemeal in the future (at higher output volumes) using as subjects college students who have come to the laboratory to participate in other projects and have either finished earlier than expected or have been excused from participation because of apparatus failures.

II. Smoking behavior following deprivation (Ryan and Lieser)

This study was conducted to answer two questions: What effect does short-term smoke deprivation have on number of cigarettes

subsequently consumed? and What effect does short-term smoke deprivation have on subsequent puffing behavior?

By "short-term deprivation" we mean being in a No Smoking condition for two hours when smoking would otherwise be an appropriate act. Thus we are indirectly testing the effects of various state laws, local ordinances, and business establishment decisions which forbid smoking in various places: buses, stores, theatres, waiting rooms, schools, etc.

Our subjects were 90 college students who visited the Research Center on two separate days during each of which they spent 4 hours taking multiple-choice tests, memorizing facts, free associating to nonsense words, filling out personality tests, and (less frequently) talking with the experimenter about miscellaneous topical matters during a 15-minute break period which split the 4-hour session into two 2-hour parts. The situation was therefore like that of study and testing periods, although it required more concentrated work than most students normally perform.

A dozen other students were tested in portions of this study, either in a pilot work or during the project itself, but were excluded from the results here presented either because we suspected they were not smokers or at best very light smokers, or because we made slight changes in procedure. All these omitted subjects followed the same general smoking patterns reported here.

On one of the days the students were allowed to smoke as often and as much as they wished (ad lib) from a free supply of their own brand of cigarettes placed prominently on the table before them.

On the other day they were forbidden to smoke during the first 2 hours (deprivation) and then allowed to smoke ad lib during the next 2 hours. Prior to the beginning of each 4-hour period, they smoked one of their own brand cigarettes through a PM Human Smoking Recorder system. The computer output describing these two smokings was used to calculate the 2-day average puff volume on nonlighting puffs for each smoker. No other cigarettes were monitored by recorder, but number of cigarettes smoked, interval between cigarettes, number of puffs, taken, and interval between puffs were noted by observer(s) in an adjoining room watching the subject via closed circuit TV. From the nominal nicotine delivery of a 35 cc puff on each brand listed in CI reports, given the size of an average puff from the recorder output, and having counted the number of puffs taken during the session, we were able to approximate nicotine intake during the sessions.

This also assumes that puffs outside the recorder are like recorded puffs, and that deprivation does not affect puff volume. We can't do anything about the first assumption, but in a prior study in which effects of one hour of deprivation on a subsequent single cigarette was evaluated, we saw no volume change after deprivation although there was an effect on number of puffs and inter-puff interval which explains the choice of variable in the present work.

Twelve of the students were males, eight were females, and half of each gender group smoked menthol.

The results are summarized in Tables 1, 2 and 3 and in Figs. 1 and 2.

TABLE 1—EFFECTS OF DEPRIVATION ON NUMBER OF CIGARETTES SMOKED, NUMBER OF PUFFS TAKEN, AND ESTIMATED NICOTINE INTAKE (ALL SMOKERS)

	Number of cigarettes	Total No of puffs	Estimated group nicotine intake (mg)
First 2 hours ad lib	79	621	79.73
Second 2 hours ad lib	74	608	78.74
2 hours post deprivation	95	832	106.50

TABLE 2—EFFECTS OF DEPRIVATION ON SUBGROUPS: MENTHOL VERSUS NONMENTHOL; MALES VERSUS FEMALES

	Number of cigarettes		Total No of puffs		Estimated group nicotine intake (mg)	
	Menthol	Non-menthol	Menthol	Non-menthol	Menthol	Non-menthol
First 2 hours ad lib	43	36	340	281	43.75	35.98
Second 2 hours ad lib	39	35	323	285	42.43	36.31
2 hours post deprivation	47	48	415	417	54.10	52.40

	12 Males	8 Females	12 Males	8 Females	12 Males	8 Females
	First 2 hours ad lib	45	34	321	300	42.09
Second 2 hours ad lib	44	30	341	267	45.13	33.61
2 hours post deprivation	56	39	459	373	59.68	46.82

TABLE 3—CONSUMPTION POST-DEPRIVATION AS A PERCENT OF SECOND TWO HOURS AD LIB AND OF TOTAL 4-HOUR AD LIB DATA; WITH SECOND TWO HOURS AD LIB COMPARED WITH FIRST TWO HOURS AD LIB TO SHOW THE CONTRAST
(In percent)

	Number of cigarettes	Total number of puffs	Estimated group nicotine intake (mg)
Post deprivation vs. second two hours ad lib			
All Smokers	128	137	135
Menthol	121	128	127
Non-menthol	137	146	144
Males	127	135	132
Females	130	140	139
Post deprivation vs. all four hours ad lib			
All Smokers	62	68	67
Menthol	57	64	63
Non-menthol	58	74	73
Males	63	70	68
Females	61	66	66
Second two hours ad lib vs. first two hours ad lib			
All Smokers	94	98	99
Menthol	91	95	97
Non-menthol	97	101	101
Males	98	106	107
Females	88	89	89

Tables 1 and 2 show that behavior and nicotine intake were strikingly similar during each of the two sessions of the ad lib smoking day. This similarity is stressed further at the bottom of Table 3, which shows the second two hours' behavior as a percentage of the first. We shall consider these two periods as essentially equal in their effect. However, because the design suggests that the post-deprivation period should be compared to a comparable period of free smoking, we concentrate our attention on the difference between the post-deprivation measures and those of the second two hours of the ad lib smoking day.

The data in the tables show that number of cigarettes consumed increased 28% from 74 to 95, that number of puffs taken increased 37% from 608 to 832, and that total estimated nicotine intake increased 35% from 78.74 to 106.50 mg after the deprivation period.

The effect of No Smoking situations of 2-hour durations is to increase subsequent consumption by anywhere from 28% to 37% depending on the measure taken.

On the other hand, in only a two-hour period smokers do not make up the entire smoke deficit created by a No Smoking situation. Comparing their consumption during the combined deprivation-smoking period of one day with their normal 4-hour smoking behavior, (see second block of entries in Table 3) they only take about 3/4 the puffs

and 3/4 of the cigarettes they would normally have taken.

TABLE 4.—MEAN NUMBER OF PUFFS FOR 9 "LIGHT" SMOKERS (1 PACK OR LESS) AND "HEAVY" SMOKERS (Over one pack a day)

	Light	Heavy
First 2 hours ad lib	22.7	37.9
Second 2 hours ad lib	21.6	37.6
Post Deprivation	36.1	46.1
Increase Post Deprivation in percent	67	23

The effects of the deprivation were not the same on all smokers. They were proportionally much stronger on the light smokers than on the heavy smokers. That is because the heavier smokers spent so much time smoking that they could not increase their consumption as much as the light smokers could. There are several ways to classify the smokers of this study as "light" or "heavy"; they all show the same type of effect. In Table 4 we show the number of puffs taken by light and heavy smokers classified by their answers to the question "How many cigarettes do you smoke each day?" On the consent form which all subjects filled out. Those nine who smoked a pack or less increased the number of puffs they took by 67% following deprivation, while for the eight who report smoking more than a pack a day the increase was only 23%.

A second and perhaps more objective way to classify the subjects is by the number of cigarettes they smoked during the first two hours of the ad lib day. Breaking these into three groups, who smoked less than four, four, or more than four cigarettes during the first two hours we make the interesting observation that after deprivation the light smokers smoked as moderate smokers normally do and the moderate smokers smoked as heavy smokers normally do (Table 5).

To overgeneralize from small samples is always dangerous, but it is tempting to suggest that establishing a No Smoking situation with the well-intentioned (?) goal of cutting back smoke consumption makes people heavier smokers than they would otherwise be. (It must be understood, however, that there is a net reduction, and that the data for the increase are based on only two hours of observation. This is not a slogan that can be used without reservation.)

TABLE 5.—MEAN NUMBER OF PUFFS FOR LIGHT, MODERATE, AND HEAVY SMOKERS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF CIGARETTES SMOKED DURING FIRST TWO HOURS OF AD LIB DAY

	Mean number of puffs/ smoker		Percent of increase
	Second two hours	Post-deprivation	
8 Light (less than 4 cigs)	206	339	65

TABLE 5.—MEAN NUMBER OF PUFFS FOR LIGHT, MODERATE, AND HEAVY SMOKERS CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF CIGARETTES SMOKED DURING FIRST TWO HOURS OF AD LIB DAY—Continued

	Mean number of puffs/ smoker		Percent of increase
	Second two hours	Post-depriva- tion	
7 Moderate (4 cigs)	33.7	44.3	31
5 Heavy (more than 4 cigs) ...	41.4	50.2	21

Will the increased smoking rate following deprivation be continued beyond the two-hour period? This is an important question, and it is impossible to answer based on the data obtained. However, we have some clues which are suggestive.

Plotting the cumulative total smoke volume (in ccs) across the four-hour ad lib period we see that intake accumulates in a near linear fashion across time, an observation we have already made in a different form by noting that first and second two-hour behavior was almost identical. Similarly we see a near linear accumulation of smoke volume during the two-hour deprivation period. The slope of the post-deprivation line is steeper than that of the control day * * *

Assuming the linearity to continue, then we can project both lines to an intersection point which represents equal volumes accumulated under the two conditions. For the present data this intersection occurs about 7½ hours after our observations stopped, implying that it will take a smoker 9½ hours to make up the intake he loses because of two hours of deprivation. It therefore seems unlikely that a group of smokers would be able to make up their deficit during a day, and would undoubtedly not be able to make up deficits which occurred late in the afternoon or early evening.

Personality Differences.—Examining the personality scores of our subjects we note that those who are high in anxiety tend to take more puffs than those who are low in anxiety. The correlation between the two variables is $+0.58$. Given the obvious relation between puffs and nicotine delivery, it is not surprising that anxiety was also positively related to nicotine intake: $r=+0.56$. Both these correlations are significant at the .05 level.

III A Comparative Evaluation of Three Methods For Field Testing Cigarettes—Accession Number 75-105 (Dunn and Martin)

Recently the New Cigarette Products Division demonstrated that they could provide any tar delivery and RTD combination within the 12 mg to 20 mg tar delivery range and 4" to 6" RTD range, and do so with good approximation to target specifications. This achievement made possible a critical comparative study of several alternative field test methods. Using high and low tar delivery levels, and high and low RTD levels, we tested the four combinations (High-High, Low-Low, Low-High and High-Low) against a control, middle-of-the-array, Marlboro-like cigarette, using three field testing methods.

The design of the study permitted a comparative assessment of the three methods and gave information about the influence of tar delivery and RTD changes on subjective response to cigarettes.

The most significant finding was that a method which permitted the testing of as many as four experimental cigarettes on a single mallout, with judgment based upon a 2-pack sample, was as sensitive and as potentially useful in cigarette testing as the

standard field testing procedure. Recommendations for further investigation of the technique are made in this report, with proposals for data treatment that promise to yield additional useful information from field tests.

We also concluded that a 5 mg reduction from the 17 mg tar delivery norm is clearly detectable to the average regular filter smoker, but he is tolerant of this reduction. He is not so tolerant of tar delivery increases.

RTD changes of ± 1 " from the 5" norm appear to have little influence upon overall acceptability. The 1" increase is clearly detectable; that 1" decrease did not appear to be so.

III. Further evaluation of delivery information influence on subjective acceptability of a low delivery cigarette (Martin and Schori)

Cigarettes at two delivery levels (15 mg and 8 mg) were rated on acceptability and strength by National POL nonmenthol smokers. One panel of 500 rated the cigarettes with no delivery information supplied. A second panel of 500 rated the cigarettes with tar and nicotine delivery levels clearly marked on the packs and on the ballots. The purpose of the test was to determine the effect of delivery information upon the subjective ratings of cigarettes at two distinctively different delivery levels.

With no information provided, the strength difference was clearly detected and the higher delivery cigarette was rated more acceptable.

The judgment of those panelists who were given delivery information contrasted sharply with the judgments of the no-information group. The low delivery cigarette was rated the more acceptable. The difference between the strength ratings of the two cigarettes, so evident under the no-information condition, was wiped out under the information condition, such that the two cigarettes were rated as being of equal strength, despite the fact that the panelists were told that the higher delivery cigarette delivered 80% more tar and nicotine.

We see two phenomena at work in these results:

(1) Given a cigarette "blind," a smoker will judge it largely on its own merits—given vital information along with the cigarette, the smoker's hedonic judgment of the cigarette will be confounded by socially learned value judgments, e.g. "low delivery is healthy and good."

(2) The smoker will move his rating on a physical attribute scale toward that end of the scale that corroborates his hedonic judgment, e.g., the cigarette rated more acceptable will be rated toward the "strong" rather than the "weak" end of the strength scale. This is the halo effect, a force we believe to be so pervasive in product testing that the validity of any judgment of the physical attributes of a product rendered in company with a preference or acceptability judgment of that product must be held suspect.

The practical implication of these findings is that a real marketing advantage is gained by calling attention to the delivery values of low delivery values of low delivery cigarettes, the effect being greatest among those smokers most likely to buy the low delivery cigarette anyway.

III. Menthol cigarette characteristics as perceived by blacks and whites (Martin, Jones and Schori)

The black menthol smoker is an important segment of the menthol market, yet all of the PM national field tests of menthol ciga-

rettes have been conducted with virtually all white panels. What with some 500 black menthol smokers having become available with the advent of the RP³ panel, the opportunity was afforded to study the black response to menthol cigarettes. We were interested in determining whether the two loosely defined ethnic groups differed in their assessments of variations in two important parameters of menthol cigarettes.

The study consisted of two runs, the second intended to be a partial replication. Because of unintended significant differences in the menthol levels of the two sets of cigarettes, the results of the two runs cannot be pooled but must be treated separately. Table 6 contains the critical values for the cigarettes.

TABLE 6.—THE CIGARETTE SPECIFICATIONS IN THE TWO BLACK MENTHOL RUNS

	Nicotine/Menthol	
	First Run	Second Run
Low Nicotine Low Menthol	84/48	85/48
Low Nicotine High Menthol	82/52	71/52
High Nicotine Low Menthol	1.08/48	1.17/35
High Nicotine High Menthol	1.12/76	1.12/80
Control	92/46	70/36

Table 7 gives the essential information about the panelists. Note that in the second run only black respondents were used.

TABLE 7.—THE PANELISTS USED IN THE TWO BLACK MENTHOL RUNS

	(The parenthesized value is the percent usable return)			
	First Run		Second Run	
	Black	White	Black	White
Number	250 (35)	350 (50)	405 (54)	0
Source	RP ³	Nat. POL	RP ³
	Menthol	Menthol	Menthol	

Two packs of each of the five cigarettes were provided in a carton mallout in both runs.

The ballots were identical in both runs, with ratings obtained for each cigarette on Acceptability, Strength and Menthol Level.

In the first run, where both white and black smokers were responding, the two groups were apparently detecting the menthol level differences among the cigarettes. It is to be noted, however, that black males and black Kool smokers were apparently not detecting these differences.

In the second run, with slightly larger differences in the menthol levels, all of the black subgroups were differentiating in terms of menthol levels.

There is some evidence that the blacks were less sensitive to "strength" differences than the whites. But the strength rating is of itself interesting in that panelists were reacting to menthol level as well as tar level when recording their strength ratings, i.e. menthol level ratings and strength ratings are probably not meaningfully distinguishable as discrete subjective variables in menthol cigarette tests. Also of interest is the observation that the variation in nicotine delivery level had no influence upon strength ratings.

Both groups of panelists in the first run were responding more favorably (higher acceptability ratings) to the lower level of menthol. These findings were not supported, however, in the second run, for here we find the black smokers were finding all of the cigarettes equally acceptable, despite the

fact that the menthol differences among the cigarettes were greater than in the first run.

Thus the first run finding that a lower menthol delivery is more acceptable among menthol smokers is made equivocal, especially for the black smoker.

What with the observation that the response of blacks may be less differentiating than whites and what with the questionable representativeness of a Virginia sample for the national market, it would seem feasible to establish a larger, national roster of black smokers especially for the evaluation of menthol candidates:

III. Mixed pack study (Ryan)

As deliveries drop we reasoned that eventually they could reach a point where all the cigarettes in a pack would be unsatisfying. The inclusion of some high delivery cigarettes in a pack would therefore give the smokers at least occasional feelings of satisfaction and should lead to a preference for a mixed pack over a homogeneous pack with the same tar and nicotine delivery per pack. Pilot testing with RP3 subjects twice indicated slight preferences for a mixture. Therefore a POL national field test of two different packs of 11 mg tar cigarettes was conducted in which one pack consisted of 20 cigarettes each delivering about 11 mg and the other pack was half made up of 8 mg and half of 14 mg cigarettes.

A total of 309 respondents (most of whom were low delivery smokers) answered the usual ballot questions giving a 9-point rating of each pack type, a preference, and so on. Observed rating and preference differences favoring the homogeneous pack did not reach statistical significance; but since we began the study hoping to show that the mixed pack would be preferred and get higher ratings, we have concluded that this idea should be rejected. This may, of course, be because the smokers found either the 14 or 8 mg model in the mixed pack unacceptable in flavor after taste, or in some other characteristic such as satisfaction.

There were a few interesting inversions in the ratings by 242 HIFI and 67 other than HIFI smokers. For example, the HIFI smokers thought the mixed pack stronger than the homogeneous (responding to the 14 mg?) and the non-HIFI smokers thought the homogeneous stronger than the mix (responding to the 8 mg?).

No one commented on the fact that the mixed pack consisted of different cigarettes.

In general the panelists rated all the cigarettes rather high—5.3 for the mix and 5.6 for the homogeneous pack—but many complained about them all burning too rapidly, being dry, and having a long filter. Several noted that the two-part paper filter broke or came apart.

The idea may still be feasible, but not with the cigarettes we used at the levels we tested.

STUDIES IN PROGRESS

I. Nicotine as a modulator of CNS arousal (Dunn, Martin and Jones)

Several investigators participating in the 1973 St. Martin Conference on "Motivation in Smoking" reported data suggesting that smoking in humans or nicotine injection in animals may have the effects of reducing aggressivity in overt behavior. Schachter also reported at that conference a greater tolerance for pain among smokers when allowed to smoke. There is also the readily observable, commonly acknowledged fact that smokers at a greater rate when under stress. These and other observations imply the in-

fluence of nicotine upon some control mechanism governing affective responsivity, the net effect upon overt behavior being to reduce the intensity of the emotionally-toned response, or raise the threshold for the elicitation of that response.

We have singled out aggressive behavior for study quite frankly because of the practical significance of the suspected effect of nicotine. If indeed, nicotine lowers the intensity or raises the threshold for a form of socially unsanctioned behavior, such as aggression, to demonstrate that effect could be of considerable consequence to the smoker and his protagonists.

We have a trio of studies in progress, all aimed at observing the effect of nicotine upon aggressive behavior in subhuman species. The species, or the individual animals, have been selected for their innate aggressivity in a form readily elicitable and readily quantifiable. The aggressive pattern is observed in the normal state of the animal and following the administration of nicotine. With proper controls, and with no change in baseline behaviors, (i.e. frequently recurring behaviors other than aggressive), any reduction in the aggressive responses can be attributed to the nicotinic effect specific to the aggressivity.

This rationale is common to all three of the studies. At the Laboratory of Comparative and Physiological Psychology at Ohio State University we have had a guiding hand in designing studies of the influence of injected nicotine upon the predatory attack of cats upon mice. At the Psychology Department of Rockefeller University, the influence of injected nicotine upon the predatory attack of rats upon mice is being investigated at our request. And at R&D we are observing for the influence of low concentrations of nicotine in the ambient water of male *Betta* fish upon their mirror display behavior.

Only preliminary observations are available, but in the two extra-R&D studies these are encouraging. The cats and rats are ceasing their attacks. Whether the base-line behaviors are remaining unchanged is now the subject of greatest interest as the data is being gathered.

In house, the toxicity phase of the *Betta* testing has been completed. We established that the LC₅₀ was greater than 10 ppm and less than 100 ppm v/v, using distilled nicotine base. The S in the 10 ppm solution was almost completely inactive, but would respond to prodding. The S in the 100 ppm solution was dead within 2 minutes. A possible avoidance pattern to the stimulus was noticed at 1 ppm. This will be the solution used as the higher concentration in the effects study. The lower concentration will be 0.1 ppm. These preliminary observations have indicated a possible differential effect of nicotine, whereby aggressive display is decreased and other base-line behaviors (e.g. air gulping) remain the same.

Thirty male *Bettas* of approximately the same age are being established in a housing tank for approximately one month. The fish will be calibrated (base line air gulping and display activity) before the effects study starts. Each fish will be in each of the three solutions for three test periods. Test days and solutions will be randomized. Measurements to be made will be number of times gill erection occurs, duration of gill erection and number of air gulps.

I. Personality, smoking, and stimulus deprivation (Ryan and Lleser)

We are interested in the problem of why some people smoke and others do not. The

personality research of Hans Eysenck offers one clue. Eysenck points out that the level of activity i. our central nervous system affects our performance efficiency. If it is too low or too high we perform inefficiently. Somewhere in between high and low there is an optimal point at which our bodies work at their best. This optimal point is markedly higher for some people than for the average man, while for still other people it is much lower than it is for the average. He hypothesized that in order to maintain optimal efficiency a person who is chronically below optimum level will seek to increase his CNS activity level. One way to do this is by seeking out stimulating situations—such as parties, music, sporting events, etc. which increase the amount of social and environmental stimulation to which he is exposed. These probably increase the amount of adrenalin in the system, which increases the CNS activity. Another way to increase CNS activity would be to consume socially approved chemicals which would have a similar effect on the body—such as the stimulant drugs caffeine and nicotine.

In fact it has been reported that people who (theoretically) seek out such stimulation, called extraverts because they are outward directed, are also more apt to be smokers than are those who avoid such stimulation, called introverts because they are inner directed.

In our next project we are testing this hypothesis by placing extraverts in a stimulus deficient environment (a dark, very quiet room) and watching to see whether they will seek stimulation (by working to turn on flashing lights and sounds) than will a group of introverts. Extraverted smokers who are smoke-deprived (or nicotine deprived) should be more in need of stimulation than those who have just finished smoking several cigarettes.

Similarly the hypothesis that introverted smokers will be less likely to work for stimulation after smoking cigarettes than when smoke deprived, for the extra input from smoke will tend to bring them close to the point where any extra environmental stimulation would make them feel uncomfortable. Hence they would be content with the status quo.

Thus an extension of the existing hypothesis predicts one type of difference in behavior for one group of people and the opposite type of behavior for another group—which always makes a nice study. (Actually we're not as convinced of the effect on the introverts as the foregoing suggests. They may respond similarly whether smoking or not, depending on how content they are with the quiet dark situation.)

I. Hyperkinetic child as a prospective smoker (Ryan)

We hypothesize that the characteristics of smokers and hyperkinetic children so closely resemble each other that in the past hyperkinetics were almost sure to become smokers. Thus we could account for some of the differences between smokers and non-smokers by the disproportionate representation of this special subgroup in the adult smoking population compared to the adult nonsmoking population.

We have undertaken a long term prospective study to identify the hyperkinetic and borderline hyperkinetic youngsters in the Chesterfield County school system, and to see whether they become smokers. All the children in one grade level were tested last year but the school system did not continue their testing this year to include extra

grades. This was due to the reorganization of the system by a new superintendent with its concomitant personnel and morale problems and readjustment of priorities. Because school systems must (under Virginia law) identify all problem children of all types, we expect to greatly expand the data base next year.

We did manage to check the reliability of last year's pupil ratings by having new teachers re-rate a previously rated subsample. The correlation was satisfactorily high (.486), suggesting that teachers agree on what constitutes problem behavior as defined by the questionnaire used.

I. Smoking and aggression (Jones)

The simulated driving test used in the risk-taking study has been modified so that college student subjects will receive inaccurate feedback regarding their performance on the task. It is expected that a student who is being paid for successful passing will respond aggressively if his successful passes are incorrectly recorded as crashes.

There will be 30 subjects tested in each of the three smoking conditions (nonsmoker, smoker-deprived, and smoker). Both groups of smokers will be instructed not to smoke at all the day they are to report to the laboratory. They will be told that urine samples will be taken to verify their abstinence. All subjects will be in the laboratory for at least an hour before the actual testing session begins, during which time they will fill out information forms, take a personality test and complete a Nowlis Mood Scale. Those in the smoker group will be permitted to smoke ad lib during this period and will be required to smoke one cigarette before each trial of the driving task. Smokers-deprived, however, will not be permitted to smoke until the entire experiment has been completed.

All subjects will have a 10-minute practice session before beginning two 20-minute trials. The first trial will be with accurate feedback so that baseline measurements may be obtained before inaccurate feedback is introduced. The smoker-deprived group will be given a third trial with inaccurate feedback. The group will be divided, with half of the subjects remaining deprived and the other half being permitted to smoke. All subjects will be given a Nowlis Mood Scale after each trial.

Subjects will be observed through a one-way mirror, verbal behavior will be coded, and the force with which they push the response buttons will be recorded as a measure of aggressive behavior. College student pilot subjects will be brought in so that observational techniques can be perfected.

III. Low delivery cigarettes and increased nicotine/tar ratios, a replication (Jones and Martin)

This test is a replication of a study (74-088) in which a 10.7 mg tar cigarette with a .12 nicotine/tar (N/T) ratio was found to be comparable to a Marlboro control in both subjective acceptability and strength. The three experimental cigarettes deliver approximately 10 mg tar with N/T ratios of .07, .10 and .13.

These cigarettes and a Marlboro control have been sent out to 300 RP³ smokers and returns are beginning to arrive. Panelists were asked to smoke the four cigarettes in any order they wish and to rate each cigarette on an acceptability scale and a strength scale before beginning to smoke the next cigarette code. In the event that the panelists smoke the cigarettes in the order suggested by the rating scales, all possible presen-

tations of the rating scales for the four cigarettes will have been used an equal number of times.

III. A low delivery cigarette with impact and flavor (Jones and Martin)

This is the first study in the 5-6 mg tar delivery program being carried out in collaboration with Paul Gauvin, Barbro Goodman, and Willie Houck. The purpose is to evaluate the relative influences of blend (Standard Marlboro blend vs 50% burley blend), burley spray (100% vs. 50%), and filter system (cellulose acetate filter vs. paper/cellulose acetate filter) on smoke impact and acceptability of cigarettes in the 5 to 6 mg tar range.

Panelists will be asked to smoke the eight experimental cigarettes and a Marlboro control in any order they wish and to rate each coded cigarette on an impact scale and an acceptability scale before beginning to smoke another cigarette code. The cigarettes have been released and should go out shortly to 400 RP³ smokers.

PLANNED STUDIES

I. Conference on the regulatory influence of nicotine on human behavior (Dunn)

An international conference on the regulatory influence of nicotine upon behavior has been proposed to the cigarette industry. We would hope that these studies on aggression could be reported at that conference, as well as studies of the influence of smoking upon other emotionally toned response patterns. The interest of prospective sponsors has yet to become great enough to provide the impetus for approval and support.

I. Is learning affected by nicotine? (Ryan and Lieser)

Some reports in the animal literature suggest that nicotine facilitates at least some aspects of the learning process. Recently Andersson and Post have reported that nicotine interferes with human learning in at least one task situation—the learning of a long list of nonsense syllables. We are unhappy with this report and unconvinced by its evidence, which appears to have some internal inconsistencies (e.g. a first nicotine cigarette slows learning, a second speeds it up); as well as some flaws in design (e.g. the control nicotine free cigarette used was Bravo—we prefer denicotinized tobacco); the "smokers" were very low intake people whom we would not classify as regular smokers (we prefer heavier smokers); both cigarettes smoked were the same type (we would have included switch groups); the list of syllables was very difficult (we would prefer a difficult and an easy list); only a few smokers were used; total smoke intake was unmeasured, etc. We're repeating the study (in part because we have student subjects already on hand in the lab who are participating in the Personality, Smoking and Stimulus deprivation study) essentially as run together with some of the corrections suggested above. We feel a responsibility to see that the published report is corrected if it is in fact wrong. The smoking studies in psychology journals contain too much unchallenged and unreplicated junk which has passed editorial review because the findings conform to editorial biases against tobacco. Sooner or later the accumulation of this unchallenged sloppy work will be used against us. We aren't interested in picking fights, but . . .

II. Inhalation patterns (Dunn and Levy)

Following our preliminary run reported at the November Project Review, we decided to

continue this work. In the preliminary runs we measured gas volume drawn in through the nose upon smoke inhalation, as well as that drawn in through the mouth. We did not measure puff volume, nor retention time, two measures that we now view as essential. We have also come to believe that the smoking of our subjects must be monitored over a period of many hours rather than during the smoking of a single cigarette. These two decisions force the experimentation into a new realm of complexity in terms of instrumentation and logistics. We have installed an observation room that permits complete control of sensory input. We plan to have our subjects remain in this room for four to eight-hour periods, measuring all parameters of smoking behavior throughout the period while varying factors suspected to be determinative of dosage. Some preliminary work on the additional instrumentation has been accomplished, but full scale resumption of the work has been delayed until the arrival in September of the new member of our staff, a physiological psychologist.

Our objective in this part of our program is to demonstrate the degree to which the smoker's absorption of smoke components is a function of his smoking behavior as opposed to his absorption being a function of what is made available to him in the cigarette smoke.

III. Annual cigarette monitoring (Ryan)

Cigarettes with tar and nicotine deliveries only a few years ago though much too low for public acceptance are now selling in the billions. Is the public's taste actually changing, so that even lower delivery cigarettes may soon become acceptable?

We lack data on the relative acceptability of cigarettes of different delivery evaluated by the same smokers. No broad studies of this type have ever been conducted here. To fill the data gap we have had Marlboro rods attached to five different filter systems to produce 85 mm nonmenthol cigarettes with nominal deliveries of 20, 17, 14, 11, and 8 mg tar, which we will ask a National POL panel to evaluate annually. The filter systems, whose characteristics were chosen by W. Houck and W. Claffin, represent the draw and other characteristics of typical cigarettes now marketed at these delivery levels.

The actual deliveries are: 19.6, 17.6, 14.3, 10.5, and 7.9 mg tar; 1.22, 1.10, 0.93, 0.74, and 0.59 mg nicotine per cigarette, respectively.

Smokers will be asked only to rate the acceptability (on a labeled scale from 1-9) of the five products in a blind test, basing their evaluation on two packs of each type sent them as a carton mailout. A variety of possible outcomes can be foreseen. In any given year different acceptabilities are expected for the five cigarettes, with the most acceptable being the one which most resembles and the lowest being the one which least resembles the smoker's own brand—if the smoker bases the acceptability of the unbranded models on cues based on their resemblance to his own brand. To the extent that he has some other criterion, then the evaluations will differ from this model. For example, if he likes taste but has chosen to smoke a low taste cigarette for obscure reasons (e.g. health? advertising campaigns? imitating his friends?) then he should give higher acceptability ratings to the high delivery models than to the low delivery models, no matter what his own brand is. The reader can speculate for himself on how other possible demographic or smoking history variables might be expected to affect the acceptability ratings.

To be sure that a wide variety of demographic characteristics are present we will poll a large sample from the FOL National panel, oversampling young subgroups to insure reasonable returns.

Although basic information of interest can be gathered from the returns of any given year, our principal interest will be in the acceptability change from year to year.

III. Low delivery cigarettes and RTD (Jones)

A study is being planned in collaboration with some people in Development in which the question of the influence of RTD level upon acceptability and strength ratings of low delivery cigarettes will be further explored. Based upon the recommendations given in a previous report (75-105), the multiple monadic testing procedure will be used. After cigarette models are designed and cigarettes made, they will be sent out to a large panel of National POL smokers.

III. Perceived attributes of cigarettes, a replication (Jones)

Two studies have been conducted concerning smoker perceptions of regular filter (72-088) and menthol (73-027) cigarettes. It seems that with the recent interest in longer (120 mm) cigarettes, smokers' ideas about cigarettes may have shifted such that they place more emphasis on length than they did previously. In addition to possible changes in what cigarette attributes are considered important, there have been brands introduced since the previous studies were completed (e.g. Marlboro Lights, Winston Lights, Kool Milds) which may have filled what at that time appeared to be gaps in the market (e.g. low in delivery, high in flavor). Therefore, plans are being made to replicate the perceived attributes studies.

Charge Number: 1600

Program Title: Smoker Psychology

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn, Jr.

Period Covered: April 1-30, 1977

Date of Report: May 13, 1977

Project Title: Regulator Identification Project

Written by: C.J. Levy

Twenty-five college student smokers have been smoking high and low delivery cigarettes for two weeks at home. These students are now coming in to our Franklin Street office on four separate occasions to smoke under more controlled conditions.

Project Title: Low Nicotine Cigarettes

Written by: C.J. Levy

Forty-eight R&D smokers compared two types of cigarettes in a booth test. Both cigarettes were made from tobacco which had been treated with steam and ammonia by Fran Utsch's group. The cigarettes (control and experimental) delivered 20.0 mg tar, 0.40 mg nicotine and 19.9 mg tar, 0.87 mg nicotine, respectively. The nicotine delivery of the experimental cigarettes was increased using nicotine citrate. No significant differences were found between the two cigarettes in this test.

Eighteen (out of 23) smokers who previously identified the experimental cigarette as producing more inhalation impact than the control were subsequently asked to smoke the cigarettes on three more occasions. Only three of these smokers consistently identified the experimental cigarette as producing more inhalation impact. Eight identified it twice and seven identified it only once.

We conclude from these tests that there are no dramatic differences between the

cigarettes when tested using a paired comparison methods, even through the experimental cigarette delivers twice as much nicotine.

Project Title: Measurement of Smoke Inhalation

Written by: C.J. Levy

(a) We are continuing to collect chest expansion data using a mercury strain gauge. We are currently working out calibration procedures with the assistance of Dr. Farone.

(b) In another approach we have brought in Dr. Eli Fromm of Drexel University as a consultant to advise in the development of a device for unobtrusively monitoring smoke inhalation under normal smoking conditions.

Project Title: Annual Monitoring

Written by: F.J. Ryan

We sent cigarettes to 4,000 panelists. All but 128 were delivered. Ballots have been returned from 2,953 people, a return of 76%. Not all of these will be usable. At least 197 (or 6.7%) have incomplete data or will be voided for various reasons: being smoked through an extra filter, or by a smoker who had a cold, or by a nonsmoker, etc. At least 125 more ballots (or 4.2%) were returned by people who had switched to menthol brands since last being polled.

Ballots are now being coded and a preliminary report should be ready by mid-June.

Project Title: Verbal Learning and Smoking

Written by: F.J. Ryan

Only two more subjects are needed to complete the data gathering phase of this study.

Project Title: Perceived Smoke Strength and Interpuff Interval

Written by: F.J. Ryan

We have screened 25 R&D smokers to find 20 who can detect differences in strength between cigarettes of widely varying delivery. They will be asked to rate the apparent strength of a 9 mg cigarette smoked at long or short interpuff intervals. If short interpuff intervals increase apparent strength, then we may be able to account for the increased puff count sometimes observed on low delivery products.

Project Title: Hyperactivity

Written by: F.J. Ryan

To test our hypothesis that hyperactive children are more likely to become cigarette smokers than nonhyperactives, we have begun pilot research for two prospective studies in collaboration with others interested in hyperactivity. Together with Dr. Ron David, a pediatric neurologist at MCV, we are identifying a group of his patients who are known to have their hyperactive or impulsive behaviors reduced by drugs (e.g. Ritalin) and a group which does not respond to drugs. Together with Dr. Al Finch, research psychologist at the Virginia Treatment Center, and Dr. Howard Garner, VCU, we are identifying a group of patients treated with Ritalin or other stimulants, and a group of controls with nonhyperactive behavior problems. In both cases we will later contact the children to see whether they have become smokers, comparing the incidence of smoking among these groups with the incidence in the nonhyperactive school population.

In return for access to their files we are helping our colleagues find (1) the variables which account for drug-responding and non-responding (Dr. David) and (2) the effect of miscellaneous treatments on later adjustment to school and society (Drs. Finch and Garner). Neither of these colleagues is being financially supported.

Project Title: Patterned Cigarette Paper

Written by: E.C. Gay

A second consumer evaluation of patterned papers was conducted using eight designs printed in green. A clear winner emerged as top choice of respondents across and within all subgroups. It has a "light" overall appearance, with a "small" "plain" design according to panelists. Additional evaluations are programmed to evaluate still other patterns, with first and second choices from each heat to compete in a final runoff evaluation later.

Charge Number: 1600

Project Title: Smoker Psychology

Period Covered: February 1-28, 1978

Project Leader: W.L. Dunn

Date of Report: March 10, 1978

Project Title: Smoking and Learned Helplessness

Written by: C.J. Levy

We continue to collect data. We are having some difficulty recruiting the male smokers needed to complete the study.

Project Title: Smoking of Low Nicotine Cigarettes

Written by: C.J. Levy

We have received the analytical data on our experimental cigarette. The nicotine-fortified cigarette delivers 1.34 mg of nicotine, and the low-nicotine cigarette delivers 0.14 mg of nicotine. We are currently recruiting R&D smokers for our study.

Project Title: Smoking Parameters Study

Written by: F.P. Gullotta

A follow-up on the completed heart rate study is being implemented. In addition to heart rate, respiration and puff measures will also be recorded. Data collection will begin in one to two weeks and the study should be completed in five to six weeks.

Project Title: EEG

Written by: F.P. Gullotta

Neither the EEG/Polygraph nor the computer has arrived. The EEG will be shipped from Quincy, MA this week. It is anticipated that the computer will arrive within a month.

A meeting has been arranged with Mr. D. Derr of Coulbourn Instruments to discuss the purchase of auditory and somatosensory evoked potential modules to be used in studies planned for the second half of 1978.

Project Title: Smoking Diary Study

Written by: F.J. Ryan

Butt collection is complete. Although 33 students completed the study, we expect to discard a few because their results appear affected by influenza or chronic unreliability. We have switched full-flavor smokers to low delivery and back, or switched low-delivery smokers to full flavor and back. The data consist of butt counts, butt lengths, nicotine in filler analyses, time of day each cigarette was smoked, and proportion of day spent in various activities.

We are interested in the extent to which smoking behavior changed when cigarette delivery changed. We are seeking (1) to find the extent to which nicotine need governed behavior and (2) to find the extent to which stimulus situations controlled the behavior. Data evaluation will be a lengthy process.

Project Title: Hyperkinetic Children

Written by: F.J. Ryan

Obstacles presented by school systems and physicians concerned with the various "privacy acts" passed by state and national legislatures have made it very difficult for us to

conduct studies using school and medical records of minors. Therefore we have stopped our activities in this area.

Project Title: Annual Monitoring
Written by: F.J. Ryan

The second "mallout" of the annual monitoring cigarettes is now firmly scheduled for the end of March. Ballots are essentially the same as last year. We will contact about 2700 of last year's panelists, plus 1300 supplementary people who smoke full-flavor or low-delivery nonmenthol filter cigarettes. Ballots are to be returned on or before April 21.

Project Title: Exit Brand Cigarettes

Written by: F.J. Ryan

A report has been written outlining the findings of the EXIT-Brand Study.

PHILIP MORRIS RESEARCH CENTER—BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH ANNUAL REPORT (PART II) APPROVED BY T.S. OSDENE & DISTRIBUTED TO H. WAKEHAM ET AL.—NOV. 1, 1974

This is the second of a two-part annual report covering the research activities under Charge No. 1600. The first part was prepared by Frank Ryan in August, 1974, and included accomplishments by him. This second part has been prepared by Tom Schori and Bill Dunn and summarizes accomplishments in their respective areas:

OBJECTIVES

Our objectives under 1600 are threefold:

- I. To learn more about why people smoke.
- II. To learn more about how people smoke.
- III. To further identify what people want to smoke.

For each of these objectives we have formulated hypotheses which guide our research effort. For the sake of clarity, the studies being reported on are designated by a three-part prefix. The first symbol is a Roman numeral designating the objective being pursued, the second symbol is a letter of the alphabet identifying the hypothesis being tested and the third symbol is an Arabic number which identifies the study.

Below we set forth in sequence the three objectives and list the working hypotheses under each objective:

I. To learn more about why people smoke.

IA. Cigarette smoke improves efficiency in the performance of complex psychological tasks.

IB. Cigarette smoking attenuates, modulates or otherwise influences emotional arousal such as to be gratifying or rewarding to the smoker, thus reinforcing the smoking act.

II. To learn more about how people smoke.

IIA. Smoking patterns vary as a function of changes in cigarette and the smoke it generates.

IIIB. Dose-control continues even after the puff of smoke is drawn into the mouth.

III. To further identify what people want to smoke.

IIIA. There are optimum combinations of critical variables in smoke composition.

IIIB. Deterioration in cigarette acceptability can be minimized when reducing tar deliveries by not reducing or changing other critical properties.

IIIC. More effective ways can be developed for obtaining consumer response to cigarettes.

From this point on we will present the individual studies of 1600, grouping them by progress status in three sections:

1. Completed

2. Data Being Collected

3. Preinvestigative (conceptualization and instrumentation)

The Ryan studies will be cited with page references to his portion of the annual report.

COMPLETED STUDIES SINCE JULY, 1973

IA1—(Dunn and Martin)—THE INFLUENCE OF CIGARETTE SMOKING UPON THE VOLUNTARY CONTROL OF ALPHA TYPE ELECTROENCEPHALOGRAPHIC ACTIVITY (Accession No. 74-075)

Observations suggest that there are links between brain wave frequencies and psychological levels of alertness. The highly aroused human will display brain activity at the upper end of the 1-30 Hz range. When drowsy or sleeping, the dominant activity will be at the low end of the spectrum. The 1-30 Hz range has been divided somewhat arbitrarily into four bands, each band associated with a reasonably circumscribable psychological state. The beta band, including all signals exceeding 13 Hz, is linked to the state of alert responsiveness to external stimulation. Those ranging from 8 to 4 Hz, the theta waves, correspond to the drowsy, sleepy states of mind. Delta, less than 4 Hz, is seen in deep sleep states. The alpha waves (8-13 Hz) are the most interesting in that these appear to be dominant when the subject is in a relaxed but awake meditative state, not unlike the states thought to characterize the meditating Indian yogi.

Thus, if one seeks to induce the "alpha state" in oneself, the effort can be facilitated by the auditory signal linked to a dominant alpha frequency. It is not clear how the gradual increase in control occurs, but it is a matter of observation that the increase does occur and that the feedback signal is facilitative.

In that we here at P.M. R&D are intent upon identifying psychological changes induced by smoke inhalation, it occurred to us that we should determine whether smoking has an influence upon achieving the alpha state. We considered it not unreasonable to anticipate a smoking effect upon rate of learning of the control of alpha activity, or even more likely an effect upon time on target during a fixed period of observation. We did not arrive at this position by way of a conceptual model, at any rate not in any formal, deductive manner. Perhaps at some pre- or sub-conceptual state there is an intuitive belief that we should be paying attention to the more subtle psychological functions having to do with alertness and concentration as possible points at which we may find smoke inhalation having some facilitative effect. In any event we had no preconceptions as to what effect, if any, smoking might have upon the acquisition and maintenance of the alpha-state. Long inured to the elusiveness of smoke inhalation effects upon psychological state or function, we have come to proceed in a pragmatic way by sinking shafts here and there for signs of smoke-induced change. Either facilitatory or inhibitory effect would be a welcome clue.

Nineteen R&D smokers, with sensing electrodes and headphones in place, sat in daily 10-minute sessions learning to keep the auditory tone on by maintaining a dominant alpha brain wave pattern. These sessions were continued until on-target time had plateaued. Nine subjects were allowed to smoke freely prior to session, and ten abstained from the preceding evening's bedtime. This was Phase I for which we had the following objectives:

1. To bring all subjects to a plateau level in maintaining the alpha state.

2. To observe for differences in learning rate between those smoking prior to the observation period and those abstaining from smoking.

3. To observe for differences in learning rate between introverts and extroverts.

4. To observe for correlations between certain measures of personality traits and acquisition rate in maintaining a dominant alpha pattern.

Mean time-on-target in the first session was 69%, with a range from 15% to 93%. The high base line of 69% for the first session was a surprise. It was also an unanticipated constraint on the study in that little latitude was left for improvement in performance. Mean time-on-target at plateau was 82%. Introverts performed better than extroverts, both initially and at plateau. We concluded after a thorough analysis that whether or not a smoker smoked immediately preceding observation had no discernible effect upon acquisition rate, not initial, nor final performance levels. Certain personality traits, as measured by the Cattell 16 PF Scales were found to be correlated with performance improvement, but these are of little interest for our purposes here. (See Table 4 of Accession No. 74-075.)

Having plateaued, a subject entered Phase II. Sixteen of the original 19 subjects completed Phase II. All subjects were pooled, each serving as his own control. There was a 5-minute pretreatment, 3-minute treatment and 5-minute post-treatment sequences. The pre- and post-treatment periods were alpha time-on-target periods. The 3-minute treatment period was a cigarette smoking and a dry-puffing period on alternate days. Each subject went through six such days, 3 experimental (smoking) and 3 control (dry-puffing).

Although there was a 2 to 1 tendency for introverts to improve and a 2 to 1 tendency for extroverts to worsen as a result of smoking, our numbers are simply too small and our performance values too variable to allow us to draw any inferences other than that all of the differences observed were but the result of chance fluctuations.

Thus we have been unable to relate any of the measures pertaining to alpha control to cigarette smoking. Note that we did not look for differences between smokers and non-smokers, since our interest was in the immediate effect of smoke inhalation.

We did make the passing observation in Phase II that there appeared to be some disruption during the initial part of the post-treatment (smoking) five minutes of observation. Not anticipating such transient, short-lived effect, we were not prepared to record anything other than cumulative performance over the whole of the five minutes. So we plan to follow up on this observation by running a few subjects under conditions in which we can record time-on-target for briefer time intervals. The results of this briefer study will be reported separately.

IA2—(Ryan and Lieser)—Effects of smoking and delayed audio-feedback on speech behavior

(See pp. 6-8—Behavioral Research Annual Report, Part I, Accession No. 74-065)

IA3—(Schori and Jones)—Smoking and attentional capabilities

Smokers, smokers-deprived, and non-smokers performed a tracking task while simultaneously performing a cross-adaptive loading task. The loading task automatically varied in difficulty such that it utilized that portion of the subject's total attentional capacity which was not needed for satisfactory tracking performance, i.e., his

spare attentional capacity. In this fashion, the size of the total work load (tracking and loading tasks combined) was individually tailored to utilize each subject's entire attentional capacity. No differences were found among groups either in tracking or loading task performance. Therefore, it was concluded that smokers, smokers-deprived, and nonsmokers expended similar amounts of attentional effort in performing the tracking task and, thus, smoking condition did not affect the size of the workload which could be handled. Reference: 73-123, September, 1973.

IB1—(Ryan and Dunn)—Heart rate change under arousal conditions among smokers and nonsmokers

The Emory-Ryan hypothesis predicts reduction in magnitude of heart rate increment under smoking conditions. We did an exploratory study in which arousal was induced by physical exercise, using smokers and nonsmokers whose heart rates were radio-telemetered to a nearby recorder. The study was aborted when we observed no difference in heart rate increments for the two groups of subjects.

IB2—(Schori and Jones)—Smoking, arousal, and mood change

In this study smokers, smokers-deprived, and nonsmokers were required to solve multiple choice problems (mathematical problems adapted from the College Boards and the Graduate Record Examination) which were rear-projected onto a screen. When the subject had solved a problem, he indicated his response by pressing the button—just below the rear-projection screen—that corresponded to the alternative he had chosen. Each subject, on different days, performed the task at 3 problem presentation rates, i.e., slow-paced, self-paced, and fast-paced. Performance of smokers-deprived was definitely better (that is, they responded both more quickly and more accurately to the problems presented) than either nonsmokers or smokers—the latter two groups exhibiting comparable performance. That the smokers-deprived performed better, without going into detail, was explained in terms of two factors in combination: (1) simply being deprived of cigarettes; and (2) the nature of the task itself.

No differences in personality profiles were found between nonsmokers and smokers (which for this analysis included smokers-deprived). This may not be too surprising. When personality differences between nonsmokers and smokers have been reported, it has generally been based upon large scale samplings of heterogeneous populations—not from small relatively homogeneous populations such as our college student sample. Furthermore, even when large heterogeneous populations are sampled, differences in personality characteristics that have been reported are very slight. In agreement with most literature on the topic, heart rates of smokers were substantially higher than those for nonsmokers and smokers-deprived, viz., an increase in heart rate of 10-11 beats/min. could be attributed to smoking.

We had expected that mood change would be more prevalent under the slow and fast-paced conditions than under this self-paced condition. However, this is not what we observed. Instead, mood change, i.e., changes in affect, was much more prevalent (more significant mood changes occurred) under the self-paced condition. Smokers, though, did experience less mood change than did nonsmokers or smokers-deprived—which in agreement with similar findings of other in-

vestigators does suggest that smoking actually may act to temper emotional reactivity. Draft manuscript, October, 1974—the technical report should be out shortly.

IIA1—(Ryan)—Puff three—Chained puffing (see p. 1, Accession No. 74-065)

IIA2—(Ryan)—Puff four—Puffing behavior at 30- and 60-second puff intervals (see p. 2, Accession No. 74-065)

IIA3—(Ryan)—Puff five—Puffing behavior changes on cigarette cut to different lengths (see pp. 2-4, Accession No. 74-065)

IIA4—(Schori and Jones)—Does the smoker compensate for changes in delivery in order to regulate intake? (TNT-4)

Winston smokers from the RP3 panel smoked 7 different cigarettes each for 1 week. There were 6 experimental cigarettes, with tar ranging from 8.2 to 14.6 mg and nicotine ranging from .28 to .90 mg, and a Marlboro control. The number of cigarettes smoked/day and the amount of rod consumed per cigarette (mm) were recorded from saved butts. If the smoker does change the number of cigarettes smoked or amount of rod consumed to maintain relatively constant intake as changes in cigarette deliveries occur, this should be evident as deliveries both increase and decrease from his accustomed levels. However, we found no evidence of any such regulatory behavior, i.e., they failed to compensate for the decreased availability of tar and nicotine by changing either the number of cigarettes which they smoked or the amount of rod consumed from each cigarette. In the face of mounting evidence (of which this study is an instance) that smokers do not alter consumption rates sufficiently to support the intake constancy hypothesis, this hypothesis must be viewed with skepticism unless some other mechanism for regulating intake can be discovered. Reference: 74-078, August, 1974.

IIIB1—(Schori and Jones)—Smoking and low delivery cigarettes (TNT-3)

Smokers from the POL National Panel were required to smoke 14 mg tar cigarettes at .30, .75 and 1.20 mg nicotine, 11 and 8 mg tar cigarettes at .30 and .75 mg nicotine, and a Marlboro control. The 14 mg tar, .75 mg nicotine cigarette (a cigarette with proportional reductions in nicotine and tar) was accorded an acceptability rating equivalent to that of the Marlboro control. The other experimental cigarettes, however, did not compare very favorably to Marlboro in acceptability. Reference 73-129, October, 1973.

IIIB2—(Schori and Martin)—Low delivery cigarettes and increased RTD (DL-2)

Smokers in an R&D handout test and in an RP3 test smoked a Marlboro control and three low delivery cigarettes—averaging less than 10 mg tar—with RTDs varying upwards from 4.8 in. We have predicted, based upon earlier data, that increasing the RTDs of low delivery cigarettes would make them subjectively appear stronger. However, this is not what we found. The Marlboro control was given the highest mean strength rating. The next highest strength rating was ascribed to the low delivery cigarette with the 4.8 in RTD while the lowest mean strength rating was given to the low delivery cigarette having the highest RTD. Although there can be other interpretations of this finding, it appears most likely that the variations in strength ratings among the low delivery cigarettes reflect their variations in RTD.

The most interesting finding had nothing to do with the relationship between RTD and cigarette strength. It was the fact that the Marlboro control, in comparison to the low

delivery cigarettes was not the most acceptable cigarette to the smokers. Thus, it may be possible to make cigarettes delivering less than 10 mg tar which will be just as acceptable to high delivery smokers as a standard Marlboro—a finding similar to those that we have reported earlier in conjunction with studies of smoker response to cigarettes of somewhat higher deliveries than those of the present study. Reference: 74-054, June, 1974.

IIIB3—(Schori and Martin)—Low Delivery Cigarettes and Increased Nicotine/Tar Ratios (DL-1)

In this study, we compared 3 low delivery cigarettes (in the 10 mg tar range) to a Marlboro control. One of these cigarettes, i.e., the 10.7 mg tar, .12 nicotine to tar (N/T) ratio cigarette, was comparable to the Marlboro in terms of both subjective acceptability and strength. In other words, that cigarette was perceived to be a full-flavored low delivery cigarette. Although we previously have had cigarettes, in this tar delivery range, which achieved parity with Marlboro in acceptability, this is the first time that such a cigarette has achieved parity in both acceptability and strength. However, we cannot be certain whether the high N/T ratio was an essential factor in that cigarette being perceived as a full-flavored cigarette. And obviously we do not wish to increase N/T ratios unless it is absolutely necessary to do so in order to make full-flavored low delivery cigarettes. Reference: 74-088, September, 1974.

IIIC1—(Schori and Jones)—A Method for Field Testing a Distinctively Flavored Candidate

In response to a specific need, we developed a general testing methodology for consumer tests of novel cigarette products. The methodology itself is currently being evaluated in an actual product test. Reference: Memo to Filosa, April, 1974.

IIIC2—(Schori)—Analyzing Descriptive Panel Data

Having recommended a different approach for analyzing descriptive panel data, we continue to do these descriptive panel analyses on a regular basis.

IIIC3—(Schori and Jones)—A Procedure to Identify Gaps in an Existing Product Market

We prepared this paper to present at the ASTM Symposium this fall (based upon an earlier report—72-088, June, 1972). However, it was felt that the material covered in the paper was of a proprietary nature and, therefore, was not suitable for outside release. Reference: Unpublished manuscript, September, 1974.

OUTSIDE PUBLICATIONS:

Schori, T.R. & Jones, B.W. Smoking and multiple-task performance. *Virginia Journal of Science*, in press.

Schari, T.R. & Jones, B.W. Smoking and work load. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, in press.

DATA BEING COLLECTED:

IA4—(Schori and Jones)—The Relationship Between Smoking and Risk-Taking Behavior

It has often been suggested that smokers take more risks than do nonsmokers. This notion, though, has been based upon non-experimental data (e.g., the fact that smokers have more traffic accidents than nonsmokers). And such data do not take into consideration certain critical factors. For instance, they do not take into consideration possible differences in exposure between

smokers and nonsmokers which could explain their differential traffic accident rates. Therefore, the present investigation was designed to determine experimentally whether smoking condition (i.e., smoking, smoking-deprivation, and nonsmoking) actually does affect the individual's degree of willingness to take risks. The task itself is a simulated driving task.

IIA4—(Ryan and Lieser)—Puff six-Puffing behavior following long and short intervals (see pp. 8-9, Accession No. 74-065)

IIA5—(Ryan and Lieser)—Smoking following cigarette deprivation

We want to know whether smokers who are deprived of smoke—by being in a "no-smoking" area or situation—will make up for this smoke deficit when they leave the "no smoking" area.

We will observe number of puffs and number of cigarettes smoked in a two-hour control period, and compare these figures with those observed in a two-hour period following two hours of smoke deprivation.

IIIB—(Dunn and Martin)—Patterns of smoke inhalation

We are investigating the manner in which the puff of smoke in the mouth is introduced further into the respiratory system.

We became interested in this aspect of smoking behavior through earlier work on the problem of dose control. Since 1968 when we undertook SEX-I, an extensive field study of the quantity of smoke taken into the mouth, we have been investigating the extent to which the smoker regulates intake and the manner in which he regulates intake.

A general premise in our theoretical model of the cigarette smoker is that the smoking habit is maintained by the reinforcing effects of the pharmacologically active components of smoke. A corollary to this premise is that the smoker will regulate his smoke intake so as to achieve his habitual quota of the pharmacological action. As circumstances and body state vary, so will vary the desired level of action. Also as the concentration of the active agents in the smoke varies, so will vary the amount of smoke taken in.

Seeking confirmation of our model, since 1968 we have been measuring intake levels while systematically varying circumstances, body state and smoke composition. We have observed changes in the predicted directions, but the magnitude of the changes has always fallen far short of that change necessary to infer that the smoker is exercising quota regulation of intake. Others have reported similar investigations with similar findings.

Recent observations have led us to question whether the indices of intake which have been investigated to date are, in fact, the appropriate indices to be measuring. We have counted the number of cigarettes smoked, we have counted the number of puffs taken, we have measured amount of rod consumed and we have obtained reasonably accurate estimates of how much smoke is actually taken into the mouth over extended periods of time.

All of these measures fall short of determining the amount of smoke brought into contact with the absorbing surfaces within the lungs. We now have evidence that with some smokers a good portion of the smoke of a given puff never goes beyond the mouth, it being retained in the mouth to be expelled ahead of that portion which was inhaled. Furthermore, we have good evidence that the gas inhaled following the drawing of a

puff from the cigarette is not exclusively the air/smoke mixture introduced through the mouth. A greater or lesser amount of air is introduced through the nose, mixing at the pharyngeal junction of the nose and mouth with the air/smoke mixture being swept in from and through the mouth.

These observations have made us aware of a heretofore unnoticed mechanism that has the potential of affording the smoker a wide latitude of control over the amount of smoke he brings into contact with the absorption sites.

It has been our purpose in this, the first of an anticipated series of studies, to systematically observe the inhalation patterns of smokers. We are measuring flow rates and volumes of air drawn through the mouth and air drawn through the nose while varying tar and nicotine levels in the mainstream smoke. If the smoker is seeking his quota of the pharmacologically active ingredients, and the regulatory mechanisms available at the post-puff levels are being used toward this end, then we would expect to find directional changes in the ratio of air drawn in through the nose and the air/smoke mixture being drawn in through the mouth, and/or changes in the total inhalation volume.

The problem has required the fabrication of novel apparatus. With much trial and error we have devised a means of independently measuring the rate and volume of air drawn in through the two orifices as the smoker inhales immediately following the drawing of a puff of smoke into his mouth. We have designed and constructed a face mask of silicon rubber which contains a cavity for the nose and a cavity for the mouth. These cavities are sealed off from ambient air and from each other when the subject's face is in position. The mask is rather massive and self supporting, yet flexible enough to effect a good seal with a face. The mask is rigidly mounted on a plexiglass sheet. Leading off behind the plexiglass sheet are two 3/8" i.d. tygon tubes, one connecting the mouth cavity to a flow rate sensor and the other connecting the nose cavity to a second flow rate sensor.

The sensors responding to flow rate are hot wire anemometers. The voltage changes in these sensors reflecting air flow are processed through electronic circuitry to be finally recorded on polygraph paper in terms of flow rate and air volume. The system is calibrated such that quantified flow rates and volumes in cc can be read directly from pen deflections.

Seated before the apparatus, the subject takes a puff from his cigarette inserts his face into the mask, inhales, withdraws from the mask and exhales in normal fashion. The only part of the sequence occurring with face in mask is the inhalation.

We have used twelve volunteer R&D pack-a-day-plus smoker of regular filter cigarettes. Each subject smoked one cigarette at the mask in the morning and afternoon of each workday. The study ran for three weeks. On the first week they smoked their regular cigarettes. On the second and third weeks they smoked Commanders and Carltons, with a split-group balanced order. The cigarette designated for a given week was smoked continuously by the subject from the first session on Monday to the last session on Friday.

Data collections has been completed and the analysis is underway. The results available at the time will be reported at Project Review on November 8.

Data collection has been completed and the analysis is underway. The results avail-

able at the time will be reported at Project Review on November 8.

IIIA1—(Schori, Jones and Martin)—Menthol cigarette preferences of Blacks and whites (MN-3)

Black menthol smokers have generally been inadequately represented in our National menthol cigarette tests. In fact, our National POL Panel, for all practical purposes, is a White panel since nonwhite returns from product tests probably rarely exceeded 3% of the total returns. Since there is considerable evidence which suggests that Blacks and Whites may differ in their likes and dislikes in menthol cigarettes, the present investigation was designed to identify Black and White preferences for menthol and nicotine deliveries in Alpine-like cigarettes. Accordingly, Black menthol smokers (from RP3) and White menthol smokers (National POL panelists) were required to smoke and rate 4 experimental Alpine-like cigarettes (which delivered two levels of nicotine at each of two levels of menthol) and an Alpine control. The lower level of nicotine, for the experimental cigarettes, was slightly lower than Alpine. The lower level of menthol was comparable to that of Alpine.

The results from the first run of this test have been analyzed, but questions have been raised about the reliability of the data. The study is to be replicated before the report is finalized.

IIIB/C1—(Dunn and Martin)—A field test of systematically varied tar and RTD levels in which three methods of cigarette presentation are compared

This study has been in process since November of last year, its execution being delayed by difficulties in fabricating cigarettes with the required tar/RTD combinations. The proper combinations have recently been achieved by Messrs Houck and Claflin, and the test is awaiting its turn on the RP3 panel.

STUDIES IN THE PREINVESTIGATIVE PHASE:

A Prefatory Note: It has been well established that one of the differences between smokers and nonsmokers is that smokers will tend as a group to display more aggressivity. There have recently been some suggestions in the literature that those individuals prone to aggression may have learned that smoking facilitates the control of these tendencies; and that it is for this reason that one finds a higher incidence of aggression prone individuals within a smoking population than within a nonsmoking population.

If this interpretation is correct, then one would expect to find that when the smoker is allowed to smoke freely, his display of aggression in an aggression-iciting situation will be at a level comparable to that of nonsmokers, but when deprived of the opportunity to smoke for a period of time before and during observation, his display of aggression will be manifestly higher than that of nonsmokers.

We recognize, however, that any observed increase in aggressivity when deprived of cigarettes may be as readily explained as the emergence of reactions to deprivation, not unlike those to be observed upon withdrawal from any of a number of habituating pharmacological agents.

The Behavioral Research Laboratory is instituting a series of studies on aggression in smokers. Collectively, the studies will be aimed at (1) observing for differential aggressivity under free-smoking vs. deprived

smoking conditions and (2) if increased aggression under deprivation is observed, differentiating between personality-related aggression and deprivation-induced aggression.

Our strategy for distinguishing between the personality-related and deprivation-induced aggression is premised upon the logic that if the aggression is personality related, then it should be observable (1) among prospective smokers, and (2) among abstaining smokers whose period of abstinence has extended beyond the withdrawal period.

Study IB1 (Schori and Jones) is designed to induce aggressivity in order to determine if, indeed, differential aggressivity under free-smoking and deprived smoking conditions is observable. Study IB2 (Dunn and Martin) is designed to observe for aggressivity the abstaining smoker whose abstinence has extended beyond the period in which deprivation-induced behaviors are likely to be present. Study IB3 (Ryan and Lieser) is a longitudinal study attempt to observe for personality-related or trait aggressivity in the prospective smoker.

IB1—(Schori and Jones)—Smoking and aggression

This study is designed to evaluate the influence of smoking condition on both aggression and performance in a complex task situation at 3-levels of failure-induced frustration. The task is a slightly modified version of the simulated driving task that is being used in the "Smoking and Risk-taking" study.

IB2—(Dunn and Martin)—Bruxism suppressed by smoking

Bruxism in medical cryptology, is but the habitual act of grinding the teeth. In a recent experiment aimed at treating the habit through the application of biofeedback principles, an enterprising psychologist at Claremont Graduate School, Dr. John Rugh, devised an unobtrusive, totable electronic package which emitted an audible signal whenever the tension in jaw muscles exceeded a preset threshold level. The package embodied a sensor whose output voltage correlated with the electrical activity of the muscles over which it was placed, an IC amplifier and the auditory signal generator. Without the device teeth grinding has been occurring at a subconscious level. The buzzer brought the behavior to the subject's attention, making it more accessible to voluntary control. Daily use of the device proved effective in the reduction of teeth grinding.

Our interest in this investigation is two fold: The relationship between jaw muscle contraction and psychological tension has relevance to smoking dynamics. Hutchinson used the measure of jaw muscle tension as an index of psychological tension in a 1970 study funded by P.M. R&O. The measure was more specifically interpreted by this investigator as an index of covert aggressive responsivity. Hutchinson put smokers into frustrating task situations and recorded the EMG signals at the jaw. He reported less muscle tension (ergo, less anger) under smoking than under abstaining conditions.

Secondly, it occurred to us that the total package may have another application to our continuing study of the motivational factors in cigarette smoking. It may make it possible to circumvent a methodological problem over which we have agonized for some time.

The problem is this: In order to properly assess the influence of cigarette smoking upon some specified behavior one must observe that behavior in the same subject

undersmoking and nonsmoking conditions. If, for example, one wished to determine whether smoking influences visual accuracy, one would obtain measures of the subject's acuity immediately following the smoking of a cigarette and at some other time obtain the same measures following a period of abstinence from smoking, the period being sufficiently long to clear the organism of the pharmacological effects of the smoke. Any observed difference, one might argue, would be a function of the effect of the smoke upon the smoker. But such an argument assumes that the abstaining smoker is in his normal, i.e., non-smoke-influenced state. This assumption is open to challenge. The counter argument is that, if the period of abstinence is sufficiently long to allow for the metabolic clearing of the agents taken in from cigarette smoke, then that period has been sufficiently long also for the onset of any deprivation effects.

Our methodological problem lies in our inability to distinguish between those behavioral changes that reflect return to some non-smoke-influenced baseline on the one hand and those changes which are the individual's response to smoke deprivation on the other hand. Thus Hutchinson's reported increase in jaw muscle tension in abstaining smokers could as readily be the emergence of behavior which had been suppressed by smoking or the onset of behavior specific to the smoke-deprived state. We need some means of distinguishing between these two possible classes of response to cessation of smoking.

We would expect behavior specific to smoke deprivation to peak rapidly following cessation of smoking and diminish gradually thereafter, dropping out entirely at some later point in time as the former smoker's system accommodated to a nonsmoking regimen.

On the other hand, if the observed behavioral change is due to the re-emergence of patterns suppressed by smoking, we would expect the behavioral change to peak fairly rapidly following discontinuations, as in the case of deprivation-specific behavior, but then plateau at peak and remain constant.

Here, then, are two distinctive time-related patterns. Were we able to continuously monitor the behavior beginning a week before ceasing to smoke and continuing for a month or more thereafter, the data should allow us to confirm or refute the Hutchinson observation that the jaw clenching rate is altered by ceasing to smoke and further, if confirmed, classify the altered rate as either withdrawal-specific behavior or baseline behavior characteristic of the individual when not smoking.

If we were to establish that the behavior is characteristic of the smoker when not smoking and not merely a transient response to deprivation, the implications are profound. Following Hutchinson's interpretation of jaw clenching as a covert manifestation of anger, we would have in hand our first clear-cut positive effect of cigarette smoking—the inhibition of anger.

If, on the other hand, the alteration were to prove to be limited only to the time period immediately following cessation, the implications would not be so profound but there would remain the possibility of some important inferences. The duration of the altered rate would reflect the duration of the deprivation period. The determination of the time interval would establish how long observations must be delayed following ceasing to smoke in order to study the uncontaminated non-smoke-influenced be-

haviors for comparisons with smoke-influenced behaviors.

The totable EMG unit lends itself nicely to the collection of the data. After substituting an electronic counter for the signal generator, we will be able to record either continuously, or by periodic sampling, the frequency with which jaw clenching occurs. A simple graphic plotting of jaw clenching rate over time should make it possible to evaluate the pattern of change and thus establish the nature of the altered behavior.

Our major problem will be to recruit enough regular smokers willing and able to abstain from smoking over the five or more weeks required.

We are corresponding with two laboratories (in the Psychology Departments of Harvard University and Claremont Graduate School) on the details of instrumentation.

IB3—(Ryan and Lieser)—The hyperactive child as prospective smoker (see pp. 9-12, Accession No. 74-065)

This is an intriguing theoretical derivation of an hypothesis which predicts that today's hyperactive child is tomorrow's smoker.

A Final Note to the Series of Aggression Studies: We are considering modest financial support to two university laboratories whose programs include studies immediately relevant to the question of the influence of smoking upon aggression. Neal Miller's laboratory at Rockefeller University is prepared to investigate further the nicotinic mechanisms in the brain of the rat, there being already some evidence that nicotine does reduce irritability and aggression while its withdrawal has the opposite effect.

At Ohio State University two psychologists are eager to follow up leads pointing to the inhibitory influence of central nicotinic systems on the aggressive behavior in cats.

IB4—(Dunn and Martin)—The influence of smoke inhalation upon accommodating to distracting stimulation, using the control of brain wave patterns as an index of accommodation

A group of investigators at Melbourne University in Australia have reported that smokers accommodate (or become inured) to distracting stimulation more rapidly while smoking than while deprived. Maintenance of alpha brain wave dominance in the face of such stimulation was used as the index of accommodation. When not accommodated, alpha dominance was lost when distracting stimulation was presented. When accommodated, alpha dominance was not disrupted by the stimulation. The reported observation is exciting because of its theoretical significance and because, as reported, it was a very clean effect induced by smoking. We are displeased with the lack of rigor in the design of their experiment, so our purpose is to replicate the experiment with better controls and improved conditions of observation.

III B4—(Schori and Jones)—Manipulating smoke impact in very low (<8 mg tar) delivery cigarettes

How can we achieve full-flavored very low delivery cigarettes? We feel that the main hindrance to doing so is our inability to achieve sufficient smoke impact in very low delivery cigarettes. Therefore, although ultimately we would like to develop a marketable one, this study (which is being conducted in cooperation with Willie Houck and Paul Gauvin) is designed to assess the relative influences of various factors on smoke impact in very low delivery cigarettes. Specifically, the relative influenced of blend

(standard Marlboro blend vs. 50% burley blend), burley-spray (100% vs. 50%), and filter system (cellulose acetate filter plus high dilution vs. paper cellulose acetate filter plus zero dilution) on smoke impact in cigarettes within the 5 to 6 mg tar range).

IIIB5—(Schori and Jones)—A low delivery full-flavored candidate (Opus 1)

In an earlier study (74-053, June, 1974), three low delivery cigarettes, averaging less than 10 mg tar, were found to be comparable in acceptability to the Marlboro control. Because of the obvious practical significance of that finding, we felt that it was necessary to follow up that study in order to determine whether with our current capabilities we can reliably make low delivery cigarettes which are just as acceptable to the smoker as Marlboro. Accordingly, we attempted to remake the most promising low delivery candidate from the earlier study. That candidate is to be compared to a Marlboro control by high delivery RP³ smokers.

IIIB6—(Schori and Jones)—A low delivery full-flavored cigarette (Opus 2)

In an earlier study (74-088 and IIIB3 above) a low delivery cigarette which delivered 10.7 mg tar—with a nicotine to tar ratio (N/T) of .12—was found to be comparable to a Marlboro both in acceptability and strength, i.e., this cigarette was perceived to be a full-flavored cigarette. We were not positive however, that the high N/T ratio was the primary determinant of the smokers' favorable perceptions of this cigarette. Therefore in this study we will make three 10 mg tar cigarettes with N/T ratios of .07, .10, and .13—insuring that tar is constant over cigarettes—and a Marlboro control. From this test, we will be able to determine: (1) whether we can reliably make full-flavored cigarettes in the 10 mg tar range; and (2) whether a relatively high N/T ratio is essential in order to do so.

IIIB2—(Dunn and Martin)—Continuation of the investigation of inhalation patterns

A number of questions have been raised by the initial inhalation study. We plan to continue these observations in order to determine what, if any, aspect of the inhalation pattern is reliable to smoker characteristics and cigarette characteristics.

“PME Research: 1972-1974” Gustafson & Haisch

* * * [Indicate deleted material]

HUMAN SMOKING HABITS—(or: the impact of our products on the smokers)

The thoughts on cigarette design which we have developed so far and which we are realizing in the trials of the Teams of “Thermodynamics of Adsorption Processes,” “Intersection of smoke with Cysteine,” and “Product Research” are our response to developing trends and public pressures.

Further input into this research is provided by the wants, references and needs of the smoker. Under the direction of Mr. Bourquin we have planned, executed and analyzed several studies on human smoking habits.

At the planning stage, the objectives and goals as well as the scope and depth of the study were set by asking some relevant questions. The answers to these questions are needed to match consumer profiles and product relevance, to provide information on certain aspects of “Smoking and Health”, and for future prototype development.

How much nicotine does the smoker want?

2. Does the smoker compensate for nicotine delivery in a low nicotine cigarette?

3. What are the actual delivery levels of important brands?

4. Does nicotine delivery depend on the social situation of the smoker?

5. Do well defined classes of cigarettes fit well defined classes of smokers?

6. How can an increased smoke impact be achieved with a low delivery product?

The first study was executed with the cooperation of the marketing department in Germany. The stumps of 27 major brands were collected at various locations and offices. To calculate filter efficiency and nicotine consumption the nicotine deposit in the filter was measured. (The German study must be regarded as incomplete as the pilot study was never followed-up by a proper scale investigation.)

The results and conclusions gave us possible solutions to some marketing problems and set the limits for product modifications.

The most frequent nicotine yield was 0.4 to 0.5 mg of nicotine per cigarette. This yield is not dependent upon the nicotine content of the tobacco and is not related to the nicotine yield under Coresta (machine) smoking conditions. The difference between nicotine yields obtained under standard laboratory procedures and yields obtained under “real” smoking conditions is explained by the existence of a compensation mechanism in the smoker. This compensation mechanism seems to be in operation for a proportion of the consumer population to adjust the nicotine yield to their needs or liking.

* * * [Indicate deleted material]

[From Philip Morris, Richmond, Virginia]

To: Dr. T.S. Osden

From: W.L. Dunn

Subject: Quarterly Report—January 1-March 31, 1995

Date: March 25, 1975

Inhalation Studies.—All work has been held up for the installation of the sound- and electromagnetically-insulated room. The room has arrived and is to be in April.

A Field Test of RTD and Tar Influences on Acceptability with Three Methods of Cigarette Presentation.—Analysis is underway.

Conference on the Regulatory Influence of Nicotine on Human Behavior.—Proposal has been presented to the industry. Awaiting decision to proceed.

FRANK RYAN'S REPORT

Puffing Following Cigarette Deprivation (Puff Seven).—Ongoing. We are observing number of cigarettes smoked and total puffs taken by college students smoking their own brands during a critical two-hour period. Preliminary data suggest that more cigarettes are smoked and more puffs taken when the observations follow a two-hour deprivation period than following two hours when smoking is permitted.

Mixed Pack Study.—Ongoing.—A national mailout is scheduled for early April in which High Filtration panelists will compare a 10 mg cigarette to a mixture of 7 and 13 mg cigarettes. The object of the test is to see whether the intentional inclusion of some more flavorful cigarettes in a pack of low delivery cigarettes will affect product ratings.

Personality, Arousal and Smoking.—Planning.—Following Eysenck's suggestion that smokers seek stimulation to increase the arousal level of their central nervous system whereas introverts avoid stimulation, we will look at the effects of smoke deprivation on extroverted smokers in a sensory stimulation deprived situation and compared to non-deprived and nonsmoker groups, as well as to introverts.

Equal Puff Volumes.—Planning.—In this smoke recorder study smokes will be in-

structed to take either puffs of a constant volume or constant duration. Cigarette characteristics will be changed from time to time to see if volume changes follow. The purpose of the study is to find some of the cues which control puff volume changes.

TOM SCHORI'S REPORT

The Effect of Smoking on Risk-taking in a Simulated Passing Task.—Data analysis is complete. The report is in preparation.

Smoking, Arousal, and Mood.—A manuscript for publication has been prepared.

The Influence of Nicotine on Aggression in Fish.—This is a new study in which the Beta, an innately aggressive fish, is to be treated with varying concentrations of nicotine in tank water. We will be observing for differential effects upon aggressive display behavior and some control behavior which is to serve as an index of general activity level.

Menthol Cigarette Preference of Blacks.—Cigarettes with two nicotine and two menthol levels have gone out to 350 Black RP³ menthol smokers. This is a modified form of the original study, the results of which proved difficult to interpret.

Low Delivery Cigarettes: The Influence of Delivery Information on Subjective Evaluations (II).—Cigarettes are ready and should go out shortly to 2 National POE panels. This is a follow-up on a smaller scale study (RP³) the results of which suggested that smokers responded favorably to being provided the information that the cigarettes were low delivery.

A Low Delivery Cigarette with Impact and Flavor.—The 5-6 mg tar delivery program being carried out in collaboration with P. Gauvin is proceeding nicely. Models for the 8 experimental cigarettes have been developed and the cigarettes are now being made.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1975.

Prof. STANLEY SCHACHTER,
Dept. of Psychology, Columbia University,
Schermerhorn Hall, New York, NY.

DEAR STAN: Welcome back and thanks for your letter. And thanks for your solicitation of my critique of your manuscripts. I'd be delighted. I wouldn't view it as an imposition because, after all, I am responsible for the Company having provided you with those modest sums and therefore have vested interest as well as personal interest in your output.

As for your Marlboro question, we've tracked sales vs. nicotine over the past five years and have concluded that there is no discernible relationship. Interestingly, the concern grew from an hypothesis antithetical to your own. Market Research is burdened with attempting to explain a slipping sales increment. The robust 15% annual increase which we'd come to view as the norm became 10% from 1973 to 1974 and recent figures are of the order of 7%. If my memory serves me well.

Some have interpreted this as the inevitable leveling off. Although we cannot fit any kind of explanatory equation using nicotine as a predictor, we cannot of course rule out the possibility that the Marlboro smoker is responding to nicotine reduction by switching to other brands. But your manner of putting the question implies that you would have predicted a sales increase. You neglected to take into account that the smoker has other options than merely increasing the number smoked.

My own prejudice is that the smoker is oblivious at the conscious level to major changes in the composition of his smoke, but