CONGRESS RETURNS: SPENDING BILLS AND PRESIDENT’S FATE DOMINATE AGENDA

The 105th Congress had barely returned from its August recess, when Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr unloaded his report and 36 boxes of evidence on the House of Representatives concerning the President’s misconduct with “that woman.” As the House leadership ponders whether and how to conduct a possible impeachment inquiry, and individual Senators condemn the President’s actions, the start of FY 1999 remains less than a month away.

Only one of the thirteen bills that will fund the government past October 1, 1998 has cleared the Congress, eight others have passed both Houses and await conference committee action, four are mired in varying stages of development, including the massive Labor-HHS-Education bill, which has passed neither the House nor the Senate. A Continuing Resolution (CR) to maintain funding for many agencies, probably at FY 1998 levels, will be necessary. As of September 11, it appears the first CR will last until October 9, which is the current adjournment target.

As UPDATE goes to press the reaction to the Starr report dominates Washington. Pundits claim by next week the public will deliver its verdict on the President and push the Congress to move ahead with a full blown inquiry or perhaps cause it to back off.

The appropriations process appears stuck, with the White House still threatening to veto seven of the bills for various reasons. Some of the bills contain policy riders that the administration opposes, including the ban on sampling in the Census in the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill. In the others, Congress simply refused to fund some of the President’s policy priorities. The President also wants emergency spending to fund peacekeeping in Bosnia and other activities. Republicans in the House want reductions in other funding to offset these expenditures.

The Republicans are also pushing a tax cut of around $70-80 billion over five years. This would include extending the research and development tax credit. The GOP leadership argues that some of the expected $63 billion surplus for FY 1999 could be returned to the taxpayers, without affecting Social Security’s future. The administration is not so sure. With its failure to agree on a budget reconciliation bill, the Congress has made it more difficult to enact the tax cut. Under reconciliation procedures in the Senate, a simple majority, rather than the 60 votes necessary to cut off debate, would have been enough to get the tax legislation passed.

In addition to the spending bills, a number of other pieces of legislation are left on the 105th’s agenda. These include the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, whose one-year extension runs out on September 30. Whether there is enough time and will to move these bills remains to be seen.

SENATE COMMITTEE APPROVES LABOR-HHS-ED FUNDING BILL

The Senate Appropriations Committee on September 3 approved its version of the FY 1999 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. As expected, the Department of Health and Human Services, particularly the National Institutes of Health, received large increases while the Department of Education, particularly the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, received level-funding.
The House Committee completed consideration of its version just before the August recess (See UPDATE, July 27).

The massive Labor-HHS-ED appropriations bill is one of the most difficult to move through Congress because it reflects the partisan differences on many domestic policies and programs. For this reason, Senators Arlen Specter (R-PA), chair of Labor-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee, and Tom Harkin (D-IA), ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee, updated a crowd of health advocates on the status of the Senate version of the bill — citing "the need to do everything to move the bill."

**A $2 Billion Increase For NIH**

The Committee provided the National Institutes of Health (NIH) with $15.6 billion, $819 million more than requested in the President's budget and a $2 billion increase above last year's funding level. This is significantly larger than the $1.2 billion allocated by the House and reflects the push to double NIH's budget in 5 years.

**Behavioral and Social Science Office Receives Large Increase**

For the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) the Committee included $12.9 million, a significant increase over its current level.

"The Committee understands that behavioral science is an area of exceptional promise for understanding and ameliorating some of the Nation's most serious health concerns, many of which are due to behavior, and commends OBSSR for its efforts to increase the visibility of behavioral science at NIH."

For the Office of AIDS Research (OAR), the Committee recommendation does not include a direct appropriation for OAR as proposed in the President's budget request. The bill retains the general provision allowing the Directors of NIH and the OAR to shift up to 3 percent of AIDS research funding between the Institutes and Centers throughout the year "if needs change or unanticipated opportunities arise." The Committee also commended the OAR for convening its Prevention Science Working Group.

The Office is urged to "broaden the scope of AIDS prevention by exploring research initiatives that link behavioral and biomedical approaches."

**National Cancer Institute**

The Committee allocated $2.9 billion for the National Cancer Institute (NCI), $158 million more than the budget request and $384.6 million over the fiscal year (FY) 1998 level. The Committee noted that it believes that NCI must expand its existing tobacco-related research portfolio with greater emphasis on behavioral, community and State intervention research."

**National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute**

The Committee recommended $1.6 billion for the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI), $84.1 million more than requested by the President and $210.8 million more than the FY 1998 appropriation. The Committee encourages NHLBI to "expand and initiate research into behavior modification in order to create public health interventions that help promote healthful behaviors."

The Institute is further encouraged to expand its research into the cause of and treatment of obesity, "especially in children and young adults."
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development

The Committee appropriated $748.5 million for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), $23.5 million more than the budget request and a $75 million increase over the FY 1998 funding level. NICHD is commended for its “continued support of demographic research,” including studies of poor families and neighborhoods, adolescent health, welfare-to-work transitions, and child care. The Committee notes that the agency’s leadership in “research and developing new data on fatherhood will help to fill a serious gap in understanding of family formation, family strengths, and the development and well-being of children.” The Institute is further commended “for building an infrastructure to enhance research on child development and behavior.”

National Institute on Aging

The National Institute on Aging (NIA) received $596.5 million for FY 1999, $40.1 million more than the President’s request and $78.2 million more than last year’s funding level. The Committee highlighted its continued “strong support for the demographic research being carried out by NIA,” particularly the Institute’s research on disability trends and the findings from the health and retirement study [HRS] and its “implications for Medicare and Social Security.”

National Institute of Nursing Research

For the National Institute of Nursing Research (NINR), the Committee recommended $69.8 million for FY 1999, $1.7 million more than the budget request and $6.4 million more than FY 1998. NINR’s “efforts to understand and reduce the burden of health problems in multiple socioeconomic, race and age groups” are noted by the Committee as “particularly responsive to society’s present needs.”

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism

The Committee recommended $259.7 million for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA). This is $14.7 million more than the President’s request and $32.9 million more than the FY 1998 level. While NIAAA is commended for its support of behavior research on alcohol abuse and alcoholism, the Committee emphasizes that “an increased commitment in research about the social, environmental, and cultural factors influencing changes in youth drinking behaviors and the targeting of preventive interventions is now needed.”

National Institute of Drug Abuse

The Committee provided the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA) $603.2 million for FY 1999, $28.2 million more than the President’s request and $77.1 million more than the FY 1998 funding level. NIDA is encouraged to “expand its support for basic research on the biological, pharmacological and behavioral bases of nicotine addiction, specifically targeting children and adolescents.” The Committee continues to support NIDA’s expansion of its behavioral science portfolio and views NIDA “as a model of how to approach its behavioral science and public health responsibilities.”

National Institute of Mental Health

For the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the Committee recommended $861.2 million, $53.6 million more than the budget request and $112.3 million over the FY 1998 funding level.

Over the years, the Committee has repeatedly urged NIMH to “strengthen its portfolio of basic behavioral research and prevention.” The Committee underscored that it continues “to see basic behavioral research and prevention as two of NIMH’s core responsibilities and urges the Institute to establish ... specific research and training initiatives to develop the theoretical knowledge on behavioral aspects of mental health, mental illness, and prevention as a means of improving the connections between basic and clinical research.” NIMH is further encouraged to “focus more attention on research into prevention, treatment and intervention and subsequently pursue large-scale clinical trials of violence against women, including behavioral and psychosocial factors.”
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) did not fare as well as its sister agencies. The Committee provided the CDC with $2.4 billion, $16.9 million below the current funding level and $130.7 million below the President's request. The Committee, however, included an additional $228.4 million “for CDC activities within the Public Health and Social Services emergency fund” and $25 million in expected interagency transfers, which along with the regular appropriation, would provide a total of $2.6 billion for the agency. The Committee criticized the CDC for allocating a “disproportionate share of available funds to administrative activities.”

Prevention Centers

The Committee recommended $9.1 million for CDC’s prevention centers, $1.2 million more than the President’s request and $1.4 million over the FY 1998 level. The Committee also provided $1 million to establish “within the CDC prevention program a tobacco prevention research network to increase the knowledge base on the most effective strategies for prevention and reducing tobacco use, as well as on the social, physiological, and cultural reasons for tobacco use among children.” The CDC is encouraged by the Committee to “consider establishing a focus on prevention marketing and behavior change strategies for enhancing health in disadvantaged communities.”

Sexually Transmitted Diseases

For the CDC’s sexually transmitted disease prevention and control programs, the Committee allocated $113.6 million, $7.9 million less than the budget request and $1.5 million more than the FY 1998 level. The Committee recommended $258.5 million for chronic and environmental disease prevention activities, $5 million below the President’s request and $46.5 million above the FY 1998 funding level. Additionally, the Committee transferred $25 million from the National Cancer Institute (NCI) to the CDC, bringing the total for chronic and environmental disease prevention activities to $283.6 million.

Office of Smoking and Health

The Committee noted its support for the agency’s Office of Smoking and Health, and “encourages continued public health prevention and cessation activities. Sufficient funds are available to fully meet the administration request for this activity.” The Committee also expressed its belief that more should be done in the area of counter-advertising.

Injury Control

For the CDC’s injury control program, the Committee provided $50.8 million, $1.4 above the President’s request and $1 million above the FY 1998 level. This sum includes an additional $6 million from “the violent crime reduction trust fund for domestic violence activities authorized by the Violence Against Women Act,” the same as the FY 1998 level. “The Committee recognizes the outstanding achievements of the injury control research centers [ICRC’s].”

Recognizing that “suicide and suicidal behavior is a major public health risk, particularly for the elderly, adolescents, and young adults,” the Committee recommendation “includes funds for the Center to sustain suicide prevention research and intervention.”

Health Statistics

The CDC’s National Center for Health Statistics is provided $84.5 million from the Public Health Service’s (PHS) 1 percent evaluation and set-aside funds — the same as the request and the FY 1998 level.

Prevention Research Not Funded

The Committee did not appropriate the $25 million for prevention research requested by the administration “for extramural research programs, information systems and laboratory activities.” Included in the bill, however, is $10 million ($19.9 million below the President’s request) for new demonstration projects to address racial health disparities. The $10 million will address six identified areas of health disparities — infant
mortality, cancer, heart disease, diabetes, HIV infections, and child and adult immunizations.

For violent crime reduction, the Committee provided $43 million from the violent crime reduction trust fund, $8 million below the FY 1998 level and $62,000 more than the budget request for activities authorized in the Violence Against Women Act.

Agency for Health Care Policy and Research

The Committee appropriated $50 million for the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR). Additionally, the Committee provided transfers of $121 million from funds available under section 24 of the Public Health Service Act, bringing the total funding for AHCPR to $171 million. This is equal to the request and $24.5 million above the FY 1998 funding level.

ED Research and Statistics

Programs Receive Little Support

The Committee level-funded the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), providing the Department of Education’s research and evaluation arm $72.6 million. OERI’s regional education laboratories were also level-funded; the Committee recommended $56 million for the regional labs.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) received $59 million from the Committee. This amount is equal to the FY 1998 level, but $9 million below the President’s request. NCES collects, analyzes, and reports statistics on education in the United States.

The Committee recommended $32 million for NCES’s assessment activities, including the Center’s administration of the congressionally mandated National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), a 20-year old program created to measure the educational achievement of American students.

The Committee provided no funds for the proposed Department of Education/National Science Foundation interagency research initiative. The administration requested $50 million for this initiative.

SENATE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS YOUTH VIOLENCE; SHOWS SUPPORT FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE RESEARCH

Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) held a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee’s Youth Violence Subcommittee on September 1 on preventing youth crime through intervention methods. Sessions welcomed several speakers, including Rutgers University Professor of Criminal Justice George Kelling.

Kelling spoke primarily about “Broken Windows,” the theory first documented by Kelling, James Q. Wilson and Cathy Coles. Broken Windows notes that just as a broken window left untended is a sign that nobody cares and leads to more serious damage, so disorderly behavior is a sign that nobody cares and leads to fear of crime, more serious crime, and urban decay.

During his testimony, Kelling spoke of the need for swift response to disorderly behavior and youth crime. He noted that this response was not entirely the responsibility of the government, but the responsibility of citizens to become involved in their communities and in the lives of youth. Children and adolescents, explained Kelling, must be involved in the process to effectively reclaim the streets and neighborhoods. Ultimately, he noted that criminal justice policies must be realistic and credible.

Kelling also called for more early intervention programs to combat juvenile crime. He pointed to several programs in Boston and Middlesex, Massachusetts that have experienced some successes. In these programs, according to Kelling, the police, prosecutors, correctional, welfare, and school officials meet to identify potential youth at risk. Local and state officials also must develop a range of intermediate sanctions that can be brought to bear immediately on youth offenders. Kelling concluded by saying, “We have learned a great deal about crime control over the past decade, shame on us if we don’t use what we have learned.”

Senator Fred Thompson noted in his remarks following the testimony that too little is still known about crime for the federal government to spend billions of dollars on crime prevention programs. He
said he agreed with the conclusions of the congressionally mandated, federally funded University of Maryland study, *What Works, What Doesn’t, What’s Promising*. The study, led by Lawrence Sherman, professor and chair of the Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Maryland, recommends that a certain percentage of the overall Department of Justice budget should be devoted to research and evaluation of crime prevention programs. Thompson said that decisions on crime prevention programs must be based on research, not the whims of politicians.

Sessions agreed with Thompson and noted that the juvenile justice system should not be federalized, but that research is indeed an appropriate task that should be supported by the federal government.

**S10 Revised?**

It appears that S10, Senator Sessions’ juvenile justice crime bill, is resurfacing and once again is on the Senate’s radar screen. The bill, stalled during the first session of the 105th Congress, looks to be back on the agenda of the Senate Judiciary Committee. S10 contains language that would provide $50 million for research of juvenile justice issues.

**CENSUS DEBATE HEATING UP; HIGH COURT AGREES TO HEAR CASE**

The Clinton Administration and Census Bureau suffered a major setback when a special three-judge panel ruled that their proposed plan to use statistical sampling in the 2000 Census was illegal. On August 24, a three-judge panel of the District Court for the District of Columbia unanimously ruled, in a case filed by the Republican leadership, that the Census Act (title 13, United States Code) bars the use of sampling to count the population for the purpose of apportionment.

As expected, on August 25 the Justice Department notified a federal court that it would appeal the ruling that barred the use of statistical sampling in the upcoming census to the United States Supreme Court. The Clinton Administration and House officials asked the Supreme Court to expedite its consideration of the district court ruling. The Supreme Court on September 10 agreed to consider the case, *U.S. House of Representatives vs. U.S. Department of Commerce* on an expedited schedule. The Court will hear arguments on November 30, possibly offering a final decision by March 1999.

Despite the recent lower court ruling, the Census Bureau is proceeding with its “dual track” planning for the upcoming census. Bureau officials state that they are simultaneously planning for a census with statistical methods and one without statistical methods. At a September 9 hearing of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight’s Subcommittee on the Census, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Census James Holmes said that “while I continue to believe that a census with sampling will be more accurate and cost less, the Census Bureau is on track to conduct a census without sampling in the event that a decision to do so is made [by the Supreme Court] next March.”

The hearing was convened by Census Subcommittee Chairman Dan Miller (R-FL) to discuss the Census Bureau’s preparations in light of the recent decision barring sampling. In his opening remarks, Miller, referring to the district court ruling, said, “Because of the legal action taken by the House of Representatives against the Clinton Administration’s illegal sampling scheme, the 2000 Census has been saved.” He further said that it was time to “put the issue of ‘sampling’ to bed . . . and work together to improve the 2000 Census and make it the most accurate count ever.” Nevertheless, Miller suggested that sampling might be used in the census for the purpose of distributing billions of dollars of federal aid.

The remainder of the hearing was marked by disagreements between Miller and Holmes over the preparations for the upcoming census. Miller stated on several occasions that he did not believe the Census Bureau was making a good faith effort to plan for a census without sampling. Holmes, and Robert Shapiro, Department of Commerce’s Undersecretary for Economic Affairs, reassured Miller that the Census Bureau was preparing for both a sampling and nonsampling census. In fact, Holmes noted that “the vast majority of the Census Bureau’s planning efforts over the last 7 years have been and continue to be directed toward components that will be used in either kind of census.” Holmes noted that
the Bureau has created 20 teams that are working on creating a census that does not utilize sampling.

Don't Delay Funding

During his testimony Shapiro stated that regardless of the type of census the Bureau undertakes, any delay in funding could severely limit the chances of a successful head count. He said that failure to reach an agreement on the Bureau’s FY 1999 funding bill by October 1 could have grave consequences. If there is no agreement before this time, Shapiro noted, the Bureau would have to be funded through a temporary measure that would only provide appropriations at the current level. Without a significant increase in funds, he stated that the “Bureau will be forced to suspend . . . 22,000 temporary employees.” Shapiro also criticized the proposed six-month funding cap in the FY 1999 appropriations bill, by noting that under this plan the Census Bureau would run out of money in January. Miller, however, pledged that he would ensure that Bureau would be exempt from any spending caps in a temporary funding measure and would have adequate funds to continue its preparations.

Miller charged that Clinton would veto the controversial Commerce, Justice, and State, and the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, which funds the Census Bureau’s 2000 Census activities, to divert public attention from his personal problems. The President has threatened to veto the CJS appropriations bill if it contains contentious language prohibiting sampling and limits funding to six-months.

Representative Carolyn Maloney said that she was appalled that Miller would “bring up Monica Lewinsky at this hearing.” She noted in her opening remarks that the opponents of statistical sampling have “cloaked themselves in the Constitution,” but have failed to produce an alternative plan for the Census that will be cost-effective, be more accurate, and reduce the large minority undercount.

Groups Rally Behind Census

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights recently sponsored a press conference in which it released a letter that Americans for a Fair and Accurate Census, a bipartisan group, including COSSA, had sent to the administration that calls for uninterrupted funding of the 2000 Census. The event also included speeches calling for the use of statistical sampling in the upcoming census to reverse the historic undercounts of minority groups and children.

Wade Henderson, executive director of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, noted that the census has become one of the most important civil rights issue facing the 105th Congress. Henderson urged Congress to provide the Census Bureau with full, uninterrupted funding and to stop playing this “dangerous game of chicken with the census.”

At the press conference, the Leadership Conference released undercount data for the 1990 census for all the states. For more information, contact the Leadership Conference at 202/466-3434 or contact their Webpage at www.civilrights.org/lcef/census2000.

SEXUALITY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS AVAILABLE

The Social Science Research Council’s Sexuality Research Fellowship Program provides dissertation and postdoctoral support for social and behavioral research on sexuality conducted in the United States.

The program seeks to contribute to a more thorough understanding of human sexuality by encouraging researchers to formulate new research questions, generate new theories, and apply new methods in sexuality research.

Applications are due December 15, 1998. For further information, go to: http://www.ssrc.org/srffell.htm

HAMILTON TO HEAD WILSON CENTER

Lee Hamilton, retiring representative from Indiana and former chair of the House International Relations Committee, has been named the new director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. He will take the reins of the Center in January. He replaces Charles Blitzer.
**MEMBERS**

| American Anthropological Association | American Society of Criminology | Association of American Law Schools |
| American Economic Association       | American Sociological Association | Law and Society Association       |
| American Historical Association     | American Statistical Association | Linguistic Society of America      |
| American Political Science Association | Association of American Geographers | Society for Research in Child Development |

**AFFILIATES**

| AACSB - The International Association for Management Education | Eastern Sociological Society | Population Association of America |
| American Agricultural Economics Association | History of Science Society | Rural Sociological Society       |
| American Association for Public Opinion Research | Institute For Operations Research | Society for Research on Adolescence |
| American Association for Agricultural Education | and the Management Sciences | Society for the Advancement of |
| American Council on Consumer Interests | Midwest Sociological Society | Socio-Economics                   |
| Association for Asian Studies | National Communication Association | Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality |
| Association for Public Policy | National Council on Family Relations | Sociologists for Women in Society |
| Analysis and Management | North American Regional Science Council | Southern Sociological Society      |
| Association of Research Libraries | North Central Sociological Association | Southwestern Social Science Association |

**CONTRIBUTORS**

| American Council of Learned Societies | Duke University | National Opinion Research Center |
| American Institutes for Research | Emory University | New York University               |
| University of Arizona | University of Georgia | University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill |
| Bowling Green State University | George Mason University | North Carolina State University |
| Brookings Institution | Harvard University | Northwestern University          |
| Brown University | Indiana University | Ohio State University            |
| University of California, Berkeley | Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan | University of Oregon             |
| University of California, Davis | Institute for the Advancement of Social Work Research | University of Pennsylvania       |
| University of California, Los Angeles | Institute for Women's Policy Research | Pennsylvania State University |
| University of California, San Diego | University of Iowa | Princeton University             |
| University of California, Santa Barbara | Johns Hopkins University | Purdue University                |
| University of California, Santa Cruz | Kansas State University | Social Science Research Council |
| Carnegie-Mellon University | University of Maryland | Stanford University              |
| Case Western Reserve University | University of Massachusetts | State University of New York, Binghamton |
| Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences | Massachusetts Institute of Technology | State University of New York, Stony Brook |
| University of Chicago | Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University | University of Texas, Austin       |
| Clark University | University of Michigan | Texas A & M University           |
| University of Colorado | University of Minnesota | Tulane University                |
| Columbia University | National Bureau of Economic Research | University of Washington         |
| Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research |                                    | University of Wisconsin, Madison |
| Cornell University |                                |                                 |
| Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice, University of Maryland |                              |                                 |

---

**Consortium of Social Science Associations**

1522 K Street, N.W., Suite 836, Washington, D.C. 20005