United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 17, 2000 No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 17, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period.

H.R. 4391. An act to amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish sourcing requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4205. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 4205) ''An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WARNER, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ROBB, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. REED, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

GAS PRICES

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I am here to speak on a growing controversy, the controversy of who is to blame for the high gas prices, particularly in the Midwest, the high spikes. Some say it is big oil and others say it is the result of the EPA forcing through Phase II formulated gasoline.

Let us this afternoon analyze the facts and begin to see where the responsibility lies. Let me cite from an internal Energy Department memo that proves that the administration knew that the new formulated gasoline, RFG, as required by EPA was a major reason for the spikes in the Midwest.

The memo was circulated while the administration was publicly blasting the big oil companies for gouging Americans. The Washington Times obtained the June 5 memo that was written for Secretary Richardson of the Department of Energy by the Department's acting policy director, Ms. Kenderdine.

This memo mirrors what analysts and oil companies have been stating; the mix of high demand and low supply has led to high prices for all gasoline. We all realize that; that makes sense. Of course, that is part of the cycle in a free market experience. The disturbing part of that memo goes on to say, and let me quote, Madam Speaker, ''the Milwaukee and Chicago areas supply situation is further affected by, among other things, an RFG formulation specific to the area that is more difficult to produce.''

Despite the clear-cut facts in the memo, the administration has claimed that the price hikes and spikes were unexplainable. In fact, they have openly speculated that it is probably big business beating up on poor citizens again. When, in fact, it is big government beating up on the American taxpayers again.

Refineries have been working to capacity to produce a new EPA-mandated gasoline and have been strained to meet the summer demands. This has left reserve supplies in a dangerous position.

According to the DOE memo, Chicago refineries do not have the capacity to step up production when there is a shortage and the specifically formulated gasoline mixed with the ethanol in the region could not be imported from other areas because few make the unique blend of fuel.

The most damaging evidence is the conclusion in that memo from June 5 that supplies were sufficient to meet overall demand at the time. The market was ''sufficiently tight,'' he went

Printed on recycled paper.

on later to say ''that any disruption in the distribution system could contribute to Phase II RFG shortages'' throughout the summer. So there we have it, that is where the spikes came from.

The White House has attempted to rely on a strategy to deflect blame from the real culprit, themselves. Considering the gasoline problems facing Americans today, I am very surprised at the timing of the EPA and this administration to move forward with the implementation of this new blend, this RFG Phase II.

I do not think the administration intentionally did this, but I am not sure. Where is their energy plan today? Where are the steps that could have prevented this from happening? Why did the EPA simply not postpone changing the gas formulas until such a time as the oil market had leveled off? Also, why did St. Louis, Missouri receive a waiver while, to my knowledge, no other city did?

Another shocking piece of this show is on Friday, June 30, the EPA released in a proposed rulemaking a comment period on whether reformulated gasoline is needed to meet the air quality standards. In other words, they are saying is this even needed. What? I mean, here they are mandating they be put in place, yet now they are issuing a memo to say is it needed. You mean to tell me that they insisted on moving forward with Phase II of RFG without knowing if they even needed to keep the program?

When will the EPA do their homework before they force regulations upon the American people? It appears to me from the evidence that the spiked prices in the Midwest were due to the EPA forcing a new formulation, a new blend of gasoline, during this time of high OPEC prices and low supplies.

The EPA should accept responsibility for putting the public through the expensive process of reformulated gasoline without proof that the gasoline would help improve our air and should withhold moving forward with any other new RFG regulations in any other cities.

Madam Speaker, the EPA and Department of Energy must formulate a plan and study to make sure their plan is effective before they gouge the American people at the pumps.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, the Federal Government has no greater priority than to be a good partner to promote livable communities.

The morning paper carried a story about another independent study to chart the ecological vital signs of our national park systems.

Madam Speaker, I think this is an important area to pose attention to, first, because it shows how the Federal Government can lead by example, and, second, it serves as a powerful refutation that somehow the United States, being a huge and wealthy Nation, does not have to worry about things like sprawl and congestion, unplanned growth and loss of farmland, that we just pave more, continue to expand, create more of whatever land we wish of farm, housing or roads.

Madam Speaker, it is reminiscent of Alice in Wonderland's experience with the Mad Hatter's tea party. ''Yes, that's it'' said the Hatter with a sigh, ''it's always tea time and we've no time to wash the things between whiles.''

''Then you keep moving round, I suppose?'' said Alice.

''Exactly so,'' said the Hatter, ''as the things get used up.''

''But what happens when you come to the beginning again?'' Alice ventured to ask.

''Suppose we change the subject,'' the March Hare interrupted, yawning. ''I'm getting tired of this. I vote the young lady tells us a story.''

Our tea party with the built and natural environment is not solved with more stories. We are going to have to face realities in our mature cities, small town America, fraying suburbs, even in our national parks. There are limits to the strains we can put on the land in our transportation systems.

The numbers are staggering in our national parks and other federally-managed sites. In 1997, over 370 million visitors increasingly jammed on clogged parking lots, jammed highways, fragile and irreplaceable resources suffering damage from too many vehicles and too many people. Nearby gateways communities are also negatively impacted by trafficking, decreased air quality, but there is a new trend in thinking about how we solve these problems.

Part of the TEA–21 Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century called for a coordination and study between the Department of Transportation and the Secretary of the Interior. They have already produced recommendations for public transportation services at 128 sites that will enhance the visitor experience and protect the environment.

Madam Speaker, this new broach to transportation has already produced tangible results in a number of areas.

The Zion National Park in Utah, which has suffered from severe congestion, gridlock and destruction of natural resources, has helped to implement a new program, a shuttle bus system initiated in May of this year helps protect the fragile natural resources and protect visitors away as they visit from the canyon and provide services to the gateway community of Springdale.

The National Park Service has proposed a light rail transit system for the south rim of the Grand Canyon. It will allow visitors to leave their cars outside the park and ride the light rail train to a canyon view information plaza, there they can view exhibits, ride alternatively-fueled vehicles and hike along the canyon's rim. Construction has already begun on the information plaza in April, and the light rail system is expected to be in place by the spring of 2004.

It is also a priority to reduce traffic congestion in the Yosemite National Park. It is already implemented a 2-year demonstration program for a regional transportation system that would allow visitors to leave their cars outside the park and travel by shuttle bus into and around the Yosemite Valley.

Together activities like this will reduce reliance on private automobiles for visitors, allow for sustainable use and enjoyment of our public lands, improve the livability and quality of life in nearby communities, and allow visitors to better enjoy their experience.

Unlike the Mad Hatter, we cannot continue to just move to the next place at the party. Fortunately, this leadership shows how we can achieve this, not just for national parks, but as a model for American communities to make them safer, healthier and more economically secure.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord, our God, our history as a people has been great. We are humbled by reflecting upon the events of the past. Fill us with hope and vision.

Preserve us from making the mistakes of the past. Grant us greater judgment that we may be children born of freedom and strong in virtue.

May we honor the heroic men and women of the past who, when insulted, did not return insult; and, when threatened, handed themselves over to You, the One who judges justly. In them we have come to recognize Your grace shining through human weakness.

May those who suffered for justice' sake receive the beatitude's reward; and may those who cried out in the void of justice, today be heard that a new day of peace may be born rooted in justice, for You live and are attentive to our cries now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 14, 2000 at 9:05 a.m.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 3544.

That the Senate Passed without amendment H.R. 3591.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN OIL DEPENDENCY

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, Americans are paying more for gas now than at any other time in our history. Families like David and Jenny Davis of Reno, Nevada are being forced to eliminate their vacation plans and change their daily schedules, like eliminating after-school programs for their children, just to save money on gas; and all of this when our country's dependency on foreign oil is at an all-time high.

Yet, for 8 years, the Clinton-Gore administration has refused to address and reduce our dependence on foreign oil or to prevent foreign oil price-fixing schemes. Instead, the administration continues to support oil-producing countries, even though they blatantly banned together to raise oil prices.

Now American families are paying for the administration's actions or inactions. Our hard-working families should not have to sacrifice their livelihoods just because the administration refuses or fails to stand up to foreign oil pricing nations.

I yield back the administration's national policy which continues to cost Americans precious money every time they go to the gas pump.

STOP GIVING TECHNOLOGICAL CHARITY TO CHINA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Something is wrong, Mr. Speaker. China has already stolen our nuclear secrets; and what they have not stolen, the White House has given to them, specifically, supercomputer and satellite technology that enhances China's missile program, and they have missiles pointed at us.

Now, if that is not enough to download your hard drive, news reports now confirm that the White House will allow private sector high-tech companies to hire Chinese scientists involved with their military technologies.

Beam me up. What is next? Will we give China our Star Wars umbrella?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back both the danger and the stupidity of this charity to China.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 7 p.m. today.

INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2000

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3125) to prohibit Internet gambling, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3125

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON INTERNET GAMBLING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 1085. Internet gambling

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

''(1) BETS OR WAGERS.—The term 'bets or wagers'—

''(A) means the staking or risking by any person of something of value upon the outcome of a contest of others, a sporting event, or a game predominantly subject to chance, upon an agreement or understanding that the person or another person will receive something of greater value than the amount staked or risked in the event of a certain outcome;

''(B) includes the purchase of a chance or opportunity to win a lottery or other prize (which opportunity to win is predominantly subject to chance);

''(C) includes any scheme of a type described in section 3702 of title 28; and

''(D) does not include—

''(i) a bona fide business transaction governed by the securities laws (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(47) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(47))) for the purchase or sale at a future date of securities (as that term is defined in section 3(a)(10) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(10)));

''(ii) a transaction on or subject to the rules of a contract market designated pursuant to section 5 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 7);

''(iii) a contract of indemnity or guarantee;

''(iv) a contract for life, health, or accident insurance; or

''(v) participation in a simulation sports game or an educational game or contest that—

''(I) is not dependent solely on the outcome of any single sporting event or nonparticipant's singular individual performance in any single sporting event;

''(II) has an outcome that reflects the relative knowledge and skill of the participants with such outcome determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of sporting events and nonparticipants accumulated individual performances therein; and

''(III) offers a prize or award to a participant that is established in advance of the game or contest and is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of any fees paid by those participants.

''(2) CLOSED-LOOP SUBSCRIBER-BASED SERVICE.—The term 'closed-loop subscriber-based service' means any information service or system that uses—

''(A) a device or combination of devices—

''(i) expressly authorized and operated in accordance with the laws of a State, exclusively for placing, receiving, or otherwise making a bet or wager described in subsection (f)(1)(B); and

''(ii) by which an individual located within any State must subscribe and be registered with the provider of the wagering service by name, address, age, and appropriate billing information to be authorized to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager, and must be physically located within that State in order to be authorized to do so;

''(B) a secure and effective customer verification and age verification system, updated to remain current with evolving technology, expressly authorized and operated in accordance with the laws of the State in which it is located, to ensure that all applicable Federal and State legal and regulatory requirements for lawful gambling are met; and

''(C) appropriate data security standards to prevent unauthorized access by any person who has not subscribed or who is a minor.

''(3) FOREIGN JURISDICTION.—The term 'foreign jurisdiction' means a jurisdiction of a foreign country or political subdivision thereof.

''(4) GAMBLING BUSINESS.—The term 'gambling business' means—

''(A) a business that is conducted at a gambling establishment, or that—

''(i) involves—

''(I) the placing, receiving, or otherwise making of bets or wagers; or

''(II) the offering to engage in the placing, receiving, or otherwise making of bets or wagers;

''(ii) involves 1 or more persons who conduct, finance, manage, supervise, direct, or own all or part of such business; and

''(iii) has been or remains in substantially continuous operation for a period in excess of 10 days or has a gross revenue of $2,000 or more from such business during any 24-hour period; and

''(B) any soliciting agent of a business described in subparagraph (A).

''(5) INFORMATION ASSISTING IN THE PLACING OF A BET OR WAGER.—The term 'information assisting in the placing of a bet or wager'—

''(A) means information that is intended by the sender or recipient to be used by a person engaged in the business of betting or wagering to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) information concerning parimutuel pools that is exchanged exclusively between or among 1 or more racetracks or other parimutuel wagering facilities licensed by the State or approved by the foreign jurisdiction in which the facility is located, and 1 or more parimutuel wagering facilities licensed by the State or approved by the foreign jurisdiction in which the facility is located, if that information is used only to conduct common pool parimutuel pooling under applicable law;

''(ii) information exchanged exclusively between or among 1 or more racetracks or other parimutuel wagering facilities licensed by the State or approved by the foreign jurisdiction in which the facility is located, and a support service located in another State or foreign jurisdiction, if the information is used only for processing bets or wagers made with that facility under applicable law;

''(iii) information exchanged exclusively between or among 1 or more wagering facilities that are licensed and regulated by the State in which each facility is located, and any support service, wherever located, if the information is used only for the pooling or processing of bets or wagers made by or with the facility or facilities under each State's applicable law;

''(iv) any news reporting or analysis of wagering activity, including odds, racing or event results, race and event schedules, or categories of wagering; or

''(v) any posting or reporting of any educational information on how to make a bet or wager or the nature of betting or wagering.

''(6) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE.—The term 'interactive computer service' means any information service, system, or access software provider that operates in, or uses a channel or instrumentality of, interstate or foreign commerce to provide or enable access by multiple users to a computer server, which includes the transmission, storage, retrieval, hosting, linking, formatting, or translation of a communication made by another person, and including specifically a service, system, or access software provider that—

''(A) provides access to the Internet; or

''(B) is engaged in the business of providing an information location tool (which means a service that refers or links users to an online location, including a directory, index, reference, pointer, or hypertext link).

''(7) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'interactive computer service provider' means any person that provides an interactive computer service, to the extent that such person offers or provides such service.

''(8) INTERNET.—The term 'Internet' means the international computer network of both Federal and non-Federal interoperable packet switched data networks.

''(9) PERSON.—The term 'person' means any individual, association, partnership, joint venture, corporation (or any affiliate of a corporation), State or political subdivision thereof, department, agency, or instrumentality of a State or political subdivision thereof, or any other government, organization, or entity (including any governmental entity (as defined in section 3701(2) of title 28)).

''(10) PRIVATE NETWORK.—The term 'private network' means a communications channel or channels, including voice or computer data transmission facilities, that use either—

''(A) private dedicated lines; or

''(B) the public communications infrastructure, if the infrastructure is secured by means of the appropriate private communications technology to prevent unauthorized access.

''(11) STATE.—The term 'State' means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

''(12) SUBSCRIBER.—The term 'subscriber'—

''(A) means any person with a business relationship with the interactive computer service provider through which such person receives access to the system, service, or network of that provider, even if no formal subscription agreement exists; and

''(B) includes registrants, students who are granted access to a university system or network, and employees or contractors who are granted access to the system or network of their employer.

''(13) SOLICITING AGENT.—The term 'soliciting agent' means any agent who knowingly solicits for a gambling business described in paragraph (4)(A) of this subsection.

''(b) INTERNET GAMBLING.—

''(1) PROHIBITION.—Subject to subsection (f), it shall be unlawful for a person engaged in a gambling business knowingly to use the Internet or any other interactive computer service—

''(A) to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager; or

''(B) to send, receive, or invite information assisting in the placing of a bet or wager.

''(2) PENALTIES.—A person engaged in a gambling business who violates this section shall be—

''(A) fined in an amount equal to not more than the greater of—

''(i) the total amount that such person bet or wagered, or placed, received, or accepted in bets or wagers, as a result of engaging in that business in violation of this section; or

''(ii) $20,000;

''(B) imprisoned not more than 4 years; or

''(C) both.

''(3) PERMANENT INJUNCTIONS.—Upon conviction of a person under this section, the court may enter a permanent injunction enjoining such person from placing, receiving, or otherwise making bets or wagers or sending, receiving, or inviting information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers.

''(c) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

''(1) JURISDICTION.—The district courts of the United States shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of this section by issuing appropriate orders in accordance with this section, regardless of whether a prosecution has been initiated under this section.

''(2) PROCEEDINGS.—

''(A) INSTITUTION BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The United States may institute proceedings under this subsection to prevent or restrain a violation of this section.

''(ii) RELIEF.—Upon application of the United States under this subparagraph, the district court may enter a temporary restraining order or an injunction against any person to prevent or restrain a violation of this section if the court determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that there is a substantial probability that such violation has occurred or will occur.

''(B) INSTITUTION BY STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The attorney general of a State (or other appropriate State official) in which a violation of this section allegedly has occurred or will occur, after providing written notice to the United States, may institute proceedings under this subsection to prevent or restrain the violation.

''(ii) RELIEF.—Upon application of the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of an affected State under this subparagraph, the district court may enter a temporary restraining order or an injunction against any person to prevent or restrain a violation of this section if the court determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that there is a substantial probability that such violation has occurred or will occur.

''(C) INDIAN LANDS.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), for a violation that is alleged to have occurred, or may occur, on Indian lands (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703))—

''(i) the United States shall have the enforcement authority provided under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) the enforcement authorities specified in an applicable Tribal-State compact negotiated under section 11 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2710) shall be carried out in accordance with that compact.

''(D) EXPIRATION.—Any temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction entered pursuant to subparagraph (A) or (B) shall expire if, and as soon as, the United States, or the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of the State, as applicable, notifies the court that issued the order or injunction that the United States or the State, as applicable, will not seek a permanent injunction.

''(3) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any proceeding under paragraph (2), a district court may, in exigent circumstances, enter a temporary restraining order against a person alleged to be in violation of this section upon application of the United States under paragraph (2)(A), or the attorney general (or other appropriate State official) of an affected State under paragraph (2)(B), without notice and the opportunity for a hearing as provided in rule 65(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (except as provided in subsection (d)(3)), if the United States or the State, as applicable, demonstrates that there is probable cause to believe that the use of the Internet or other interactive computer service at issue violates this section.

''(B) HEARINGS.—A hearing requested concerning an order entered under this paragraph shall be held at the earliest practicable time.

''(d) INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(1) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR USE BY ANOTHER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An interactive computer service provider described in subparagraph (B) shall not be liable, under this section or any other provision of Federal or State law

prohibiting or regulating gambling or gambling-related activities, for the use of its facilities or services by another person to engage in Internet gambling activity or advertising or promotion of Internet gambling activity that violates such law—

''(i) arising out of any transmitting, routing, or providing of connections for gambling-related material or activity (including intermediate and temporary storage in the course of such transmitting, routing, or providing connections) by the provider, if—

''(I) the material or activity was initiated by or at the direction of a person other than the provider;

''(II) the transmitting, routing, or providing of connections is carried out through an automatic process without selection of the material or activity by the provider;

''(III) the provider does not select the recipients of the material or activity, except as an automatic response to the request of another person; and

''(IV) the material or activity is transmitted through the system or network of the provider without modification of its content; or

''(ii) arising out of any gambling-related material or activity at an online site residing on a computer server owned, controlled, or operated by or for the provider, or arising out of referring or linking users to an online location containing such material or activity, if the material or activity was initiated by or at the direction of a person other than the provider, unless the provider fails to take expeditiously, with respect to the particular material or activity at issue, the actions described in paragraph (2)(D) following the receipt by the provider of an order under paragraph (2)(B).

''(B) ELIGIBILITY.—An interactive computer service provider is described in this subparagraph only if the provider—

''(i) maintains and implements a written or electronic policy that requires the provider to terminate the account of a subscriber of its system or network expeditiously following the receipt by the provider of an order under paragraph (2)(B) alleging that such subscriber has violated or is violating this section; and

''(ii) with respect to the particular material or activity at issue, has not knowingly permitted its computer server to be used to engage in activity that the provider knows is prohibited by this section, with the specific intent that such server be used for such purpose.

''(2) COURT ORDER TO INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(A) APPLICATION.—A Federal or State law enforcement agency, acting within its authority and jurisdiction and having reason to believe that a particular online site residing on a computer server owned, controlled, or operated by or for the provider is being used by another person to violate this section, may apply ex parte to a United States magistrate judge for an order to such provider under this paragraph to take the actions described in subparagraph (D).

''(B) ORDER.—The magistrate judge shall issue the order sought under subparagraph (A) upon a showing of probable cause to believe the particular on line site is being so used.

''(C) NOTICE.—Seventy-two hours after the latter of—

''(i) giving notice to the alleged violator of the order under subparagraph (B); or

''(ii) making reasonable efforts to notify the alleged violator of the order;

the law enforcement agency shall give the provider a copy of the court order. At that time the order shall take immediate effect. An alleged violator may, however, contest the order by requesting an expedited hearing from the court during that 72-hour period. If the alleged violator does so, the court shall as soon as possible hold the hearing, at which the law enforcement agency shall have the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that the on line site is being used in violation of this section.

''(D) SCOPE OF ORDER.—An order under this paragraph shall require that the provider expeditiously—

''(i) remove or disable access to the material or activity residing at that online site that allegedly violates this section; or

''(ii) in any case in which the provider does not control the site at which the subject material or activity resides, the provider, through any agent of the provider designated in accordance with section 512(c)(2) of title 17, or other responsible identified employee or contractor—

''(I) notify the Federal or State law enforcement agency that the provider is not the proper recipient of such order; and

''(II) upon receipt of a subpoena, cooperate with the Federal or State law enforcement agency in identifying the person or persons who control the site.

''(E) CONTENTS OF ORDER.—An order issued under this paragraph shall—

''(i) identify the material or activity that allegedly violates this section;

''(ii) provide information reasonably sufficient to permit the provider to locate (and, as appropriate, in an order issued under subparagraph (D)(i) to block access to) the material or activity;

''(iii) be supplied to any agent of a provider designated in accordance with section 512(c)(2) of title 17, if information regarding such designation is readily available to the public; and

''(iv) provide information that is reasonably sufficient to permit the provider to contact the law enforcement agency that obtained the order, including the name of the law enforcement agency, and the name and telephone number of an individual to contact at the law enforcement agency (and, if available, the electronic mail address of that individual).

''(F) POSTORDER HEARING.—An alleged violator that has not contested an order under subparagraph (C) may, not later than 60 days after the order takes effect, apply to have the order rescinded. A United States magistrate judge shall hear and determine that application. At that hearing the law enforcement agency that sought the order shall have the burden to show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the site was being used by that alleged violator to violate this section.

''(3) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The United States, or a State law enforcement agency acting within its authority and jurisdiction, may, not less than 24 hours following the issuance to an interactive computer service provider of an order described in paragraph (2)(B), in a civil action, obtain a temporary restraining order, or an injunction to prevent the use of the interactive computer service by another person in violation of this section.

''(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of any application for a temporary restraining order or an injunction against an interactive computer service provider described in paragraph (1)(B) to prevent a violation of this section—

''(i) arising out of activity described in paragraph (1)(A)(i), the injunctive relief is limited to—

''(I) an order restraining the provider from providing access to an identified subscriber of the system or network of the interactive computer service provider, if the court determines that there is probable cause to believe that such subscriber is using that access to violate this section, by terminating the specified account of that subscriber; and

''(II) an order restraining the provider from providing access, by taking reasonable steps specified in the order to block access, to a specific, identified, foreign online location;

''(ii) arising out of activity described in paragraph (1)(A)(ii), the injunctive relief is limited to—

''(I) the orders described in clause (i)(I);

''(II) an order restraining the provider from providing access to the material or activity that violates this section at a particular online site residing on a computer server operated or controlled by the provider; and

''(III) such other injunctive remedies as the court considers necessary to prevent or restrain access to specified material or activity that is prohibited by this section at a particular online location residing on a computer server operated or controlled by the provider, that are the least burdensome to the provider among the forms of relief that are comparably effective for that purpose.

''(C) CONSIDERATIONS.—The court, in determining appropriate injunctive relief under this paragraph, shall consider—

''(i) whether such an injunction, either alone or in combination with other such injunctions issued, and currently operative, against the same provider would significantly (and, in the case of relief under subparagraph (B)(ii), taking into account, among other factors, the conduct of the provider, unreasonably) burden either the provider or the operation of the system or network of the provider;

''(ii) whether implementation of such an injunction would be technically feasible and effective, and would not materially interfere with access to lawful material at other online locations;

''(iii) whether other less burdensome and comparably effective means of preventing or restraining access to the illegal material or activity are available; and

''(iv) the magnitude of the harm likely to be suffered by the community if the injunction is not granted.

''(D) NOTICE AND EX PARTE ORDERS.—Injunctive relief under this paragraph shall not be available without notice to the service provider and an opportunity for such provider to appear before the court, except for orders ensuring the preservation of evidence or other orders having no material adverse effect on the operation of the communications network of the service provider.

''(4) ADVERTISING OR PROMOTION OF NON-INTERNET GAMBLING.—

''(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

''(i) CONDUCTED.—With respect to a gambling activity, that activity is 'conducted' in a State if the State is the State in which the gambling establishment (as defined in section 1081) that offers the gambling activity being advertised or promoted is physically located.

''(ii) NON-INTERNET GAMBLING ACTIVITY.—The term 'non-Internet gambling activity' means—

''(I) a gambling activity in which the placing of the bet or wager is not conducted by the Internet; or

''(II) a gambling activity to which the prohibitions of this section do not apply.

''(B) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR USE BY ANOTHER.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An interactive computer service provider described in clause (ii) shall not be liable, under any provision of Federal or State law prohibiting or regulating gambling or gambling-related activities, or under any State law prohibiting or regulating advertising and promotional activities, for—

''(I) content, provided by another person, that advertises or promotes non-Internet gambling activity that violates such law (unless the provider is engaged in the business of such gambling), arising out of any of the activities described in paragraph (1)(A) (i) or (ii); or

''(II) content, provided by another person, that advertises or promotes non-Internet gambling activity that is lawful under Federal law and the law of the State in which such gambling activity is conducted.

''(ii) ELIGIBILITY.—An interactive computer service is described in this clause only if the provider—

''(I) maintains and implements a written or electronic policy that requires the provider to terminate the account of a subscriber of its system or network expeditiously following the receipt by the provider of a notice described in paragraph (2)(B) alleging that such subscriber maintains a website on a computer server controlled or operated by the provider for the purpose of engaging in advertising or promotion of non-Internet gambling activity prohibited by a Federal law or a law of the State in which such activity is conducted;

''(II) with respect to the particular material or activity at issue, has not knowingly permitted its computer server to be used to engage in the advertising or promotion of non-Internet gambling activity that the provider knows is prohibited by a Federal law or a law of the State in which the activity is conducted, with the specific intent that such server be used for such purpose; and

''(III) at reasonable cost, offers residential customers of the provider's Internet access service, if the provider provides Internet access service to such customers, computer software, or another filtering or blocking system that includes the capability of filtering or blocking access by minors to online Internet gambling sites that violate this section.

''(C) NOTICE TO INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

''(i) NOTICE FROM FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—If an interactive computer service provider receives from a Federal law enforcement agency, acting within its authority and jurisdiction, a written or electronic notice described in paragraph (2)(B), that a particular online site residing on a computer server owned, controlled, or operated by or for the provider is being used by another person to advertise or promote non-Internet gambling activity that violates a Federal law prohibiting or regulating gambling or gambling-related activities, the provider shall expeditiously take the actions described in paragraph (2)(A) (i) or (ii) with respect to the advertising or promotion identified in the notice.

''(ii) NOTICE FROM STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.—If an interactive computer service provider receives from a State law enforcement agency, acting within its authority and jurisdiction, a written or electronic notice described in paragraph (2)(B), that a particular online site residing on a computer server owned, controlled, or operated by or for the provider is being used by another person to advertise or promote non-Internet gambling activity that is conducted in that State and that violates a law of that State prohibiting or regulating gambling or gambling-related activities, the provider shall expeditiously take the actions described in paragraph (2)(A) (i) or (ii) with respect to the advertising or promotion identified in the notice.

''(D) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The United States, or a State law enforcement agency, acting within its authority and jurisdiction, may, not less than 24 hours following the issuance to an interactive computer service provider of a notice described in paragraph (2)(B), in a civil action, obtain a temporary restraining order, or an injunction, to prevent the use of the interactive computer service by another person to advertise or promote non-Internet gambling activity that violates a Federal law, or a law of the State in which such activity is conducted that prohibits or regulates gambling or gambling-related activities, as applicable. The procedures described in paragraph (3)(D) shall apply to actions brought under this subparagraph, and the relief in such actions shall be limited to—

''(i) an order requiring the provider to remove or disable access to the advertising or promotion of non-Internet gambling activity that violates Federal law, or the law of the State in which such activity is conducted, as applicable, at a particular online site residing on a computer server controlled or operated by the provider;

''(ii) an order restraining the provider from providing access to an identified subscriber of the system or network of the provider, if the court determines that such subscriber maintains a website on a computer server controlled or operated by the provider that the subscriber is knowingly using or knowingly permitting to be used to advertise or promote non-Internet gambling activity that violates Federal law or the law of the State in which such activity is conducted; and

''(iii) an order restraining the provider of the content of the advertising or promotion of such illegal gambling activity from disseminating such advertising or promotion on the computer server controlled or operated by the provider of such interactive computer service.

''(E) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of subparagraphs (C) and (D) do not apply to the content described in subparagraph (B)(i)(II).

''(5) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—

''(A) IMMUNITY FROM LIABILITY FOR COMPLIANCE.—An interactive computer service provider shall not be liable for any damages, penalty, or forfeiture, civil or criminal, under Federal or State law for taking in good faith any action described in paragraphs (2)(A), (4)(B)(ii)(I), or (4)(C) to comply with a notice described in paragraph (2)(B), or complying with any court order issued under paragraph (3) or (4)(D).

''(B) DISCLAIMER OF OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to impose or authorize an obligation on an interactive computer service provider described in paragraph (1)(B)—

''(i) to monitor material or use of its service; or

''(ii) except as required by a notice or an order of a court under this subsection, to gain access to, to remove, or to disable access to material.

''(C) RIGHTS OF SUBSCRIBERS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prejudice the right of a subscriber to secure an appropriate determination, as otherwise provided by law, in a Federal court or in a State or local tribunal or agency, that the account of such subscriber should not be terminated pursuant to this subsection, or should be restored.

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF RELIEF.—The availability of relief under subsections (c) and (d) shall not depend on, or be affected by, the initiation or resolution of any action under subsection (b), or under any other provision of Federal or State law.

''(f) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the prohibition in this section does not apply to—

''(A) any otherwise lawful bet or wager that is placed and received, or otherwise made wholly intrastate for a State lottery, or for a multi-State lottery operated jointly between 2 or more States in conjunction with State lotteries if—

''(i) each such lottery is expressly authorized, and licensed or regulated, under applicable State law;

''(ii) the bet or wager is placed on an interactive computer service that uses a private network or a closed-loop subscriber based service regulated and operated by the State lottery or its expressly designated agent for such activity;

''(iii) each person placing or otherwise making that bet or wager is physically located when such bet or wager is placed at a facility that is open to the general public; and

''(iv) each such lottery complies with sections 1301 through 1304, and other applicable provisions of Federal law;

''(B) any otherwise lawful State-regulated parimutuel wagering activities on live horse or dog racing, or live jai alai, conducted on a closed-loop subscriber-based system, provided that the type of wagering activity has been authorized by the State.

''(C) any otherwise lawful bet or wager (other than a bet or wager described in subparagraph (A)) that is placed, received, or otherwise made wholly intrastate, if such bet or wager, or the transmission of such information, as applicable is—

''(i) expressly authorized, and licensed or regulated by the State in which such bet or wager is initiated and received, under applicable Federal and such State's laws; and

''(ii) placed on a closed-loop subscriber based service; or

''(D) any otherwise lawful bet or wager (other than a bet or wager in any class III game conducted by a tribe that is not explicitly authorized by an applicable tribal-State compact between that tribe and the State where the tribe is located) that is—

''(i) placed on a closed-loop subscriber based service or a private network; and

''(ii) is lawfully received by a federally recognized Indian tribe, or the sending, receiving, or inviting of information assisting in the placing of any such bet or wager, if the game is permitted under and conducted in accordance with the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, so long as each person placing, receiving, or otherwise making such a bet or wager, or transmitting such information, is physically located on Indian lands (as that term is defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act) when such person places, receives, or otherwise makes the bet or wager.

''(2) BETS OR WAGERS MADE BY AGENTS OR PROXIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) does not apply in any case in which a bet or wager is placed, received, or otherwise made by the use of an agent or proxy using the Internet or an interactive computer service.

''(B) QUALIFICATION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to prohibit the owner operator of a parimutuel wagering facility that is licensed by a State from employing an agent in the operation of the account wagering system owned or operated by the parimutuel facility.

''(3) ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION.—The prohibition of subsection (b)(1)(B) does not apply to advertising, promotion, or other communication by, or authorized by, anyone licensed to operate a gambling business in a State.

''(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect any prohibition or remedy applicable to a person engaged in a gambling business under any other provision of Federal or State law.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code,

is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1085. Internet gambling.''.

SEC. 3. REPORT ON ENFORCEMENT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report, which shall include—

(1) an analysis of the problems, if any, associated with enforcing section 1085 of title 18, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act;

(2) recommendations for the best use of the resources of the Department of Justice to enforce that section; and

(3) an estimate of the amount of activity and money being used to gamble on the Internet.

SEC. 4. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of this Act and the provisions of such amendments to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act is designed to respond to a major scourge on the Internet. There are now, more than 700 unregulated out-of-control Internet casino-style gambling sites on the Internet. Sports betting may be even larger than the casino gambling. The proposals now, not by any of the States, but by some who would ask that the States begin to provide the sale of lottery tickets online in people's homes, something that a great many people are very concerned about.

The bill allows the use of the Internet by the States for the sale of lottery tickets in public places where children can be screened out. But there are those who stand to make tens of millions of dollars selling lottery services to the States to sell those tickets online. No State does that today. This bill prevents that from occurring.

The bill is supported by a wide array of organizations, including the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the National Football League, the National Basketball Association, Major League Baseball, the National Hockey League, all concerned about sports betting online, particularly by children.

The bill is supported by a wide array of religious organizations, the National Council of Churches, the Presbyterian Church of the United States, the Family Research Council, Focus on the Family, the Christian Coalition, Jerry Falwell Ministries, the American Family Association, the United Methodist Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, the Home School Legal Defense Association.

But the bill's original purpose is served by the request of the National Association of Attorneys General, NAAG, who came to Senator KYL in the Senate and to myself in the House and said that the 1961 Wire Act prohibiting gambling interstate on electronic means of communications is out of date and needs to be updated. That is what this bill responds to. They strongly support the legislation, as does the National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion.

I would like to thank a number of Members for their help with this legislation: the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF); the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection from the Committee on Commerce, which helped to work out additional language to make it absolutely clear that this legislation does not expand gambling in any way, shape, or form; the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) who helped to work out new language in the legislation related to due process rights for those who may have their sites taken down or blocked.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for their leadership on this issue as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) who has been very supportive.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for their support of this legislation, which I believe will pass with overwhelmingly strong bipartisan support.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me say from the outset that I believe that it is highly inappropriate to consider a controversial deeply flawed bill on the Suspension Calendar. This is the wrong process because I and other Members have amendments we want to offer that we are foreclosed from offering in this process.

So on that basis alone, I believe this suspension ought to be rejected. The most controversial aspect of it are the carve-outs for the powerful special interests.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan just pointed out that there are carve-outs for horse racing and Jai-Alai and dog racing. How are we going to have a realistic bill if Jai-Alai and dog racing and all these others have exemptions carved out?

The real rub in this bill is that, while those have exceptions, State lotteries do not. I think we would also agree that our State lotteries are perhaps the best form of gaming we have out there and that they are giving legitimate dollars to our States, for the education of our kids, for education, for housing.

Now, no one disputes that we ought to regulate these offshore gambling casino interests in the Antilles and Antigua. No one disputes that we ought to have that on the books.

Let me say at the beginning that I applaud the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and applaud the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for their efforts to put those provisions in this bill.

But do my colleagues know what? In creating those provisions, they have created numerous other problems by carving out all these exemptions for these special interests gaming operations. Really, this language has come from the Christian Coalition. I thought that the Congress ought to be the one that writes legislation, not the Christian Coalition. It is ironic that the Christian coalition wants to have an exception for dog racing. The Christian Coalition does not seem to have a problem with that, but they have a problem with State lotteries providing necessary educational funds for their kids in the different States.

In addition to that, this legislation also does not do enough to protect the important sovereignty that exists between Native American tribes and our Federal Government, something that the majority continues to trample on at every single turn.

As vice chair of the Native American Caucus, I just am so upset that this bill would ignore the important sovereignty provisions that the States have worked out with these tribes, the Federal tribe relationship. It is a sovereign relationship.

Finally, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) understands that these Internet service providers, the very people that are charged with policing this bill, are unequipped to deal with this. The fact is that we have an Internet that is in its infancy. We all know the Internet is in its infancy. My colleagues are going to put the regulatory burden, the enforcement burden for these regulations on these Internet service providers, many of whom are woefully inadequate to do so. So it is going to create a real hell of a time for these Internet service providers.

So let me just say that, while my colleagues have the Attorneys General on their side, we have the governors. Every governor, the Governors' Association, has written strongly opposing this legislation because it would absolutely gut the funding for the necessary programs that many of these governors rely on in order to provide our very constituencies with the educational funding that we need.

Finally, let me just say we need more money in education. The thought that my colleagues are going to take money away from education in our States at a time when we need more of it is just absolutely incredible to me. The fact that they carve out exceptions for these other gambling operations, while not carving out an exemption, for example, for State lotteries, to me, it

just does not make any sense. State lotteries ought to be the ones that we at least carve out an exemption for, not these others.

So I just cannot say that this is a good bill. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), we ought to consider this bill on regular calendar and regular order so that we can have a deeper dialog and discussion about the very controversial nature of this legislation.

□ 1415

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to the gentleman that not every governor agrees. In fact, we have a real problem here with forged letters from governors, as indicated on the front page of Roll Call and in The New York Times, with a letter being circulated by opponents of this legislation claiming that Governor Jeb Bush of Florida wrote a letter in opposition to the bill when in point of fact no such thing occurred. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement is now investigating the matter.

I would also say to the gentleman that there are no exemptions in this legislation for horse racing. That is why all of these groups are supporting this legislation. And who would know better than the reporters for the racing industry. Here is the headline in the Daily Racing Form: ''Internet bill said to lose exemption for racing.'' Blood Horse Magazine: ''Racing to lose Internet bill exemptions.''

The fact of the matter is this bill has been carefully crafted with the assistance of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) to make it absolutely clear that while parimutuel betting is treated fairly, they are not in any way exempt or carved out under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER).

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3125.

I strongly support this bill for three primary reasons: first, it gives law enforcement the ability to block offshore casino Web sites; second, the bill protects children from gambling; and, third, it protects the rights of States to continue governing a legal, regulated, taxpaying industry, the parimutuel industry.

Parimutuel gaming is and always has been a State issue. States control parimutuel gaming, and they control it effectively. It is an industry that is highly regulated, pays taxes and has a respectable place in the States many of us represent. States do not, however, control casinos on Indian reservations. They certainly do not control offshore casino Web sites, of which there are at least 700, many of them in the Caribbean, which are not regulated and not taxed.

I have heard concerns about cheating on the Internet. Parimutuel bets, however, are safe bets, equally safe made in person or at a simulcast.

Finally, we do not have to worry about children logging on to the parimutuels and placing bets. Individuals would have to participate in a closed-loop subscriber-based service to wager on horses, greyhounds, or Jai-Alai. It does not get brought into the home unless a person wants it.

The bill strikes a perfect balance for what is needed, a prohibition on Internet casino gambling and a preservation of the rights of States to regulate the parimutuel industry.

References were made by my respected colleague and friend with respect to the effect of education dollars of this bill. Speaking as a representative of the State of Florida, let there be no mistake, the State lottery of Florida has not added, relatively, a single penny to the schools and to the education coffers of the State of Florida. Just the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

It may be that my friend from Virginia is not aware of the latest version of his bill that eliminates the requirements that wagers on horse racing, dog racing, and Jai-Alai be initiated from a State in which such betting or wagering is lawful and received in a State in which such betting is lawful.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope people approaching the Capitol will be careful because they might stumble on the increasingly growing pile of discarded Republican ideas.

In Sunday's Washington Post, there was an excellent article by Stephen Moore of the Cato Institute documenting the extent to which the Republican Party in the House has abandoned its notion of controlling spending. I recommend people read Mr. Moore's article. He used to be a consultant to the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget. He said the Republicans have given up really on controlling spending. They spend it wrong, in some ways; but they spend a lot of it.

In this morning's Washington Post, we have another Republican idea of yore biting the dust: term limits. Some people with very long memories, inconvenient ones, will remember term limits. It used to be part of the Contract With America. Some people do not remember the Contract With America, or the contract of Mr. Gingrich; but term limits has also been discarded. It cited cases of the Republican leadership urging Members to break their pledge with regard to term limits.

Well, today two more old Republican principles bite the dust. One was not that old, because the Internet is not that old. But we used to hear about freedom of the Internet. We used to hear how important it was that people be allowed to do what they want on the Internet. Now we understand the true principle. It is important that people be able to do what the Republican Party wants them to do on the Internet. If the Republican Party has no objection, then they can do it. But if the Republican Party thinks there are pictures they should not look at, or perhaps booze they should not buy, or bets they should not make, then freedom for the Internet goes away.

This is a very intrusive regulation of the Internet. This notion that citizens ought to be able to make their own decisions about what to do over the Web now stands revealed as a very insufficient idea. In fact, we were told we must protect children against this because children live in houses with parents with computers, and we must not allow the parents to be the ones who decide what their children do. We, the Federal Government, will step in and we will protect children from that Internet, which will reach out and grab them when their parents are not looking.

Another principle that appears to be on its last legs that the Republican Party sometimes professes support for is that of States' rights. I understand the governor of Florida has said that was not an accurate letter from him. I also understand that we would need subpoena power to get the governor of Florida to tell us what he really thinks about this. And since I, at least, do not have that vote, I cannot tell. The governor of Florida has said he will not tell us his position, but most of the governors are against it.

And I was particularly struck when my friend from Florida said, well, parimutuel betting should be an exemption, although it is an exemption that the author of the bill says does not exist. But the gentleman from Florida, defending that nonexistent exemption, says, well, parimutuel betting is controlled by the States and Jai-Alai is controlled by the States. Well, are lotteries run by the States not controlled by the States? This bill makes it illegal for States to decide that they wish to use the Internet for their lotteries.

Now, remember, the State would have a decision to stay off the Internet if it want wanted to. So here we have a bill that says to the States that we will tell them, the States, that they may not use the Internet for their lottery distribution. What a two-fer: two great principles with one stone. First of all, freedom of the Internet; secondly, States' rights. Bang, they both go with this bill.

Here we say to the States we will let parimutuel gambling go on, because that is a closed loop, and that is okay because States have regulated that. And my friend from Florida said the State lottery in Florida has not given Florida enough money for education, has not given them any money for education. I am sorry about that, but I will tell my colleague that in the State of Massachusetts the lottery has, I think, been very helpful for education.

I do not understand why this Congress ought to interfere with the decision by the people of Massachusetts and the governor and the legislature of Massachusetts to use the Internet.

Now, understand what we have been told. If the States want to act to make sure that retailers in a downtown are not disadvantaged in the collection of sales taxes, we will get in their way. But if the States want to put their lottery on the Internet, we, the Federal Government, will interfere, if this bill passes; and we will tell them to forget all that stuff they read about Internet freedom because if the Federal Government does not like what the States are doing on the Internet, to use a technical parliamentary term ''freedom schmeedom.'' We will interpose our superior morality and tell the States that gambling is not right; and, therefore, while the State may choose to have a lottery, and individuals may choose to use the Internet for that lottery, we, the Federal Government, know better than the States and we know better than the individuals.

I do not think that I have seen in one piece of legislation a more stunning repudiation of principles.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act. As an original cosponsor, I urge all my colleagues to support this very important bill.

After listening to my colleague from Massachusetts, I hope we can all come back to reality for just a minute. Everyone, including Republicans and Democrats, would agree the Internet is a great educational tool and a valuable source of information and communication. However, American families must be protected from the dangers associated with unrestricted and unregulated gaming.

In States like Nevada, the gaming industry is well regulated and its activities are tightly monitored. However, allowing gambling to be conducted on the Internet would open the floodgates for corruption, abuse, and fraud. Not only could unscrupulous operators bilk millions of unsuspecting customers, but our children could easily obtain their parents' credit cards, turn their bedrooms into casinos, and with these sites unknowingly squander their families' hard-earned money.

The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act provides the necessary tools for law enforcement officials to crack down on these fly-by-night Internet gambling sites. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill which will protect our children, our homes, and our technology from fraudulent, unscrupulous, and unregulated Internet gaming and gambling site operators.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to the bill.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3125 will actually do nothing to stem the tide of Internet gambling. In fact, the bill constitutes a significant step backwards for several reasons.

First, it provides for extended Internet gambling in the areas of horse racing, dog racing, and Jai-Alai. And there seems to be some question about that, so I will just read from the bill, starting on page 34: ''The prohibition in this section does not apply to,'' and when we turn to page 35 it says, ''any otherwise lawful State regulated parimutuel waging activities on live horse or dog racing or live Jai-Alai conducted on a closed-loop subscriber-based system.'' That closed-loop subscriber-based system is about as hard to get on as opening up an Internet brokerage account to trade stocks. About anybody can do it. As a result of these exemptions, the bill will proliferate rather than prohibit gambling over the Internet, and that is because people would rather gamble at home rather than having to go all the way to the track.

In addition, the bill will not effectively prohibit those gambling interests it actually seeks to stop because offshore the Federal Government has no authority to close those particular Web sites. We can tell AOL or another company to shut down a domestic site, but we have no authority to shut down something offshore in a rogue nation for which we have no diplomatic relations. That will give them essentially a complete exclusive franchise to run these operations.

Lastly, the bill is not effective because it provides no individual liability. While it makes activities by certain gambling entities running the operation illegal, it does not make it illegal for the individual to gamble.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, the title of the bill, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, is one that I am sure a lot of Americans will support. But this bill will actually expand gambling for horse racing, dog racing, and Jai-Alai. It will be ineffective in stopping casino gambling and sports betting run by offshore businesses and, as a result, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act is more sound bite than reality; and, therefore, I must oppose the legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his leadership on this particular measure.

Mr. Speaker, today I have come to the floor to speak on behalf of H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act. As my colleagues may know, unregulated Internet gambling through virtual casino games has become a very lucrative business.

□ 1430

These Web sites are not regulated, taxed or licensed by the States and are available to the public, including those who are underage and would not be allowed in an actual gambling facility, on the open Internet.

New sites offering games such as blackjack and roulette crop up each day, and the industry has plans for major expansion next year if the issue is not addressed legislatively by Congress in this session.

H.R. 3125 effectively addresses the problems created by these sites, clarifies Federal law, and gives the authorities the tools necessary to regulate Internet gambling activities. At the same time, the bill establishes a regulatory framework for Internet gaming activities that recognizes the leadership role that should be played by the individual States in regulating legal gaming activities they have already authorized.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate companion bill passed the Senate late last year by unanimous consent and we are ripe to enact legislation clarifying the complex issue of Internet gambling. If H.R. 3125 is not passed this year, it will likely be too late to stop the problems caused by these unregulated gambling businesses. H.R. 3125 is a good bill that works, as is evidenced by the broad level of support that it has garnered from various groups and on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this practical and necessary legislation and working to enact the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act into law.

I also would like to clarify the fact that lotteries are not affected. Lotteries are regressive. And we all know that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) a real champion in the fight against gambling.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, this will not expand gambling. I rise in strong support. I can stand here all day to categorize the number of hurt and pain and suffering and agony and even death of many young people who get involved in gambling. Gambling hits the poor, the elderly and, sadly, the young.

I want to share that every Member of this body who was here when the National Gambling Commission was established, voted for the National Gambling Commission, which issued a report, and it said as follows: Simply put, ''Adolescent gamblers are more likely to become problem or pathological gamblers. Several studies have shown the link between youth gambling and its association with alcohol and drug use, truancy, low grades, illegal activities to finance gambling.''

The Commission goes on to strongly support the bill of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE). The Commission reported in 28 percent of the cases where children carried a gun to school, gambling was a factor.

This legislation would address an industry that has grown overnight on the Web virtually without anyone focusing on it until the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) did.

As the gambling commission noted, youth gambling like youth smoking is often an issue of accessibility and marketing. Nothing is more accessible to young people that we now have than the Internet.

I urge my colleagues, if we miss this opportunity, more children will be hurt and go through pain and suffering and agony and even death. This is an opportunity to do what the National Commission says we should do. This is an opportunity to do what most people know is absolutely right.

I urge my Members, particularly those who say they are for strong family values and they care about the future of young people and they care about all these issues, to come to the House tonight when we vote and vote aye on the Goodlatte bill.

I would like to also put a list of the stories we have taken off the wire service in the last few months of the hurt and the pain and the suffering and the agony of the people who have gotten involved in gambling.

SAMPLE NEWS CLIPS ON GAMBLING

''As many as 500,000 Michigan adults could be 'lifetime compulsive gamblers,' and the number could swell with two new Detroit casinos in operation and a third to open soon, says a new state report. The survey, released Wednesday, also found that well over half of those with gambling problems began young. 'When we asked compulsive gamblers ''When did you start having a problem?'' we were startled to learn that 77% of them said they were already compulsive by the time they were 18,' said Jim McBryde, special assistant for drug policy in the Michigan Department of Community Health.'' (Detroit News, 1/13/00)

''As allies of the National Collegiate Athletic Association push legislation that would ban wagering on college sports, a new study found that one out of every four male student-athletes may be engaging in illegal sports betting—and that one in 20 places bets directly through illegal bookies. And though prevalent among student-athletes, the study found that sports wagering activity is higher among ordinary students—39% among male nonstudent athletes.

''The study surveyed 648 student-athletes and 1,035 students, both male and female, at three midwestern universities. The study also found that 12% of male student-athletes—roughly the same portion as nonathletes—showed signs of problem gambling. About 5% of the overall athlete sample demonstrated signs of pathological gambling disorders.'' (Las Vegas Sun, 7/6/00).

''More than 850 Internet gambling sites worldwide had revenues in 1999 of $1.67 billion, up more than 80% from 1998, according to Christiansen Capital Advisors, who track the industry. Revenues are expected to top $3 billion by 2002.'' (Reuters, 5/31/00).

''Will Torres Jr. spends part of his day listening to sad stories. As the director of the Terrebonne Parish (La.) District Attorney's Office's Bad Check Enforcement Program, Torres has heard some doozies. ''I've seen people lose their homes, their retirements wiped out, their marriage. People losing everything they have,' Torres said. Gambling, specifically video poker, is starting to catch up with drugs and alcohol as a precursor to local crime . . . ''Torres and the District Attorney's Office recently noticed an interesting trend while profiling bad-check writers: a large number of their suspects are video poker addicts. 'We're not talking about people who mistakenly write a check for groceries at Winn-Dixie for $25.33,' Torres said. 'We're talking about people who are writing checks for $25 or $30 eight times a day at locations with video machines or places in close proximity of video poker machines.' ''So far this year, Torres' office has collected $320,000 for Terrebonne Parish merchants who were given 3,600 worthless checks. Torres said about 30% of those bad checks are connected to gambling. '''It's eating people up,' he said. 'It's real sad when people don't have a dollar. No money for food because of gambling addictions. I've seen it up close, and video poker plays a large role in the problem.'''' (The Courier [Houma, La.], 8/28/99)

''Rodney Stout, 25, of Pine Bluff (Ark.) was sentenced Friday to 30 years in prison for abducting Stacey Polston of Jacksonville and her 18-month-old daughter at gunpoint and stealing Polston's van. . . . Stout was under financial pressure, he said. He had a 'gambling problem' that came to a head when he gambled away $5,000 he had set aside for moving expenses.'' (Arkansas Democrat-Gazette, 5/9/00).

''Former University of Southern California baseball player Shon Malani was sentenced Wednesday to two years in federal prison for stealing nearly $500,000 from the federal credit union where he worked. U.S. District Judge Helen Gillmor rejected a request for leniency made by Malani's attorney, who said he stole the money to pay off gambling debts totaling hundreds of thousands of dollars.'' (Associated Press, 3/1/00).

''One third of 120 compulsive gamblers participating in a pioneering treatment study have either filed for bankruptcy or are in the process of filing, a University of Connecticut researcher said Tuesday. . . . . (Nancy) Petry said she recently gave a talk to a group of bankruptcy lawyers who estimated that as many as 20% of their clients had mentioned gambling as a reason for their problems.'' (Hartford Courant, 6/14/00).

''Of all the heroes who emerged from the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, perhaps none was more inspirational than Henry Tillman. A big, tough hometown kid, he had plunged into serious trouble when he was rescued in a California Youth Authority lockup by a boxing coach who saw a young man of uncommon heart and untapped talent. In a little more than two years, he would stand proudly atop the Olympic platform at the Sports Arena, just blocks from his boyhood home, the gold medal for heavyweight boxing dangling from his neck.

''But two years after his mediocre pro career ended, he was back behind bars. And now he stands accused of murder in a case that could put him away for life.

''[G]ambling got Tillman into trouble. He was arrested in January 1994 for passing a bad credit card at the Normandie. He pleaded no contest and got probation. In 1995, he pleaded guilty to using a fake credit card in an attempt to get $800 at the Hollywood Park Casino in Inglewood.

''I have suffered from a long history of gambling addiction, which I am very ashamed had taken over my life,' Tillman wrote in a letter to the court.'' (Los Angeles Time, 1/26/00)

''More than half the state's adult population has visited a casino, either in Michigan or elsewhere, a statewide poll shows. . . . People at the top and bottom of the income scale are the biggest spenders at the casinos Those making less than $15,000 a year spend $172 per visit, and those earning more than $100,000 per year spend $161 per visit. People in the $30,000–$45,000 income bracket spend the least, reporting an average of $87.40 per visit. ''Pollster Ed Sarpolus noted that the age groups most likely to visit casinos are between 18 and 24, and between 50 and 54.'' (Detroit Free Press, 11/17/99)

''Tethered to his post by a curly plastic cord that stretched from his belt loop to a frequent-player card inserted in a Black, Widow slot machine, James Lint pondered. What happens to the little guy when casinos come to town?

'''I see a lot of people leave with tears in their eyes,' said the Georgia businessman, taking a short break from the machine in Biloxi's Beau Rivage casino. 'They come here too much, and they spend too much money.'

''Lint, who flies his private plan to Biloxi three times a year to kick back at the casinos, doesn't count himself among the ranks of those who gamble away what they cannot afford. But some people do lose their grocery money to slot machines, and no one—not casino operators, not gung-ho promoters of the industry—denies it.

''It would be hard to: The Mississippi Coast has been at the center of several high-profile compulsive gambling incidents, including one involving two famous writers, brothers who squandered an inheritance worth more than $250,000 at blackjack and slots.

''It is a hard-edged reality that happens—at casinos, at racetracks, at church bingos, at state lottery outlets. The Mississippi Coast has seen a 26-fold increase in the number of Gamblers Anonymous meeting—to 13 a week—since the first casino opened in 1992.'' (Lexington [Ky.] Herald-Leader, 9/12/99)

''There is an ugly undercurrent that's sweeping away thousands of Missourians-people whose addiction to gambling has led to debt, divorce and crime. This is a world of people like Vicky, 36, a St. Charles woman who regularly left her newborn son with baby sitters to go to the casinos and who considered suicide, after losing $100,000. ''And Kathy, a homemaker and mother of two from Brentwood, who would drop her kids at school and spend the entire day at a casino playing blackjack. She used a secret credit card that her husband didn't know about to rack up more than $30,000 in debt. . . .

''In a three-month look at compulsive gambling, the Post-Dispatch found that . . . Fast-cash machines on casino floors can hasten a problem gambler's descent into debt, prompting the nation's largest machine supplier last month to let people deactivate their cards in casinos. Hard Numbers on gambling-related crimes are elusive, but fraud detectives in St. Louis say they're seeing an increase in workers with access to money taking it to support gambling habits.'' (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, 2/6/99)

''The battle against domestic violence is gaining ground, and work by University of Nebraska Medical Center researcher Dr. Robert Muelleman is helping. . . . Muelleman worked on a . . . study at the UNMC hospital this summer. The study has not been published yet, so the results are not entirely concluded, he said, but some preliminary inferences can be drawn. 'It looks as if problem gambling in the partner is going to be as much a risk factor as problem alcohol and that's really new information.' he said.'' (Daily Nebraskan, 1/13/00)

''A Charlotte, N.C., postal worker is suing First Citizens Bank and Visa for his Internet gambling debts—because he says it's illegal

for the bank and Visa to let their credit cards be used for gambling online. . . . Lawers for (Mark) Eisele filed the suit, which seeks class action status, in the U.S. District Court in San Francisco, where Visa International is based. . . . The suit claims Visa and First Citizens, which issued Eisele's credit card, violated the federal Wire Act, which prohibits use of wire communications services for some gambling.'' (Las Vegas Review-Journal, 8/18/99)

''A California bank robber returned to his old habits after being released from a New Jersey prison to travel to a halfway house in his home state, according to bank robbery charges in at least two states. . . .

''[Noel] Miller, who had been staying at a New Orleans motel, told investigators he was robbing banks to finance his gambling habit and to support himself.'' (Associated Press, 6/1/00)

''A casino executive who fudged his tax returns should have his license renewed anyway, New Jersey's top casino regulator said Monday. James Hurley, chairman of the state Casino Control Commission, said Mirage Resorts Inc.-Atlantic City president Mark Juliano demonstrated 'extremely poor judgment and an acute lack of sensitivity regarding his financial reporting responsibilities.' But Hurley said it wasn't serious enough to deny Juliano a license to work in New Jersey casinos. Juliano, 44, of Haddonfield, a former president of Caesars Atlantic City Hotel Casino, wrote off $8,965 for a 'phantom' personal computer, reported gambling losses as a business expense and told the IRS he drove 180,000 miles on a car found to have traveled only 69,000 total miles, according to an investigation by the state Division of Gaming Enforcement.'' (Associated Press, 6/19/00)

''Brian Dean Gray, a former Richmond (Va.) stockbroker, pleaded guilty yesterday in U.S. District Court to all three federal fraud charges against him for stealing more than $850,000 from clients and gambling much of it away. . . . He used more than $350,000 to gamble on horse racing, at New Jersey casinos and in card games.'' (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 6/3/00)

''Before casino gambling, (Atlantic City) was home to numerous thriving churches of various denominations. But in recent years, churches and synagogues have begun to close. . . . The Rev. Patrick J. Hunt, pastor at (the Church of the Ascension), said the casino industry is helping society gradually erode. 'We want anybody to come to church,' Hunt said. 'But gambling is a vice and the casinos do their darndest to make sure we don't exist and that every other church doesn't exist.'" (Atlantic City Press, 10/11/99)

''A Florida man who lost about $50,000 while gambling [in Atlantic City] during the past two days died Tuesday after he jumped seven floors from a Trump Plaza Hotel and Casino roof onto Columbia Place, officials said.'' (Atlantic City Press, 8/18/99)

''A German tourist jumped to his death off a 10-story casino parking garage Wednesday in the third such suicide in Atlantic City in eight days.'' On Aug. 17, a gambler who had lost $87,000 jumped to his death off a Trump Plaza roof. On Monday, a dealer at Caesar's Atlantic City Hotel Casino committed suicide by leaping off the casino's parking garage.

''It wasn't clear if the most recent victim had been gambling. He left no suicide note.'' (Associated Press, 8/25/99)

''A Kanawha County (W.V.) woman admitted she skimmed $40,000 from her group's bingo and raffle games Thursday, unveiling an ongoing state and federal investigation of groups that operate such games. Donna J. Hopkins, 50, was secretary of the Marmet Soccer Association when she embezzled the money.'' ([Charleston, W.V.] Gazette, 3/3/00)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds, mainly to remind my friend from Virginia that the gambling commission advocated a ban on Internet gambling without exception. And that is not this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that I agree with the comments of my friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF). Gambling is a pernicious vice.

H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 2000, is well-intentioned but I do not think it succeeds in what it is attempting to do. Instead, this legislation creates legislation that is unenforceable and places great regulatory burdens on Internet service providers and represents the first full-blown regulation of the Internet passed by this body.

This bill will expand gambling online and undermine the State's authority to regulate gambling. The carve out for parimutuel betting will allow for parimutuel betting nationwide even in those States where gambling is currently illegal.

A business licensed and regulated in one State will be allowed to take bets from someone located in other States regardless of whether the State where the bettor is located has authorized such activity. All the bettor would need to do is dial into the licensed business taking the bets. This would constitute a closed loop. Anyone who so desires would be able to load the software to be able to perform this function on his computer and the States would not be able to enforce their laws.

Internet service providers are burdened by being required by the Government to act as enforcers of this law. By passing this bill, we will be deputizing ISPs with the task of denying their customers access to any site that allows wagering. The courts will need to issue a court order to each and every ISP in the country telling them to shut off access to any offending site, and the ISP will be required to put in place filters to ensure that none of their subscribers can gain access.

What is the cost? Let me assure my colleagues that it is not just monetary. ISPs, in order to be in full compliance with this law, will need to monitor what sites its customers are visiting. Keeping up with the sites that allow gaming will be impossible for most ISPs. AOL may have the resources to monitor the activity on every site accessed by its servers, but Rocky Mount Internet based in Utah does not.

ISPs now have or will soon have the technology to shield the identity of its customers. People will be able to access gambling sites anonymously, rendering it impossible for this law to be enforced. With this technology, both the gambling site as well as the subscriber will be able to mask the address from Federal agents. Any filters required by the law will, therefore, be rendered useless.

This legislation is harmful and ultimately unenforceable. We should reject this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) that the National Gambling Impact Study Commission said the Federal Government shall prohibit without new or expanded exemptions Internet gambling not already authorized.

This legislation, thanks to the good work of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN), makes it perfectly clear that there are no exemptions for anyone under this legislation.

I would say to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) that we have worked very closely with Internet service providers and we will continue to do that to make sure that the burdens are manageable, and they have seen and worked with us on the language contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, let me say in the beginning, let us not let the perfect become the enemy of the good here.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his bill and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) for crafting a compromise that we can support. So I hope all the folks will come on board here. We can mend this bill later on if they are not happy with it.

Opponents of this legislation cry out there is special legislation here creating carve-outs for specific industries. And I say, Mr. Speaker, the carve-outs that they cite are not carve-outs. Rather, they allow for activity that is already lawful under existing law to continue.

This legislation permits parimutuel wagering to operate as it has for many, many years under Federal and State laws. This legislation is mindful of States' rights and sovereignty and allows States their rights to regulate activity within their border, and that is currently legal. So there are no carve-outs here.

As such, the bill does not expand or promote gambling on the Internet. Instead it allows for those activities as currently permitted by States to exist. This legislation has the support of a lot of groups. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, let me start off by stating let's not let the perfect become the enemy of the good. The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act before us today is not a perfect bill. But it is a step in the right direction and I commend my friend from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, and my good friend from Louisiana, Mr. TAUZIN, for crafting a compromise we can support.

Some of the opponents of this legislation will say that this bill promotes or expands gambling on the Internet. Nothing can be further from the truth. The legislation before us

today in no way expands gambling on the Interent. First and foremost, the legislation offered by my friend from Virginia prohibits gambling businesses from using the Internet to place, receive, or otherwise make a bet or wager. It does not create new government laws, or additional regulations on the Internet, it merely brings the interstate gambling ban up to date. H.R. 3125 in no way expands gambling on the Interent and permits only activities that are otherwise lawful and regulated by the states.

Opponents of this legislation cry that H.R. 3125 is special favor legislation creating carve outs for specific industries. Mr. Speaker, the carve outs they cite are not carve outs, rather, it allows for activity that is already lawful under existing law to continue. This legislation permits parimutuel wagering to operate as it has for many years under federal and state laws. This legislation is mindful of states' rights and sovereignty, and allows states their right to regulate activity within their borders that is currently legal. As such, the bill does not expand or promote gambling on the Internet, instead, it allows for those activities as currently permitted by states.

This legislation has the support of the National Football League, Major League Baseball, National Association of Attorneys General, the Christian Coalition, the Family Research Council, as well as numerous other organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation. Though not perfect, ti certainly is a step in the right direction, and it is the first step in battling the proliferation of illegal gambling on the Internet—with future Congresses free to revisit this matter and amend this legislation as necessary.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this vote would turn only on the question of whether or not there are exemptions created in the bill.

This is the administration's beginning statement. ''The administration strongly opposes H.R. 3125, which appears to be designed to protect certain forms of Internet gambling that are currently illegal while potentially opening the floodgates for other forms of illegal gambling. The administration is especially troubled by the exemptions included in the bill for parimutuel wagering on activities such as horse races, dog races and Jai-Alai. These exemptions could have the effect of allowing individuals to bet on dog and horse racing from their homes, giving children and other vulnerable populations unsupervised, unlimited access to such gambling activities.''

That is an exemption. There is no policy justification for such exemptions.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think the best response to the comments of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) would come from the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) who has played a critical role in making it absolutely clear that the language in this bill does not provide any exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection, a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act. It is a good bill. I urge my colleagues to vote for it this afternoon.

Back in June the subcommittee I am honored to chair, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection, was afforded the opportunity to hold a hearing on this bill. At the hearing, we learned many things regarding current State and Federal law as it applied to both interstate and intrastate gambling activities.

While the existing framework governing such activity is not always a model of clarity, our hearing revealed that this bill as it came to us to the committee explicitly legalized certain interstate parimutuel gaming activities that the Justice Department believes are prima facie illegal under current Federal law, namely the Wire Act.

As a result, the administration did, in fact, oppose H.R. 3125 when we held our hearings and they opposed it on the grounds that first it did then expand gambling beyond and above what is allowed by existing law according to Justice's interpretation of the Wire Act and, secondly, that it was not technologically neutral and that it made legal on the Internet activities that might be illegal when conducted on phone wire.

In response to these criticisms, my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and I, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman BLILEY), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and their staffs, recrafted the parimutuel gaming provisions of the bill as we see them today.

Working with the sports leagues, many religious interests and the parimutuel gaming interests themselves, we are happy to report that we were successful in coming up with the compromise language that makes it clear that the bill no longer draws any legal distinction between the Internet and wire line gaming activities and, as a result, in no way expands gambling beyond the present limits whatever those limits are according to the Justice Department or the courts of the land.

This language now added to H.R. 3125 in the form of a managers amendment clarifies the bill prohibits all online gambling and only permits otherwise lawful, State regulated, live parimutuel wagering activities that are conducted on a closed subscriber-based loop.

By the way, I should also point out it does allow the Internet intrastate for the use of the lottery activities provided that they are conducted in a public place. With this language, H.R. 3125 now addresses the administration's concerns and places an appropriate ban on gambling activities that is badly needed for the country and needs to be adopted.

In the past couple years, online gambling has flourished into a $1 billion industry with more than 700 sites in existence. The sports-related casino style gambling taking place over the Internet today has, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) pointed out, ruined the lives of many Americans young and old.

If we fail to present the President with this legislation this year, the proliferation will be enormous. Make no mistake. This bill needs to be passed. It is neutral. It does not expand gambling. It needs to be addressed.

□ 1445

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, merely to advise my friend from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Virginia that the changes that they made made the expansion of gambling worse. That came from the Department of Justice, whom you thought you were trying to satisfy. The Department has received a copy of the language, they say, which we believe constitutes the amendment intended to resolve concerns over the exemption of horse racing, dog racing, and Jai-Alai. It is our position that this amendment may be even more problematic than the current version of the bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the gentleman and say that the Justice Department says that the Wire Act covers these situations but does not prosecute anyone. Under this legislation, they would have new tools requested by the National Association of Attorneys General to combat this very serious problem on the Internet, and that is exactly what we intend to give them with this legislation. There are no exemptions. We certainly do not expand gambling. We attack the multibillion dollar industry that is growing on the Internet, the 700 cybercasinos, the sports betting, the threat of sales of lottery tickets in people's homes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. Cox).

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time, and I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for trying to do the right thing here today, because I share the concerns of my colleagues about the spread of illegal Internet gambling. But I rise in reluctant opposition to this legislation because while it is well intentioned, it is bad telecommunications policy.

This legislation would create enormous, if unintentional, regulatory problems. First, it proposes to treat online and offline gambling under different rules. That is a violation of the

fundamental tenet of the Internet Nondiscrimination Act that this House passed very recently by the overwhelming vote of 352–75. Regulating commerce on the Internet under different rules from commerce in the offline world is a dangerous precedent that invites significant new regulation of the Internet such as we have not yet seen.

Second, the bill expands gambling opportunities to make legal certain types of bets over the Internet that would be illegal if they were made over the telephone. Third, the bill would unfairly make Internet service providers and search engines and other interactive service providers, ISPs, who have nothing to do with gambling, people who have nothing to do with gambling, it would make them responsible for policing the behavior of their subscribers. This is the principle that we rejected when then Representative WYDEN and I brought the Internet Freedom and Family Empowerment Act to the floor so that we could stop the approach that the Senate had adopted with the Communications Decency Act, later rejected by the Supreme Court.

In this bill in order to avoid criminal prosecution, ISPs and other interactive services would have to make sure that they are not hosting or linking to Web sites containing gambling advertising or information. To avoid criminal prosecution, they would have to block users from accessing foreign Web sites over which they have no control, an especially dangerous precedent while the United States at this very moment is seeking to oppose efforts by foreign governments to do that to our Web sites.

Fourth, this bill would have the Federal Government dictate, indeed amend, the terms and conditions on which ISPs today offer service. It would require that every ISP terminate the account of any subscriber who is suspected of using the service to gamble. Fifth, the bill contains price controls. It requires every ISP to offer gambling filtering software at, quote, ''reasonable cost,'' putting the Federal Government in an unspecified way in charge of determining what is a reasonable price for filtering software.

For the mom-and-pop Internet service providers who constitute the vast majority of America's thousands of ISPs, the legal and regulatory costs of complying with this new Federal regulatory scheme are significant. That is why this imperfect bill remains opposed by so many groups, the Computer and Communications Industry Association, AT&T, the Center for Democracy and Technology, the Electronic Privacy Information Center, the Traditional Values Coalition, the Free Congress Foundation, the Seniors Coalition, and Americans for Tax Reform.

Oppose this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, let me respond to the gentleman from California for whom I have great respect but with whom I must disagree on every single point raised. This legislation does not treat online gambling unfairly compared to offline gambling. In fact, the activities complained of have been going on on the telephone lines for decades and this legislation is simply designed to bring the Wire Act, written in 1961 when the Wire Act was a good description of telecommunications in this country, into the modern age when telecommunications takes on a whole host of different ramifications, including the Internet. It does not in any way expand gambling on the Internet. We have made that perfectly clear time and time again. Why else would the National Coalition Against Gambling Expansion support this legislation?

The bill retrenches gambling on the Internet by fighting 700 online cybercasinos, by giving law enforcement new tools to deal with sports betting online, by stopping the efforts of some who stand to make tens of millions of dollars selling services to State lotteries to sell tickets online in people's homes.

I want to make the point perfectly clear that we do not tell the States that they cannot use the Internet. We simply say that when they use the Internet, they have to use it in public places, like convenience stores or other places where children can be screened out and they cannot buy tickets online as they could at home. That is why the Home School Legal Defense Association supports the legislation, the Southern Baptist Convention supports it, and many, many other religious and family organizations.

Furthermore, we do not require Internet service providers to police the Internet. We simply require them to cooperate with law enforcement. And we do not require them to shut down suspected sites, because the bill provides due process requirements of notice and hearing before a judge, and a judge finding that an action should be taken before an Internet service provider can be required to take down or block a site.

The legislation has been carefully crafted to be sensitive to the Internet industry, which I am very supportive of. After all, I am the chairman of the Congressional Internet Caucus and have worked on many issues with the gentleman and others to promote the Internet. But one way to promote the Internet is to make sure that the seamy side of life is dealt with on the Internet. Just like child pornography has to be dealt with on the Internet, so does unregulated, out-of-control, illegal gambling. That is why the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the National Football League, Major League Baseball, the National Hockey League, and the National Basketball Association support this legislation because of the renewed threat to amateur and professional sports in America brought on by an incredible explosion in gambling and sports betting because of the Internet. These new tools are needed by law enforcement. That is why the National Association of Attorneys General have asked us for this legislation. That is why I ask my colleagues to support it.

It is also important to note that this legislation treats Indian gaming fairly. Every word in this legislation has been signed off on by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this effective legislation to fight gambling on the Internet.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 2000. This legislation is necessary to stem the rising tide of Internet gambling, which is largely unregulated and unreachable by American authorities.

Mr. Speaker, Internet gambling has the potential to make thousands of Americans who enjoy video games into gambling addicts. All that an Internet gambler needs to play casino-style games on the Internet is a computer, a modem, and a credit card—and therein lies the dangerous allure of this type of wagering. Unlike a glitzy casino where playing games of chance is a social experience, Internet gambling is usually done alone, with the only limit being the limit on one's credit card. I believe that gambling over the Internet has the potential to turn a generation of children who are addicted to video games into a generation of adults addicted to playing casino-style games over the Internet.

Furthermore, most of the cyber-casinos are located in the Caribbean, so that the few gamblers who do win have no recourse if there is a dispute. Mr. Speaker, banning Internet gambling now will prevent much more serious social problems later. For that reason, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 3125.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3125, The Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, a bill that threatens the continued growth of e-commerce as well as the privacy rights of individuals.

The Department of Justice, high-tech companies and socially conservative organizations agree—H.R. 3125 is fatally flawed. By prohibiting some types of gambling and expanding others, H.R. 3125 puts an inappropriate burden on high tech companies and interferes with the civil liberties of Americans.

The legislation is rife with loopholes. Betting on horses and dogs is allowed; sports and casino-style games are not. Jai-alai is in, while state lotteries are out. This arbitrary patchwork of exemptions and prohibitions seems to be rooted in the degree of power of a particular interest group rather than sound public policy.

H.R. 3125 imposes new and unprecedented regulatory burdens on the Internet that are shortsighted and threaten our civil liberties. The notice and take-down provisions are overbroad, too burdensome for ISPs, and give the government too much power.

Finally, the blocking provisions in H.R. 3125 threaten to intrude on individual privacy. This Congress is still in the process of drafting legislation aimed at assuring the privacy of individuals using the Internet. H.R. 3125 would leap over that thoughtful process and attempt to regulate what many Members have vowed to allow—freedom on the Internet. H.R. 3125

puts artificial boundaries on the Internet when the Internet is designed specifically to transcend boundaries.

I share my colleagues's desire to protect society from the dangers of abusive gambling which can be a corrosive agent, both culturally and personally. However, H.R. 3125 does not do what it purports to do. If Congress wants to ban gambling on the Internet then it should ban all gambling on the Internet. The piecemeal approach embodied in H.R. 3125 is an exercise in hypocrisy. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 3125.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act. During Judiciary Committee mark-up, I brought up my concerns relating to the tribal gaming exemption. I am pleased that the Gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, and the Gentleman from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG, were willing to work with me to include language which addresses my concerns about what I believe was an ambiguous section of the bill.

I would like to take a moment to explain my concerns and how, through the manager's amendment, these concerns were addressed. The provision exempting gambling on a closed loop system requires both the sender and the receiver to be on Indian lands. This is not limited to the Indian lands on which the game is conducted, therefore, it would allow linking of all Indian lands nationwide. My concern with this language was how multi-Tribal linking could impact individual Tribal/State gaming Compacts.

Let me provide an example: If State A's Compact allows for slots, and State B's Compact allows for blackjack and slots, absent clarification, the tribe in State A could argue it can now participate in blackjack. Included in the manager's amendment is additional language on this section to ensure that no Class III gaming activity can occur without the explicit authorization of a Tribal/State Compact. This language does not require Tribes to renegotiate their Compacts with states; rather it reinforces the Tribal/State Compact.

In conclusion, the Indian gaming language has been clarified so that the carefully negotiated Tribal/State compacts are not at risk. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 3125, the Internet Gambling Prohibition Act.

I am concerned that the bill creates unfair carve outs. In-home gambling on horse and dog races is allowed, but tribal Internet gaming is prohibited. I fail to see how dog races are acceptable but tribal gaming is not. This bill does not deserve our support.

The bill is so riddled with exemptions it is opposed by the Traditional Values Coalition, which says that the bill does little to address the problems it purports to solve.

Tribal gaming has been essential in furthering economic development on our reservations. It has allowed for medical clinics and upgrading of substandard housing. It has lifted Native Americans from poverty. It has given them self-determination over their destiny. It has furthered Native American sovereignty.

It is important we recognize all Native Americans have given to this country. For that reason, earlier in the year I introduced H. Res. 487 to honor Native Americans.

Native Americans have shown their willingness to fight and die for this nation in foreign lands. They honor the American flag at every powwow.

Native Americans should be treated fairly. We should not burden them with restrictions we are unwilling to place on others.

The bill is opposed by the Department of Justice, AT&T, the San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Computer and Communications Industry Association, Covad Communications, Center for Democracy and Technology, National Congress of American Indians, Electronic Privacy Information Center, ACLU, Traditional Values Coalition, Seniors Coalition, Free Congress Foundation, Americans for Tax Reform, CATO Institute, American Association of Concerned Tax Payers, and Coalition for Constitutional Liberties.

For all of the above reasons, I am opposing H.R. 3125.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 3125, which could more appropriately be re-titled the Internet Gambling Proliferation Act.

What this proposed legislation does is impose a new set of laws that selectively privilege some forms of gambling by exempting them from these laws. At the same time, other forms of gambling are condemned. What Congress should do is work with the states to enact legislation, which deals rationally with prohibiting or regulating Internet gambling.

Furthermore, in my home State of New Mexico—as in many other states—this legislation would unnecessarily complicate the ability of states and tribal governments to work out a rational regulatory scheme.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3125, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3125.

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

There was no objection.

SEMIPOSTAL AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4437) to grant to the United States Postal Service the authority to issue semipostals, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4437

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Semipostal Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO ISSUE SEMIPOSTALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 416. Authority to issue semipostals

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) the term 'semipostal' means a postage stamp which is issued and sold by the Postal Service, at a premium, in order to help provide funding for a cause described in subsection (b); and

''(2) the term 'agency' means an Executive agency within the meaning of section 105 of title 5.

''(b) DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY.—The Postal Service is hereby authorized to issue and sell semipostals under this section in order to advance such causes as the Postal Service considers to be in the national public interest and appropriate.

''(c) RATE OF POSTAGE.—The rate of postage on a semipostal issued under this section shall be established by the Governors, in accordance with such procedures as they shall by regulation prescribe (in lieu of the procedures under chapter 36), except that—

''(1) the rate established for a semipostal under this section shall be equal to the rate of postage that would otherwise regularly apply, plus a differential of not to exceed 25 percent; and

''(2) no regular rates of postage or fees for postal services under chapter 36 shall be any different from what they otherwise would have been if this section had not been enacted.

The use of any semipostal issued under this section shall be voluntary on the part of postal patrons.

''(d) AMOUNTS BECOMING AVAILABLE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts becoming available from the sale of a semipostal under this section shall be transferred to the appropriate agency or agencies under such arrangements as the Postal Service shall by mutual agreement with each such agency establish.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF APPROPRIATE CAUSES AND AGENCIES.—Decisions concerning the identification of appropriate causes and agencies to receive amounts becoming available from the sale of a semipostal under this section shall be made in accordance with applicable regulations under subsection (e).

''(3) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amounts becoming available from the sale of a semipostal under this section shall be determined in a manner similar to that provided for under section 414(c)(2) (as in effect on July 1, 2000).

''(B) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Regulations under subsection (e) shall specifically address how the costs incurred by the Postal Service in carrying out this section shall be computed, recovered, and kept to a minimum.

''(4) OTHER FUNDING NOT TO BE AFFECTED.—Amounts which have or may become available from the sale of a semipostal under this section shall not be taken into account in any decision relating to the level of appropriations or other Federal funding to be furnished to an agency in any year.

''(5) RECOVERY OF COSTS.—Before transferring to an agency in accordance with paragraph (1) any amounts becoming available from the sale of a semipostal over any period, the Postal Service shall ensure that it has recovered the full costs incurred by the Postal Service in connection with such semipostal through the end of such period.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Postal Service shall prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this section, including provisions relating to—

''(A) which office or other authority within the Postal Service shall be responsible for making the decisions described in subsection (d)(2);

''(B) what criteria and procedures shall be applied in making those decisions; and

''(C) what limitations shall apply, if any, relating to the issuance of semipostals (such as whether more than 1 semipostal may be offered for sale at the same time).

''(2) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—Before any regulation is issued under this section, a copy of the proposed regulation shall be published in the Federal Register, and an opportunity shall be provided for interested parties to present written and, where practicable, oral comment. All regulations necessary to carry out this section shall be issued not later than 30 days before the date on which semipostals are first made available to the public under this section.

''(f) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Postmaster General shall include in each report rendered under section 2402, with respect to any period during any portion of which this section is in effect, information concerning the operation of any program established under this section.

''(2) SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT.—If any semipostal ceases to be offered during the period covered by such a report, the information contained in that report shall also include—

''(A) the commencement and termination dates for the sale of such semipostal;

''(B) the total amount that became available from the sale of such semipostal; and

''(C) of that total amount, how much was applied toward administrative costs.

For each year before the year in which a semipostal ceases to be offered, any report under this subsection shall include, with respect to that semipostal (for the year covered by such report), the information described in subparagraphs (B) and (C).

''(g) TERMINATION.—This section shall cease to be effective at the end of the 10-year period beginning on the date on which semipostals are first made available to the public under this section.''.

(b) REPORTS BY AGENCIES.—Each agency that receives any funding in a year under section 416 of title 39, United States Code (as amended by this section) shall submit a written report under this subsection, with respect to such year, to the congressional committees with jurisdiction over the United States Postal Service. Each such report shall include—

(1) the total amount of funding received by such agency under such section 416 during the year;

(2) an accounting of how any funds received by such agency under such section 416 were allocated or otherwise used by such agency in such year; and

(3) a description of any significant advances or accomplishments in such year that were funded, in whole or in part, out of amounts received by such agency under such section 416.

(c) REPORTS BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall submit to the President and each House of Congress an interim report on the operation of the program established under section 416 of title 39, United States Code (as amended by this section) not later than 4 years after semipostals are first made available to the public under such section.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—The General Accounting Office shall transmit to the President and each House of Congress a final report on the operation of the program established under such section 416, not later than 6 months before the date on which it is scheduled to expire. The final report shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the General Accounting Office, together with any recommendations it considers appropriate.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 4 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''416. Authority to issue semipostals.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The program under section 416 of title 39, United States Code (as amended by this section) shall be established within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO ISSUE SEMIPOSTALS FOR BREAST CANCER RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 414(g) of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(g) This section shall cease to be effective after July 29, 2002, or the end of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the Semipostal Authorization Act, whichever is later.''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—No later than 3 months and no earlier than 6 months before the date as of which section 414 of title 39, United States Code (as amended by this section) is scheduled to expire, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Congress a report on the operation of such section. Such report shall be in addition to the report required by section 2(b) of Public Law 105–41, and shall address at least the same matters as were required to be included in that earlier report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4437.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as with any measure of this magnitude, the point at which a bill comes to the floor of this House, of course, is realized only through the concerted efforts and a great deal of hard work by a number of good people, and that is certainly the case here today.

In that regard, I want to begin by expressing my deepest appreciation particularly to the ranking member on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), his staff, the staff of the full subcommittee, for their efforts, for their support and most importantly their substantive and constructive input. I would say not only is the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) a primary cosponsor of this legislation, he is indeed one of the primary authors; and frankly his input, his participation made what I think is a good piece of legislation even better.

I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and, of course, his colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member on the full committee, for their cooperation and for their efforts in helping to bring this very worthy piece of legislation before us today.

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, seeks to achieve two very important objectives. The first is to extend the authorization of the highly successful breast cancer research stamp. It was not that long ago in the 105th Congress under the guidance of two of our former colleagues, a fellow State associate of mine, the gentlewoman Susan Molinari from New York, and Vic Fazio, the gentleman from California, who worked so hard in realizing what became the first ever semipostal issuance in the history of the United States. Since that time, since the creation of the breast cancer research stamp, the proceeds from the sales of these issues from voluntary purchases has resulted in some $15 million in additional funds made available for breast cancer research.

There is truly, Mr. Speaker, not a person in this country that has not in some way been touched by the cruel hand of this disease, a wife, a mother, a close friend, a loved one or, in my own case, a grandmother. Those dollars, willingly donated by millions upon millions of caring individuals, will hopefully bring us ever closer to the day when this scourge is but a sad and very frightening memory. Without our action here through this bill, Mr. Speaker, the current authorization will end at the conclusion of this month, on July 29, in fact.

So many in this House, so many in this Nation have called upon us to act further. In the House, I would say we owe particular thanks to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), who gathered 117 of our colleagues calling for this extension. In fact, the authorization for such an action contained in this bill is modeled on the gentleman from New Hampshire's bill and would extend the current program for an additional 2 years.

As I mentioned, our presence here today also comes through the urging and support of many, many others, far too many to properly credit them all by name. But we certainly want to thank and commend each and every one of those folks. But I do want to pay particular tribute to just a few, if I might. Ms. Betsey Mullen, who was here with us in Washington earlier today, I believe and I hope she still is, and her colleague at the Women's Information Network Against Breast Cancer, Dr. Bodai, for their untiring efforts. I would also like to thank Ms. Mullen's 6½-year-old nephew and her

8½-year-old niece who took the time out of what I know are their busy lives and busy summers to actually address handwritten letters to all of us here in Congress urging our continued efforts on behalf of this semipostal.

Mr. Speaker, I include the letters in their entirety for the RECORD.

DEAR CONGRESS, Girls and boys can get breast cancer and I don't want girls and boys and the President and his wife, cat and dog to get sick. Keep the stamp going.

From Brendon Fisher.

JULY 16, 2000.

DEAR CONGRESS, I think it's very important to keep the stamp because if we don't every girl is going to worry about it or maybe get brest cancer. But if we keep it we will get money to cure to stop it. My Aunt Betsey risked her life on it and I'm proud of her. If you think about it no one likes it because you can die from it. I think and a lot of other people agree with me that it would be best to keep the stamp and then things will go perfect.

Hope my letter makes a difference because not just me is counting on this.

By Paige Fisher, 8 in a half years old, MD.

If I might, I would like to read a part of both of those.

''Dear Congress:

''Girls and boys can get breast cancer and I don't want girls and boys and the President and his wife, cat and dog to get sick. Keep the stamp going.''

That is from Brendon Fisher, who is, as I said, 6½ years old.

□ 1500

And this one: ''Dear Congress, I think it is very important to keep the stamp, because if we don't, every girl is going to worry about it or maybe get breast cancer. But if we keep it, we will get money to cure, to stop it. My Aunt Betsey risked her life on it and I'm proud of her. If you think about it, no one likes it because you can die from it. I think, and a lot of other people agree with me, that it would be best to keep the stamp and then things will go perfect. I hope my letter makes a difference, because not just me is counting on this. By Paige Fisher, 8½ years old.''

Paige, I want to let you know that yours and Brendon's efforts have indeed made a difference. As I said, I have many to thank.

I would like to give a personal thanks to a special individual, a lady by the name of Jennifer Katz, who has a tangential professional interest in this cause, but who long before this question evolved, Mr. Speaker, through her own life experiences taught me and I suspect many, many others how to learn from her efforts that through tragedy one can identify important goals and challenges and learn in life some things so personal that can become bigger than self, and to thank her for helping me better understand that reality.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, and certainly not least, we all owe our thanks to the dedicated administration and employees of the Postal Service, because it was through their selfless commitment, through their efforts that this program in its initial stages has reached the historic levels that it has. Yes, Mr. Speaker, many, many thanks to so many people.

The second equally important part and important section of this bill would establish a permanent process and give defined authority within the Postal Service to regularly and formally establish future semipostals that will serve similar purposes in the national American public interest.

The success of the Breast Cancer Research Stamp has understandably led many of our colleagues to propose similar initiatives that are designed to benefit many other worthy causes. And, indeed, this year alone in this Congress, we have had some 14 bills introduced into both bodies that attempt to achieve just such a goal.

Mr. Speaker, I will read from them briefly: the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) on AIDS research; the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) on diabetes; the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) on Alzheimer's; the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) on prostate cancer; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on emergency food relief; the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) on organ and tissue donation; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) on World War II memorial; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) on the American Battle Monuments Commission; the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on domestic violence. And in the other body, Mr. LOTT on Highway-Rail Grade crossing safety; Mr. NIGHTHORSE-CAMPBELL on domestic violence; Mr. DEWINE on organ and tissue donation, and the list goes on and on.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, all of these are very worthy initiatives, and I think it is just that fact that perhaps most clearly of all calls for the passage of this bill. I fear absent our action, Mr. Speaker, that none of these may be achieved, that in the perhaps regrettable, but I think undeniable political reality of this Congress as we push back and forth toward trying to achieve our own personal and sometimes equally laudable goals, none of them may be passed.

Mr. Speaker, through this legislation, we can say to the postal service, we must establish a system that must consider these kinds of initiatives and they must issue them on a regular basis. In this fashion, Mr. Speaker, I think we can most assuredly guarantee that these kinds of initiatives will indeed continue into the future, as I think they should.

Mr. Speaker, I would say, while the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Initiative has gone exceedingly well, it has not been without its flaws. Some observers including the General Accounting Office have found that some of the procedural and administrative surroundings have been less than perfectly implemented. This bill seizes upon a report done by the GAO that calls for certain reforms within future issuances, providing for better accounting methods to make sure that both the expenditure and the revenue side are clearly defined and clearly recorded, a provision for full reporting on the program, including regularly reports to both bodies in this Congress, methods to ensure full costs coverage, so that those who choose not to participate in the stamp are not somehow burdened with added costs, to ensure that any future, postal increases necessitated are not a result of semipostals no matter how worthy the cause.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I do firmly believe that this is a balanced and well-reasoned and in my humble opinion a very worthy and necessary piece of legislation, and I would urge its passage here today.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman of this committee, for being forthcoming with reference to this legislation. Additionally, I would like to thank the delegate, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), my good friend, for graciously allowing me to manage the time on this important measure.

I would like to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) in the consideration of H.R. 4437, the Semipostal Authorization Act, legislation, granting the postal service the discretionary authority to issue semipostals. This measure was unanimously reported from the committee on June 29, 2000.

I am pleased to note that on June 29, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) reported out an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4437, which made a number of important changes to the original text. We owe our interests in semipostals to Dr. Ernie Bodai, chief of surgery at the Kaiser Permanente Medical Center in Sacramento, California, and one of our former colleagues, former Congressman Vic Fazio from California.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bodai first proposed the idea of a semipostal with the money raised going toward breast cancer research. He took his idea to Congressman Vic Fazio; and on May 7, 1996, Congressman Fazio introduced the first semipostal bill, H.R. 3401, the Breast Cancer Research Stamp Act.

He was joined in this effort by Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN when she sponsored identical legislation in the Senate. Congressman Fazio subsequently reintroduced his bill in the 105th Congress as H.R. 407. On May 13, 1997, Representative Fazio joined Representative Susan Molinari from New York,

former Congresswoman, in sponsoring H.R. 1585, Stamp Out Breast Cancer Act.

The bill, as amended, and passed by the House on July 22, 1997, by a vote of 423–3 permitted the postal service to establish a special rate of postage for first class mail, not to exceed 25 percent of the original first class rate of postage. Stamps issued under this special rate are available for purchase by the public on a voluntary basis and as an alternative to regular postage.

After deducting an amount sufficient to cover reasonable costs attributable to the printing, sale, and distribution of the stamps, the postal service would transfer 70 percent of the amount generated to the National Institutes of Health and 30 percent to the Department of Defense for breast cancer research.

The National Institutes of Health designated the money to support innovative pilot studies that will further breast cancer awareness. The Department of Defense designated the money for awards intended to encourage innovative approaches to breast cancer research.

H.R. 1585 was subsequently enacted into law, Public Law 105–41, in addition to authorizing the breast cancer research stamp for 2 years, required the General Accounting Office to submit a report to Congress that evaluated the effectiveness and the appropriateness of this method of fund-raising.

In its April 2000 report, entitled ''Breast Cancer Research Stamp, Millions Raised for Research, But Better Costs Recovery Criteria Needed,'' the GAO determined that the semipostal was successful. It is expected that by July 28, 2000, well over 215 million stamps will have been sold and more than 15 million in revenue raised.

GAO further determined that the semipostal was an effective and appropriate way to fund-raise.

Mr. Speaker, the incidence of breast cancer continues to far outstrip available resources and funds. The statistics are as sobering as they are rising. Breast cancer is still the number one cancer killer of women between the ages of 15 and 24. The disease claims another woman's life every 15 minutes in the United States. More than 2 million women are living with breast cancer in America today, yet 1 million of them have not been diagnosed.

More and more people are joining the ranks of breast cancer survivors rather than breast cancer victims due in large part to breakthroughs in cancer research. According to the American Association for Cancer Research, 8 million people are alive today as a result of cancer research. The bottom line is that every dollar we continue to raise will save lives.

Clearly, the American public by purchasing more than 215 million breast cancer semipostal stamps believes this is a good cause and one worthy of contributions. I would urge on behalf of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the committee that we move quickly and pass H.R. 4437.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests, but before yielding back, let me compliment and express my appreciation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for his invaluable assistance here and to associate myself with his remarks about not just the importance of this bill in its two major aspects but to the invaluable contributions of both our former colleagues, Mr. Fazio and Ms. Molinari, as I attempted to state in my remarks, but also as I said, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and others for the great assistance that they have given and urge all of our colleagues to join us in expressing their support of this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4437, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICKI COCEANO POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3985) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar City, Florida, as the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3985

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. VICKI COCEANO POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar, Florida, shall be known and designated as the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3985.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of standing on this floor just last week as we proposed four similar naming bills and made the comment that I felt very strongly then, and I continue to believe in that we are indeed fortunate to have the efforts of so many Members of this body from across the country who work so hard and have done such a tremendous job in identifying truly worthy individuals to which and upon whom we can extend this honor of a post office naming.

□ 1515

I would like to pay my compliments and thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the primary sponsor of this legislation, for keeping us on track in that regard and for helping us to uphold a record in which we all take a great deal of pride.

As the Clerk has read, Mr. Speaker, this bill does indeed designate the United States Postal Service building located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar, Florida, as the Vicki Coceano Post Office Building.

H.R. 3985 was amended by the full committee but only as a result of a necessary technical correction to the address that was originally identified by the Postal Service, and has no other substantive impact upon the bill itself.

We are indeed fortunate, as we just heard on the previous piece of legislation, to have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) with us, and I know that he is prepared to make a very full statement about Ms. Coceano. I do not want to take away from that opportunity, but let me note that as we attempt to do on all of these bills we have looked over the background and the contributions of this very special lady, a special lady, who I understand is affectionately known in her community as Mayor Vicki, which I think speaks volumes about the affection and the respect of those who know her best and how they view this very, very unique individual.

As a resident of South Florida for some 40 years, I understand that is a fairly remarkable achievement in a State that benefits from the migration of many people from my State, for example. So she has been there for 4 decades contributing to her community, as her nickname suggests, serving in public office and serving in a distinguished way, but clearly her contributions extend far beyond that of running

for mayor or some other public position. She has been a contributor, a volunteer and a doer in a wide range of activities that have certainly benefited her community. But through such efforts as on the White House Conference on Aging and others, she has not limited her scope and her influence to the wonderful community of Miramar but has attempted to serve this entire nation.

So it is with a great deal of pride that I rise today to put forward this bill and to commend, as I said, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the entire Florida delegation who have joined in the cosponsoring of the bill, and I urge all of our colleagues to join us in supporting this initiative.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) for his warm and generous comment. I am deeply appreciative. Additionally, I would like to thank our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), for assisting my office in expediting this matter before the end of this portion of our session.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) again for giving me the privilege of going forward today in this regard, as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who has been extremely helpful to us.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3985. I introduced this bill earlier in the year to name a post office in my hometown of Miramar, Florida, for Vicki Coceano. The city commission of the City of Miramar passed a resolution overwhelmingly supportive of this measure before I undertook any action at all. Additionally, my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), in whose district this facility actually exists, was also extremely supportive.

For me, it becomes a moment of personal privilege. I am now in my fourth term here in the United States Congress. And I have had the good fortune of doing a significant number of things on behalf of the people that I represent in the district that I am privileged to serve. And I would hope on behalf of this Nation and indeed the entire Earth that some of my actions have been helpful. But none gives me any greater pride than to offer this measure today for indeed as is the case with a lot of Members who come forward with legislation, today it is a point of real privilege for me because Vicki Coceano is a person that I have known for 38 years. And I have known her to be more than forthright as a citizen. In the days of segregation, it was Vicki Coceano that spoke out frequently with reference to matters of this kind.

So, Mr. Speaker, and I would also say to my dear friends in South Florida, this honor is altogether fitting and appropriate.

In the few minutes that I have, let me say a little more about a wonderful woman in South Florida, Vicki Coceano, that the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) so rightfully brought up, Mayor Vicki. Mayor Vicki, as she is affectionately known by some, Vicki by some of us, and has preferred it that way, has resided in South Florida for more than 40 years and has generously given both her time and talents throughout that period to make Broward County, which its largest city is Fort Lauderdale but its proudest city is Miramar, during that period of time to make it a better place to live and work.

She was elected to serve as a Miramar city commissioner in 1977 and elected mayor in 1989, serving the people of Miramar for more than 20 years, indeed all of its existence. There is one who has departed, former Mayor Calhoun, who I know is looking down on us today as we take this action and is proud of the fact that Vicki is being a recipient of this honor.

Vicki has also served on many boards at the Federal, State and county levels, including the Blue Ribbon Committee for Broward County Schools, the Area Agency on Aging and the White House Conference on Aging.

Above all, Vicki has always been interested in our Nation's youth, recognizing that they are tomorrow's leaders and that our future rests in their hands.

She spearheaded a successful fundraising campaign to build a youth center and has since been honored with a Spirit of Life Humanitarian Award.

Though struggling with illness at this time, Mayor Vicki is still very much involved with the planning and zoning board; serves on the executive committee of the Area Agency on Aging and is a volunteer at the Broward County Humana Hospital.

For Vicki Coceano, civil service is part of a life blended with optimism, fervency and genuine care for those she serves. Her commitment has both shaped her legacy and the life of Miramar's residents.

Coceano was recently awarded the Spirit of Life Humanitarian Award at a banquet in which the proceeds will benefit the Mayor Vicki Coceano Cancer Research Fellowship at the National Medical Center and Beckman Research Institute.

In addition, her name brandishes both the Broward County Hall of Fame and the Broward County Women's Hall of Fame.

The new post office in Miramar will service the transactions and connections people forge each day. If we can add Mayor Vicki's name to this building, it would certainly be fitting for a leader who understands the power of communicating the language of change and articulating its power through her actions, commitments and spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that all 22 of my Florida colleagues have cosponsored this bill with me, and I am equally proud that Senator BOB GRAHAM has introduced an identical bill in the Senate.

Clearly, Floridians know and wish to honor Vicki Coceano. I am delighted to see this honor bestowed today upon a delightful woman that has served us so much.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me again thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) for bringing to us the name of an individual, as we heard in some detail, who really does bespeak what is good and right about this country and, more importantly, good and right about its people. We are indebted to him and to all of his colleagues who joined with him in supporting it.

Finally, I would urge of all of our Members here today to support us in passing this very worthy bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3985, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

"A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar, Florida, as the 'Vicki Coceano Post Office Building'.".

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 534) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate that security policy and security procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration remain inadequate, that the individuals responsible for such policy and procedures must be held accountable for their performance, and that immediate action must be taken to correct security deficiencies.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 534

Whereas two computer hard drives containing a large quantity of sensitive classified nuclear weapons data at the Department of Energy's Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico, were recently

missing for an undetermined period of time, exposing them to possible compromise;

Whereas the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, in its report dated June 1999 on security problems at the Department of Energy, concluded that ''the Department of Energy and the weapons laboratories have a deeply rooted culture of low regard for and, at times, hostility to security issues'';

Whereas in response to longstanding security problems with the nuclear weapons complex and to recommendations made by the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board in that report, Congress enacted the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (title XXXII of Public Law 106–65) to establish a semi-autonomous National Nuclear Security Administration with responsibility for the administration of programs for the national security applications of nuclear energy;

Whereas the Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives concluded in February 2000 that the Department's plan to implement the provisions of that Act ''taken as a whole appears to allow continued DOE authority, direction, and control over the NNSA and retain current DOE management, budget, and planning practices and organizational structures'';

Whereas the Secretary of Energy has recognized the need to address nuclear weapons security problems within the Department of Energy and has sought to make improvements;

Whereas the Secretary of Energy, in fulfilling the duties and functions of the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security, and the Director of the Office of Security and Emergency Operations of the Department of Energy, in serving as the Chief of Defense Nuclear Security of the National Nuclear Security Administration, were responsible for nuclear weapons security policies and implementation of those policies while the computer hard drives were missing;

Whereas the effective protection of nuclear weapons classified information is a critical responsibility of those individuals entrusted with access to that information; and

Whereas the compromise of the nuclear weapons data stored on the computer hard drives, if confirmed, would constitute a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States and its allies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory revealed to Congress on June 9, 2000, demonstrate the continued inadequacy of nuclear weapons security policy and procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration and at facilities of the Administration;

(2) individuals responsible for the implementation, oversight, and management of nuclear weapons security policy and procedures within the Administration and its facilities must be held accountable for their performance; and

(3) the Administrator for Nuclear Security must take immediate action to improve procedures for the safeguarding of classified nuclear weapons information and correct all identified nuclear weapons security deficiencies within the Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 534, the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, 5 weeks ago the Department of Energy informed Congress that two computer hard drives containing a large quantity of classified nuclear weapons data were missing from the Los Alamos National Laboratory and had been missing for at least 6 weeks. This breach of security was just the last in a long and sorry history of lax security at our nuclear weapons laboratories.

In direct response, Congress last year created a semi-autonomous agency, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and charged it with the responsibility to better manage the Nation's nuclear weapons complex.

Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson opposed this new organization from the beginning and has sought to undermine the implementation of NNSA at every step. Contrary to congressional direction, he declared himself as the administrator for nuclear security and he dual hatted his own chiefs of security and counterintelligence to serve in these positions for both the DOE and NNSA.

While this arrangement is directly counter to the law, it leaves no doubt as to who was running the new administration and who was responsible for security at the labs in June.

In fact, Secretary Richardson and the senior DOE leadership told Congress repeatedly that the security problems at the nuclear weapons laboratories were being fixed. In May of 1999, Secretary Richardson stated that the safeguards of national secrets have been dramatically strengthened and improved.

On March 2, 2000, Secretary Richardson testified to the Committee on Armed Services, quote, ''that we have reached a point where we have very strong security procedures,'' unquote; and, quote, ''there is no longer a culture of lax security. That has ended,'' unquote.

Furthermore, the Secretary's independent oversight office recently reviewed security practices at Los Alamos National Laboratory and stated that they were, quote, ''first class,'' unquote.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this latest episode at Los Alamos has demonstrated that these assertions were not true. Through briefings and hearings, the Committee on Armed Services determined that security procedures at the labs continued to be unacceptably lax and ineffective. We learned that no log was kept of the individuals who entered the vault where the hard drives were stolen; that the Department was not even aware of how many people have access to the vault; and that the vault was inadequately secure.

□ 1530

I simply cannot understand how any reasonably comprehensive review of a laboratory's security procedures would conclude that such procedures were adequate, much less first class.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 534 appropriately expresses concern by the House of Representatives over security matters within the national nuclear laboratories and calls for immediate corrective action. It also expresses the view that those responsible for these serious lapses in security must be held accountable.

The senior leadership of the Department chose to accept responsibility for the management of NSA and eagerly and erroneously claimed credit for improving security. They must now accept responsibility for their failures as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 534.

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

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

I rise today in support of this resolution, which is a resolution expressing the sense of the House concerning recent security lapses at the Energy Department, particularly at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

On June 9 of this year, the Committee on Armed Services was notified by the Department of Energy that two computer hard drives containing classified, restricted data were missing from a document storage vault located in the weapons design ''X Division'' at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. The information on these hard drives relates to the development, design, and manufacture and use of nuclear weapons. In a very real sense, the information on these computer disks represents the ''keys to the kingdom.'' Fortunately, the missing hard drives have been recovered, but we still do not know whether they were simply misplaced or whether they were copied or otherwise used by those with hostile intentions toward the United States.

The security lapses that led to the apparently temporary loss of the two computer disks containing highly sensitive nuclear weapons secrets are inexcusable. I am especially distressed that a culture continues to exist at the Los Alamos National Laboratory that relegates security concerns to secondary importance. Something must be done to change that culture. I applaud Secretary Richardson's efforts to improve security and get the Department of Energy on the right track; but obviously, the steps he has taken so far are somewhat inadequate to ensure that our nuclear secrets are adequately safeguarded.

The protection of nuclear weapons information is a critical responsibility

for all of those with access to that information. The compromise of the data on the missing hard drives could seriously jeopardize the national security of our country and of our allies.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House today, which the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) and I have cosponsored, expresses the sense of the House that the security failures at the Los Alamos National Laboratory show that our existing nuclear weapons security policy is inadequate, that the individuals responsible for implementing that security policy should be held accountable, and that the administrator of the Nuclear Security Administration must take immediate action to improve our procedures concerning the safeguarding of nuclear weapons information.

It is my sincere hope that Secretary Richardson and others with the responsibility for security matters within the Department will heed the words of this resolution and take prompt steps to ensure that we do not again suffer security breaches such as that involving the loss of hard drives at Los Alamos. Our Nation simply cannot afford lax security when it comes to our nuclear secrets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 534.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), who is chairman of the Special Oversight Panel of the Department of Energy Reorganization.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly appropriate for the House to express its concern over the recent incidents at Los Alamos. A number of people in the country perhaps have lost sight of the fact that nuclear weapons continue to constitute the central element of this country's security apparatus around which the rest of our defense efforts support, and to have an incident like this at Los Alamos I think is both shocking and frustrating for a number of Members. It is shocking because once we get into some of the details, there are several common sense sort of measures that are simply not employed; and the difficulty for us is how we legislate common sense into the day-to-day activities of these facilities.

But it has also been very frustrating, because this is not an isolated incident; this is simply the latest in a long series, a long string of incidents. Last year, as the chairman mentioned, Congress, to try to stop this long string, enacted reforms in the Department of Energy which have not been implemented to the letter and spirit of the law. So there is a great sense of frustration that we continue to have security lapses while we continue to do business as usual, which has not worked, for the past 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we have to break this stream. Recently, General John Gordon has been installed as the administrator of the Nuclear Security Administration and we need to support him to make sure that he can take the necessary action to break this string.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution includes two important points. One is that we have to hold individuals accountable, and that is exactly the principle of the reforms we passed last year, to have a clear chain of command, more like a military-style chain of command, but also a system of accountability, so that if somebody messes up, we know who to hold responsible for those lapses.

The second element here urges the administrator to take appropriate action quickly. It is appropriate for him to do so, and General Gordon is beginning to go around to all of the sites and try to get a clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses in our current nuclear weapons complex.

However, Congress cannot legislate the details of every silly thing that may cause a security lapse. It is up to the administrator, General Gordon, supported by Congress and others within the administration, to change this culture which the chairman talked about, to make the institutional reforms. That is really the answer.

So I support this resolution. I think it is an appropriate expression of the deep concern we have, but it also gets at the heart of what it is going to take to fix it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

I too today rise in support of House Resolution 534, which focuses attention on the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Lab and calls for improvements of the current system, especially increased accountability by those in charge.

However, while I am in strong support of the need to improve efforts to protect and preserve our national security, these efforts should not impinge on the civil rights for all Americans, especially those of Asian and Pacific Islander ancestry. The security procedures at the Los Alamos National Lab have had a significant impact on the Asian-American community. The case of Wen Ho Lee, a Chinese American scientist who was arrested last year for mishandling classified data at Los Alamos, clearly indicates the nature of these effects. The effects of Lee's case on other Asian-American scientists was immediate and of sufficient concern for the Department of Energy to take action to address charges of racial profiling and treatment of Asian-Pacific Americans in DOE national labs.

In Sunday's New York Times, James Glanz reported several APA groups have called to boycott the labs and are urging Asian and Asian-American scientists not to seek employment there. I do not support this policy; but while I do not support it, it is important to note the impact of this case on the recruitment and retention of Asian-Pacific Americans in the labs. The number of Asian applicants decreased from an average of 28 in 1998 and 1999 to three in the first half of the year 2000. And with Sandia and Livermore laboratories included, the percentage of postdoctoral appointments of Asian Americans fell from 14 percent in 1998 to half this year. These declines are disturbing, since Asian-Americans are a huge source of talent and have contributed more in a disproportionate way to the security of this country, and they earn over a quarter of all Ph.D.s in science and technology at American universities each year.

The charges of racial profiling and discriminatory investigation at hand illustrate just how much security procedures have had an effect on the Asian-Pacific American community. All employees should be held accountable, regardless of race or ethnicity, but no one should be held additionally responsible either. Let us make sure that our nuclear weapons security and any subsequent activities in the labs in the name of security remain the focus of this resolution. Let us make sure that political posturing or advantage does not intimidate this effort, and let us make sure that a commitment to justice and fairness for all citizens is not sacrificed in the pursuit of national security.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, July 16, 2000]

AMID RACE PROFILING CLAIMS, ASIAN-AMERICANS AVOID LABS

(By James Glanz)

Asian and Asian-American scientists are staying away from jobs at national weapons laboratories, particularly Los Alamos, saying that researchers of Asian descent are systematically harassed and denied advancement because of their race.

The issue has long simmered at the laboratories, but it came to a boil last year with the arrest of Dr. Wen Ho Lee, who is accused of mishandling nuclear secrets at Los Alamos. Though officials vehemently deny it, many Asian-Americans said Dr. Lee, a naturalized citizen born in Taiwan, was singled out because of his ethnicity.

In any event, Asians and Asian-Americans said, security procedures implemented after Dr. Lee's arrest fall hardest on them. Since the arrest, some scholarly groups have even called for a boycott of the laboratories, urging Asian and Asian-American scientists not to apply for jobs with them.

Whether because of the calls for a boycott, the underlying claims of discrimination, or both, all three national weapons laboratories—Los Alamos, Lawrence Livermore and Sandia—have seen declines in Asian and Asian-American applicants for postdoctoral positions, according to their own statistics. Other Asian and Asian-American scientists have left voluntarily.

Los Alamos, for example, has seen the number of Asian applicants (those granted formal reviews by committees) dwindle to 3 in the first half of 2000 from an average of 28 in 1998 and 1999. The number accepting jobs at Los Alamos fell from 18 in 1998 to 9 in 1999 to 3 in the first half of 2000.

The combined acceptances of Asians and Asian-Americans at Sandia and Livermore, which compile statistics by fiscal years ending in late September, are similar to Los Alamos, falling to 3 so far in 2000 from 21 in 1998. At Los Alamos, the number of Asians applying for jobs declined in percentage as well, to 4 percent of total applications from 12 percent in 1998. Over all, postdoctoral appointments of Asian and Asian-American fell to 7 percent from 14 percent when the three laboratories, with their slightly different recordkeeping, are combined.

''To me, this is an indicator that some of the best have decided either not to apply, or even when they do apply, not to come when they're offered a position,'' said Dr. John C. Browne, director of Los Alamos.

The decline is troubling for two reasons. First, Asians and Asian-Americans represent a huge pool of talent—more than a quarter of all Ph.D.'s awarded in science and technology at American universities each year. Second, postdoctoral appointments, which are generally filled by researchers who have recently earned Ph.D.'s are an essential source of candidates for permanent positions. The appointments constitute ''the primary means of recruiting future scientists and engineers for Los Alamos,'' said Jim Danneskiold, a spokesman for the laboratory.

In May, the National Science Foundation, a major source of research money, reported that ''heightened security concerns'' at the laboratories were hindering efforts to recruit and retain Asian and Asian-American scientists.

And last week, speaking before a panel of the House Armed Services Committee on reorganizing the Energy Department, Representative Ellen O. Tauscher, Democrat of California, referred to suspicions of racial profiling at Livermore and Sandia.

Mrs. Tauscher said there was ''the sense that Asian-Americans are targeted or scapegoated as potentially coming to work at the labs because they can spy,'' adding that the problem ''has a deleterious effect on our ability to recruit and retain.''

Observers say they are not surprised by the comments.

''There's no question in my mind that the Asian-Americans are conscientiously avoiding working in Los Alamos and the other labs like the plague,'' said Prof. L. Ling-chi Wang, chairman of the department of ethnic studies and director of the Asian American studies program at the University of California at Berkeley.

Two organizations, the Asian Pacific Americans in Higher Education and the Association for Asian American Studies, have called for a boycott, urging Asian-Americans not to work at the laboratories.

Professor Wang, who helped organize the boycott calls, is not alone in thinking that they have contributed to the flight from the laboratories.

Dr. Browne said that an ''overall black cloud'' caused by the boycott was driving Asian and Asian-American scientists away, but said that the did not believe racial profiling had occurred at Los Alamos.

Still, it is difficult to say whether anger over security measures is the sole reason for the sharp drop in Asian and Asian-American applicants, particularly with laboratory budget cuts and a booming economy creating lucrative jobs in private industry. But the impact is apparent.

''The labs are falling apart,'' said Dr. Jonathan Medalia, a specialist in national defense at the Congressional Research Service and the author of a study on the laboratories, which he presented at a conference but has not yet delivered to Congress.

The loss of talent is most severe in computer science, Dr. Medalia said, and if it continues, could threaten the nation's ability to ensure the safety and reliability of its nuclear weapons.

He said that tightened security measures increased the losses among all ethnic groups, but that the economy and other effects contributed.

Accusations of racism have also led to formal complaints.

In December, nine Asian-American scientists and engineers at Livermore filed a discrimination complaint with the State of California that the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing is investigating.

The federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has also begun an investigation, said officials at the laboratory and a lawyer for the scientists.

Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson, whose agency oversees the laboratories, conceded that political pressures from Congress had created ''an atmosphere of fear'' among foreign-born scientists.

A year ago, Mr. Richardson named a committee to investigate complaints of racial profiling, and he appointed Dr. Jeremy Wu, a former official in the Agriculture Department's office of civil rights, as the department's ombudsman to review diversity issues and hear employee complaints. But the problems are so ingrained, scientists said, that those measures are not enough.

''For years, a lot of these things have festered, and it was typical of the Asian way to say nothing,'' said Kalina Wong, an American-born scientist of Chinese and Hawaiian descent who tracks inventories of nuclear materials at Livermore, and one of the employees who filed the complaint. Now, Ms. Wong said, ''Pandora's Box is open.''

Laboratory officials deny any systematic discrimination. If anything, they said, administrators are eager to promote members of ethnic groups.

THE COMPLAINTS—A HISTORY OF DISCRIMINATION

The new security directives do not explicitly mention Asian-Americans or any other group; moreover, Mr. Richardson accompanied the directives with a warning that they should not be seen as an excuse to question the ''loyalty and patriotism'' of Asian-Americans as a group.

But the directives required scientists to report ''close and continuing contact'' with nationals of sensitive countries—a designation that overs Russia and most countries in Asia, but few countries in Europe.

''If you have relatives in sensitive countries, you are under the microscope,'' said Dr. Aaron Lai, a climate researcher at Los Alamos and a naturalized citizen born in Taiwan. ''Before the Wen Ho Lee case, the chance of getting promoted was very low,'' Dr. Lai said. But with the new rules, he said, ''it's getting worse.''

Joel Wong, an engineer at Livermore, who is from Hong Kong and is now an American citizen, said, ''They associate foreign-born with being a threat.''

The 19-member committee appointed by Mr. Richardson, issued a report earlier this year, based on interviews with workers. Its recommendations included appointing an ombudsman, as Mr. Richardson has done, and compiling data on minority groups across the department. Existing data are sketchy at best. The report also described pervasive feelings of unease and fear.

In October, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus heard from several scientists who said Asian-Americans faced discrimination at the laboratories.

Ms. Wong, the Livermore scientist, told the group of a lagging salary, racially insensitive comments from officials, her removal from sensitive projects and an unexplained erosion of authority.

''The whole Chinese spy allegation has set us back further,'' said Ms. Wong, whose family has been in the United States for five generations and who has worked at Livermore for more than two decades. ''It seems now that there is license to do as was done to me because we Asians are potential spies.''

Livermore officials said racial bias has not played a role in the treatment of scientists, either before or after the Lee case.

''There is no underlying discrimination,'' a Livermore spokeswoman, Susan Houghton, said. ''If anything, it's the opposite. It is still very much a goal to increase minority representation in management.''

In an interview, Ms. Houghton and Tommy Smith, a mechanical engineer who is the laboratory's director of affirmative action and diversity, said Livermore had established goals for increasing the numbers of Asians and other minorities in management and held a one-day workshop for employees in April. ''Obviously, we can always do a better job,'' Ms. Houghton said.

She also noted that the investigations into discrimination claims were not proof of wrongdoing.

Los Alamos has about 7,000 employees, including 3,500 scientists, said Mr. Danneskiold, the laboratory spokesman.

Over all, Asians or Pacific Islanders make up 2.4 percent of the staff and about 4 percent of the scientists, he said.

But of 99 senior managers, only 1 is of Asian descent, Mr. Danneskiold said. And of 322 leaders of technical groups, a lower rung in management, only 3 are Asian-American.

Similar if somewhat less pronounced disparities exist at Livermore; at Sandia, the proportion of Asians in management and the laboratory are nearly the same.

Michael Trujillo, the equal employment opportunity officer at Los Alamos, also rejected the idea that Asian-Americans' relatively low representation in management was a result of bias. But Mr. Trujillo said he could not offer an explanation. ''I don't think that there's an easy answer on that,'' he said.

THE RULES—RESPONSE THAT SOME CALLED RACIAL PROFILING

The Energy Department ombudsman, Dr. Wu, said in an interview that he believed new security rules had infringed on ''individual rights and scientific freedom'' and added that he hoped he could improve the situation.

He has been on the job since January, but he began visiting the laboratories last year and has already investigated several bias complaints. In two cases, involving the loss of a security clearance and the termination of a grant, rulings against Asian and Asian-American scientists have been overturned, he said.

Edward J. Curran, who directs the Energy Department's counterintelligence office, said a review almost two years ago led to increased reporting requirements for many employees and to polygraph testing of some scientists. He said the rules were intended to make intelligence officials aware of any unusual inquiries from foreign nationals and to help catch any American scientists who were spying, whatever their ethnicity.

Among the directives are two that Mr. Richardson issued last July in which scientists are required to report certain ''close and continuing contact'' during unclassified visits with people from countries deemed sensitive.

Dr. Al West, a security director at Sandia, said that at least one Asian-American scientist, whose fiancee was from Hong Kong,

left for a longstanding job offer in private industry ''because they got tired of dealing with all the inquiries into their personal affairs'' as a result of the new rule.

And Dr. Shao-Ping Chen, a physicist at Los Alamos, criticized a requirement to list all contacts and relationships with people in sensitive countries.

''Where it should stop is not easy to tell,'' said Dr. Chen, originally from Taiwan but now an American citizen. ''If you have a big family, those people are large numbers.''

Henry Tang, chairman of the Committee of 100, a group of Chinese-Americans engaged in public policy issues, said that in enforcing the new rules, security officials ''are no different than a highway patrolman suspecting someone merely by virtue of their physical characteristics.''

Dr. Paul D. Moore, who was the F.B.I.'s chief of Chinese counterintelligence analysis for more than 20 years and is now at the Center for Counterintelligence and Security Studies, a nongovernmental training center in Alexandria, Va., said that belief was mistaken. But Dr. Moore said that it had ultimately taken root because, in his view, the Chinese government specifically courts ethnic Chinese in the United States when looking for potential spies. As a result, he said, counterintelligence agents focus on Chinese-Americans. ''It's unfair,'' he said, ''but what are you going to do?''

THE BOYCOTT—A MIXED REACTION AMONG SCIENTISTS

As racism accusations simmer, the moves that have sparked the most discussion—and dissension—are the calls for a boycott.

Dr. Shujia Zhou, who left Los Alamos last year, said, ''The Asian people feel hit hard.''

Dr. Zhou published research in journals like Science and Physical Review Letters but said he left the laboratory because officials made continuing his work difficult, revoking his computer access, for example, and because the atmosphere had soured for Asians.

He easily found another job, Dr. Browne, the Los Alamos director, said that revoking computer privileges for some Asian scientists was an ''unfortunate'' overreaction and that fairer procedures had been put in place.

The calls for a boycott have generated mixed reactions at the laboratories. Dr. Manvendra K. Dubey, a Los Alamos scientist and chairman of its Asian-American Working Group, said he opposed a boycott ''because if we disappear from within, we will have no voice.'' Some say the heightened sensitivity to race may eventually help the laboratories.

But for now, the security concerns about Asian countries, the lack of data on where and how Asian-American scientists work, and the near-absence of Asians in upper ranks are hindering progress at the laboratories, many Asian-American scientists say.

Perhaps more pernicious, they add, is the idea, prevalent among some Americans of European descent, that rational scientists must be immune to ordinary racial bias. That visceral difference in viewpoint may pose the most elusive but enduring barrier to improvements, some Asian scientists say.

''I think it's hard for a white person to appreciate the bias,'' said Dr. Huan Lee, a Chinese-American scientist at Los Alamos.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be speaking right after the delegate from Guam, because I very much agree with the points he made.

As I read the resolution, I do not disagree with much of what it says, but I am troubled by the climate that brought it forward and by the climate I think it will exacerbate.

First, I believe there has been a substantial exaggeration of the threat to national security that has so far occurred from mistakes made at Los Alamos. I do not believe that we have any showing that America's security has been, in fact, jeopardized by the errors that have happened. I also think that we are likely to see our security jeopardized if we overreact in a way that drives first-rate scientists away from participating in the national security enterprise, and I fear we are coming close to that point.

There is, after all, a tension between security and the kind of intellectual freedom and creativity that is necessary for science to flourish. Of course, we must not sacrifice security, but neither can we focus only on security and disregard the negative impact an excessively harsh and rigid regime can have on those scientists who especially today have many other choices. They do not have to come to work for the Federal Government. They do not have to come to work in these laboratories. If we make the mistake of treating them as perspective spies and criminals, we drive them away.

I must say I am especially concerned about the anti-Asian-American impact of some of these efforts. I, like the gentleman from Guam, was disturbed to read in The New York Times, in effect, admissions by some of those concerned with security that there was, in fact, an anti-Asian bias. Indeed, I was interested to see when the Federal Government was forced to produce its potential list of countries with whom Wen Ho Lee may have dealt that it was clear that his own ethnicity was irrelevant to this. Even in the allegations, it was not a case of some idealogical or homeland betrayal; the allegation is that Dr. Lee was a man afraid of losing his job and he may have behaved improperly in pursuit of another job with a range of countries. I have no knowledge of these accusations, and I obviously should not and would not talk about them. But it is interesting to say that even in this most prominent case, no allegation that his ethnicity and his being of Chinese ancestry was at all relevant.

Yes, it is important for us to preserve security. It is also important for us not to exaggerate and promote fear because there has not been any showing that our security has, in fact, been damaged; and it is especially important to avoid even the hint of prejudice against our Asian-American fellow citizens. We have had too many cases in American history in which Asian-Americans have been singled out and in every single one of them they have been shown to be unfair.

So if this resolution goes forward, it in and of itself does no harm. But the climate that brought it forward and the climate it may produce must be resisted.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to briefly comment on some of the things we have heard here on the floor.

The first thing is, of course, there is nothing in this resolution which promotes or in any way encourages the sorts of concerns that both the gentlemen have talked about. Of course, none of us want to do that.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I fully agree and I think the committee and Congress fully agrees that we want to be very cautious about saying to any particular group ''We don't want you,'' because the fact is, we have to get and keep top quality people in our National Laboratories and plants. We can afford to do nothing to drive them away.

But I think it is important to get back to the principles that are in this resolution, which include individual accountability. That is, if not a group but an individual makes a mistake or worse, then that individual will be held accountable for it.

That is what our national security requires. It requires that we get and keep the best quality people, but once they are there and privy to some of the most sensitive information in the country, that we hold them accountable for how they treat that information. That is the principle I think that General Gordon will move ahead with as he tries to reach that difficult balance of doing the work in these facilities and also balancing the security, and bringing it all together to see that our security is not compromised.

I think that there is a concern that all of us share. We want to get and keep the best quality people, but this resolution does not hinder that. In fact, I would argue that it helps it by moving towards and encouraging individual accountability.

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

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

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

I had not intended to participate in this discussion, but as a member of the Cox Select Committee, I do have to say that we developed extraordinary evidence in a unanimous report from that committee, a bipartisan committee, that indeed there were grave security losses from and inappropriate security procedures at the Los Alamos Lab.

I would also like to mention that there was no specific reference to Mr. Lee made in that report. An investigation conducted by the Federal Bureau

of Investigation was the way that, I believe, there was the first time his identity was ever mentioned in the media or anyplace else. The Cox Committee made no recommendations.

I do think the people who suggest in some fashion that Congress has been identifying particular ethnic group as responsible for espionage or as security risks, is inappropriate and inaccurate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 534.

The question was taken.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SMALL WATERSHED REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 728) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 728

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 2000''.

TITLE I—DAM REHABILITATION

SEC. 101. REHABILITATION OF WATER RESOURCE STRUCTURAL MEASURES CONSTRUCTED UNDER CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (16 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 14. REHABILITATION OF STRUCTURAL MEASURES NEAR, AT, OR PAST THEIR EVALUATED LIFE EXPECTANCY.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

''(1) REHABILITATION.—The term 'rehabilitation', with respect to a structural measure constructed as part of a covered water resource project, means the completion of all work necessary to extend the service life of the structural measure and meet applicable safety and performance standards. This may include (A) protecting the integrity of the structural measure or prolonging the useful life of the structural measure beyond the original evaluated life expectancy, (B) correcting damage to the structural measure from a catastrophic event, (C) correcting the deterioration of structural components that are deteriorating at an abnormal rate, (D) upgrading the structural measure to meet changed land use conditions in the watershed served by the structural measure or changed safety criteria applicable to the structural measure, or (E) decommissioning the structure, if requested by the local organization.

''(2) COVERED WATER RESOURCE PROJECT.—The term 'covered water resource project' means a work of improvement carried out under any of the following:

''(A) This Act.

''(B) Section 13 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 78–534; 58 Stat. 905).

''(C) The pilot watershed program authorized under the heading 'FLOOD PREVENTION' of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1954 (Public Law 156; 67 Stat. 214).

''(D) Subtitle H of title XV of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451 et seq.; commonly known as the Resource Conservation and Development Program).

''(3) STRUCTURAL MEASURE.—The term 'structural measure' means a physical improvement that impounds water, commonly known as a dam, which was constructed as part of a covered water resource project, including the impoundment area and flood pool.

''(b) COST SHARE ASSISTANCE FOR REHABILITATION.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary may provide financial assistance to a local organization to cover a portion of the total costs incurred for the rehabilitation of structural measures originally constructed as part of a covered water resource project. The total costs of rehabilitation include the costs associated with all components of the rehabilitation project, including acquisition of land, easements, and rights-of-ways, rehabilitation project administration, the provision of technical assistance, contracting, and construction costs, except that the local organization shall be responsible for securing all land, easements, or rights-of-ways necessary for the project.

''(2) AMOUNT OF ASSISTANCE; LIMITATIONS.—The amount of Federal funds that may be made available under this subsection to a local organization for construction of a particular rehabilitation project shall be equal to 65 percent of the total rehabilitation costs, but not to exceed 100 percent of actual construction costs incurred in the rehabilitation. However, the local organization shall be responsible for the costs of water, mineral, and other resource rights and all Federal, State, and local permits.

''(3) RELATION TO LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.—As a condition on entering into an agreement to provide financial assistance under this subsection, the Secretary, working in concert with the affected unit or units of general purpose local government, may require that proper zoning or other developmental regulations are in place in the watershed in which the structural measures to be rehabilitated under the agreement are located so that—

''(A) the completed rehabilitation project is not quickly rendered inadequate by additional development; and

''(B) society can realize the full benefits of the rehabilitation investment.

''(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATERSHED PROJECT REHABILITATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, may provide technical assistance in planning, designing, and implementing rehabilitation projects should a local organization request such assistance. Such assistance may consist of specialists in such fields as engineering, geology, soils, agronomy, biology, hydraulics, hydrology, economics, water quality, and contract administration.

''(d) PROHIBITED USE.—

''(1) PERFORMANCE OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.—Rehabilitation assistance provided under this section may not be used to perform operation and maintenance activities specified in the agreement for the covered water resource project entered into between the Secretary and the local organization responsible for the works of improvement. Such operation and maintenance activities shall remain the responsibility of the local organization, as provided in the project work plan.

''(2) RENEGOTIATION.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), as part of the provision of financial assistance under subsection (b), the Secretary may renegotiate the original agreement for the covered water resource project entered into between the Secretary and the local organization regarding responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the project when the rehabilitation is finished.

''(e) APPLICATION FOR REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—A local organization may apply to the Secretary for technical and financial assistance under this section if the application has also been submitted to and approved by the State agency having supervisory responsibility over the covered water resource project at issue or, if there is no State agency having such responsibility, by the Governor of the State. The Secretary shall request the State dam safety officer (or equivalent State official) to be involved in the application process if State permits or approvals are required. The rehabilitation of structural measures shall meet standards established by the Secretary and address other dam safety issues. At the request of the local organization, personnel of the Natural Resources Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture may assist in preparing applications for assistance.

''(f) RANKING OF REQUESTS FOR REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall establish such system of approving rehabilitation requests, recognizing that such requests will be received throughout the fiscal year and subject to the availability of funds to carry out this section, as is necessary for proper administration by the Department of Agriculture and equitable for all local organizations. The approval process shall be in writing, and made known to all local organizations and appropriate State agencies.

''(g) PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN REHABILITATION ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may not approve a rehabilitation request if the need for rehabilitation of the structure is the result of a lack of adequate maintenance by the party responsible for the maintenance.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to provide financial and technical assistance under this section—

''(1) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

''(2) $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

''(3) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

''(4) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(5) $35,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

''(i) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—The Secretary, in concert with the responsible State agencies, shall conduct an assessment of the rehabilitation needs of covered water resource projects in all States in which such projects are located.

''(j) RECORDKEEPING AND REPORTS.—

''(1) SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall maintain a data base to track the benefits derived from rehabilitation projects supported under this section and the expenditures made under this section. On the basis of such data and the reports submitted under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress an annual report providing the status of activities conducted under this section.

''(2) GRANT RECIPIENTS.—Not later than 90 days after the completion of a specific rehabilitation project for which assistance is provided under this section, the local organization that received the assistance shall make a report to the Secretary giving the status of any rehabilitation effort undertaken using financial assistance provided under this section.''.

TITLE II—DAM SAFETY

SEC. 201. DAM SAFETY.

(a) INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF OTHER DAMS.—

(1) INVENTORY.—The Secretary of the Army (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall establish an inventory of dams constructed by and using funds made available through the Works Progress Administration, the Works Projects Administration, and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

(2) ASSESSMENT OF REHABILITATION NEEDS.—In establishing the inventory required under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall also assess the condition of the dams on such inventory and the need for rehabilitation or modification of the dams.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report containing the inventory and assessment required by this section.

(c) INTERIM ACTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that a dam referred to in subsection (a) presents an imminent and substantial risk to public safety, the Secretary is authorized to carry out measures to prevent or mitigate against such risk.

(2) EXCLUSION.—The assistance authorized in paragraph (1) shall not be available to dams under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

(3) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of assistance provided under this subsection shall be 65 percent of such cost.

(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section a total of $25,000,000 for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1999, of which not more than $5,000,000 may be expended on any 1 dam.

(d) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall coordinate with the appropriate State dam safety officials and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), in helping me bring forward H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments.

I also appreciate the support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for this very important bill.

Seeing the need for rehabilitation of aging dams built across the State of Oklahoma and the country, I introduced H.R. 728. This legislation will give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority to provide financial assistance to local organizations for up to 65 percent of the total rehabilitation construction costs for those dams built under the Small Watershed Program.

H.R. 728 will authorize a total of $90 million over the next 5 years, beginning in 2001, to help us rehabilitate our Nation's watershed projects and ensure that we and our communities continue to enjoy the benefits that watershed projects offer.

My predecessors left a legacy with the Small Watershed Program. They realized the impact that this program would have on both the State of Oklahoma and the Nation as whole.

I was raised in and still live in Roger Mills County, Oklahoma. One of the things I most clearly recall from growing up there was the sight of these flood control dams near my home. I did not know it at the time, but those dams were built because community and political leaders knew from firsthand experience the importance of flood control. They had witnessed the horrible floods that washed across Oklahoma's watersheds in the 1930s and 1940s, terrifying events that inspired them to take the necessary steps to reduce the threats that flooding poses to people, land, and water quality.

Since 1944, over 10½ thousand small watershed dams have been built in the United States. Over 2,000 of those dams are located in Oklahoma. Many of these dams were planned and designed with a lifespan of 50 years. Fifty years ago there was little concern about what to do when these dams reached their life expectancy.

During the week of July 4, 1998, a celebration in Cordell, Oklahoma, marked the 50th anniversary of America's first United States Department of Agriculture small watershed dam. This is just one of a thousand dams that will reach the end of their 50-year life expectancy within the next 10 years.

Although the Federal government paid for the construction costs of these dams, under current law, there is no Federal authority or funds to rehabilitate them. Repair costs are far beyond the budgets of the local sponsors.

The Federal government clearly has a responsibility to ensure dam safety. We cannot wait until a disaster happens. If rehabilitation is not done, we may be faced with the awesome and awful possibilities of flooding, loss of wildlife habitat, water shortages, and pollution. Far more regrettable in the case of failure, we might be confronted with the loss of life, and yes, property, crops, and livestock.

The economic impact of dam failures on communities and local economies would be devastating. We must act before any of these situations occur.

The small watershed program is one of our Nation's most successful public and private partnerships. In fact, these completed small watershed projects have provided over $2.20 in benefits for every $1 in cost. Very few government programs can make that claim. We must continue to build on this partnership.

Today the Small Watershed Program represents an $8.5 billion Federal investment and an estimated $6 billion local investment in the infrastructure of our Nation. We do not allow our highways to crumble, nor should we ignore our small watershed dams. It is time we address the rehabilitation needs of these structures.

The fact is, these small watersheds have done such a good job that most people do not even realize they exist as they drive by them, as they go up and down the highways. There are not many programs that have that kind of a success factor.

We must continue to build on this program that our predecessors started over 50 years ago. It has been a great privilege to champion this cause here in our Nation's capital that will have such a direct impact on my home county, my home State, and our Nation as a whole. I look forward to seeing this legislation passed into law, and continuing to build on one of the most successful programs our government has known.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 2000. This bill amends the Watershed Protection and Flood Control Protection Act, also known as P.L. 566 program, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to eligible local organizations to cover a portion of the total cost for the rehabilitation of structural measures originally constructed as part of the Department of Agriculture's USDA water resource project.

Under current law, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, is authorized to provide technical and financial assistance to local organizations in planning and carrying out small watershed projects for flood protection, agriculture and water management, recreation, municipal and industrial water supply, and wildlife enhancement.

Many of the 10,000-plus dams built under this program are reaching the end of their 50-year design life and are in need of rehabilitation. In fact, some now pose a threat to public health and safety.

During the Committee on Agriculture's markup of this legislation, I offered an amendment to protect the privacy of information provided to USDA by the farmers and ranchers participating in the Department's voluntary programs or receiving technical assistance.

My amendment, which was accepted by the committee, was designed to protect the trust established between the USDA and America's farmers and ranchers resulting in the high level of

participation we currently enjoy in our voluntary conservation programs.

When landowners come in on a voluntary basis to work on their local NRCS, Farm Service Agency, or conservation district office to implement conservation measures on their farms and ranches, they need to be assured that the information they provide remains confidential. Concerns have been raised that if this information was transferred to other agencies or entities, it would lose its confidential nature and could be made public.

The provision I offered would not have prevented other Federal agencies from collecting data under their own statutory authority. It would merely protect from disclosure to other Federal regulatory entities the confidential information provided to USDA, local conservation districts, or RC&D councils by a farmer, rancher, or landowner who has participated in the USDA conservation program.

Without this protection, the billions of dollars in technical and financial assistance spent every year by the taxpayers to help the Nation's landowners protect our soil and water resources could be jeopardized because of the unwillingness of producers to participate in our voluntary programs. In short, my amendment would have ensured that our voluntary, incentive-based programs are kept separate from the regulatory efforts of other agencies.

If Members doubt the callous disregard that some Federal agencies have for the American farmer, rancher, and the average citizen in general, look no further than EPA's persistence with the total maximum daily load (TMDL) regulations.

After a dozen congressional hearings, 35,000 written comments, and clear intent from Congress via the military construction conference report that the proposed TMDL regulations needed to be withdrawn and thoroughly re-examined, the EPA persisted in their policy to put forth these tainted regulations.

We need to send a strong message that information provided on a voluntary basis for purposes of receiving assistance from USDA should remain confidential to all parties working in cooperation with USDA. While it is unfortunate that this could not be accomplished here today on this worthy bill, this issue must be addressed by Congress.

I want to applaud and thank my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), for his hard work in working to draft and pass this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 728.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I rise in support of H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 2000.

First let me congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and his colleagues, and commend the leadership of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Agriculture for moving forward with this important legislation.

□ 1600

H.R. 728 responds to a growing crisis in water resources infrastructure throughout this Nation. There are over 10,000 dams constructed under national resource conservation service programs; many are in need of critical repair and are presenting flooding and environmental threats to communities.

This bill responds in two ways. Title I authorizes NRCS to rehabilitate aging and deteriorating dams constructed under the agency's small watershed program. Title II authorizes the Corps of Engineers to inventory and assess the condition of dams constructed decades ago under other authorities, such as the Work Projects Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, and in the interim, to provide emergency measures to prevent risks to the public.

A good example of these aging dams is the Mountain Springs dam right on the edge of my congressional district. It is a dam that has provided flood control and watershed qualities throughout 60 years, and now it is about to be drained because it is deemed dangerous. We need these things attended to.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to emphasize that these projects should be performed in the most cost-effective manner that accomplishes the rehabilitation objective. However, the Secretary is not required to develop a cost benefit ratio analysis or a cost benefit ratio.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about restoring infrastructure, enhancing public safety, and protecting the environment. America's rural communities in particular will benefit.

For all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 728.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 728. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) for his outstanding initiative and effort in introducing this legislation and the leadership of the two committees for advancing it.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, this Member certainly supports the goals of this measure. It is clearly appropriate to provide necessary resources to aid in the rehabilitation of the small watershed structures which have been constructed over the past 50 years. These small dams and other structures, constructed under the P.L. 566 program, have provided numerous benefits over the past decades, including flood control, wildlife habitat, recreation, irrigation and water supplies.

This program has been especially important to Nebraska. Over the years, the P.L. 566 program has resulted in the installation of 880 dams and other structures in Nebraska. In fact, this Member is proud to point out that his district, the First Congressional District of Nebraska, has more P.L. 566 dams and structures than any other district in the Nation. The more than 700 structures in this Member's district provides flood protection, reduces erosion and provides many useful benefits.

Throughout Nebraska, it is estimated that the State realizes a minimum of $27 million in annual direct benefits as a result of these structures. Documentation and examples of those benefits are found in the report by the National Resource Conservation Service, the NRCS, of the USDA, entitled ''Protecting the 'Good Life' through P.L. 566; The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act across Nebraska.''

As just mentioned, during the previous 50 years, more than 10,000 upstream flood control dams have been built throughout the United States. The NRCS has provided cost-sharing and technical assistance while local sponsors have assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the structures when they were completed. Unfortunately, many of those structures are now reaching the end of their 50-year designed life. Without significant rehabilitation, much of this investment could be lost.

This act authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to cover a portion of the total costs incurred for the rehabilitation of those structures. The bill does not allow any assistance to be provided to perform operation and maintenance activities, a limitation this Member strongly supports.

During a hearing of the Subcommittee on Water and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, this Member shared with the subcommittee a letter from Dayle Williamson who, until very recently, was the outstanding, highly respected director of the State of Nebraska's Natural Resources Commission, he just retired, which emphasized that the sponsors of Nebraska's projects have been providing adequate maintenance over the years for the structures. Therefore, he suggested, and this Member agrees, that they should not be penalized for their stewardship by allowing other States to tap into scarce resources to perform routine operation and maintenance which they routinely should have been providing. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) has taken that fully into consideration. Another outstanding feature of this legislation.

This Member additionally asked for specific safeguards to ensure that funding would not be used for the purposes of routine operation and maintenance. I am pleased, therefore, to note that a provision was added to the legislation which states that the Secretary of Agriculture may not approve a rehabilitation request if it is determined that the need for rehabilitation of the structure is the result of a lack of adequate maintenance by the party responsible for the maintenance.

Nevertheless, it is clear that there are a great many instances where assistance is appropriate and necessary. This Member believes that H.R. 728 recognizes this growing need and provides a far-sighted approach in addressing these problems. By providing additional assistance now, we can ensure that the original investments will continue to pay dividends well into the future.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support H.R. 728 and again commends the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) for his outstanding initiative.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say again in reiteration of what all of my colleagues who have testified in favor of this legislation today and the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I do also thank them for their work and input into this very important legislation.

I know, speaking from back home in Texas, the importance of these projects has been demonstrated time and time again over these 50 years, but now particularly as cities like Dallas and Fort Worth begin to look at some very serious flood concerns that they have and how they might address that. Other cities all over the United States, most communities will find, when one looks at how to solve a problem of flood control that one will find the small watershed projects would be right at the top of the list.

Now, when we have these large number of dams that have been built and are in need of rehabilitation, this legislation only make makes very, very serious common sense.

So I appreciate, again, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) for bringing this legislation to all of our attention, and all of the cooperation that has been made to reach it to the point to where we are today. I encourage the House to support the bill.

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I wish once again to express my appreciation of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and all of the members of the various committees and subcommittees who worked on this.

From a concept that initially came together in July of 1998 at a gathering to celebrate 50 years of successful service by one of these structures to the bill, that was then filed again in February of 1999, that has worked its way through subcommittee and full Committee on Agriculture, subcommittee and full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, that has been examined by resources, a bill that is, if there is such a thing, a textbook way of reviewing legislation, we have at one point or other in the last year and a half examined every facet of this concept, I think, from every perspective.

The legislation that we have today, thanks to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), ranking member, and the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST), and many other Members, is a good solid piece of legislation that will do the things that need to be done in this country and in a fashion we will all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the continued program that has been so successful for half a century now or more.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 728, the small watershed rehabilitation amendments of 2000. The bill takes steps to improve the nation's deteriorating water resources infrastructure and requires the Secretary of Agriculture to rehabilitate aging dams built under programs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the Army to inventory and assess certain dams from the Great Depression era and authorizes actions to mitigate against immediate threats to public safety.

I commend Representative FRANK LUCAS and his colleagues for championing this legislation and the leadership of the Agriculture Committee for their cooperation, as well. Thanks should also go to my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, in particular Representative JIM OBERSTAR, the ranking Democrat, Representative SHERRY BOEHLERT, the chairman of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, and Representative BOB BORSKI, the subcommittee's ranking member.

The Transportation and Agriculture Committees share jurisdiction over the NRCS's small watershed program and worked together closely to revise and improve title I of this critically important legislation. I also appreciate the Agriculture Committee's cooperation with respect to title II, relating to the Army Corps of Engineers' authorities regarding dam safety and included by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the needs are great. Rehabilitating the nation's dams will not be cheap but the benefits will be enormous. With over 10,000 small watershed dams in need of rehabilitation, H.R. 728 takes an important and timely first step. We anticipate NRCS and affected local communities will undertake cost-effective rehabilitation measures and coordinate closely with State dam safety officials. We also anticipate that, if funded, this bill will make communities safer and cleaner as flooding and sedimentation risks are reduced.

Mr. Speaker, I support passage of H.R. 728, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 2000. H.R. 728 authorizes the Department of Agriculture, through the Natural Resources Conservation Service, to rehabilitate dams constructed as part of their small watershed program and other conservation programs.

This bill also authorizes additional dam safety measures for the Corps of Engineers. H.R. 728 requires the Secretary of the Army to inventory and assess the condition of certain dams and to take interim actions to prevent threats to public safety.

This bill invests in our nation's aging dam infrastructure. It will increase public health and safety and environmental protection. It will bring jobs, piece of mind and environmental benefits to communities with deteriorating dams.

The final language, essentially what the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee reported last November, is the result of extensive input from engineers, construction contractors, environmental advocates, dam safety officials, local government representatives, and Federal agencies. It includes, among other things, important flexibility in defining ''rehabilitation'' so that environmentally sound and locally supported options, such as ''decommissioning,'' may be considered.

I congratulate Representative FRANK LUCAS and his colleagues for pursuing this legislation and I thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Agriculture Committee for their cooperation and leadership. In particular, I thank the leadership of the Agriculture Committee and Chairman BUD SHUSTER, Ranking Democrat JIM OBERSTAR, Ranking Democrat of the Water Resources and Environment Subcommittee, Representative BOB BORSKI, for their interest and support. From the beginning, our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, which I chair, recognized H.R. 728 could help make communities safer and cleaner.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to pass this important, critically-needed legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today in full support of H.R. 728, the Small Watershed Rehabilitation Amendments of 1999. Most importantly, I want to stress to my colleagues why this piece of legislation is vital to so many rural areas of the United States.

Since the 1940's, over 100,000 small watershed dams have been built under USDA programs. Small watershed dams provide great benefit to their surrounding areas. These dams provide downstream flood protection, water quality improvement, irrigation water, and rural water supplies. In flood control alone, the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the USDA estimate the small watershed dams prevent more than $800 million in damages each year. People can also enjoy increased recreation and wildlife habitat.

The bad news is that many have reached or are rapidly approaching their fifty year life span. Numerous structures are in need of rehabilitation to ensure the continued environmental and economic benefits that our country currently enjoys. Action must be taken to prevent the loss of life, water supply, and flood control that these dams afford to many rural areas.

Currently, no funding source exists to restore watershed projects, and local sponsors do not have the resources to attempt to save these dams. H.R. 728 establishes financial assistance for the assessment and rehabilitation of small watershed dams over the next ten years. With federal cost sharing, local sponsors will now have the opportunity to repair these crucial watersheds.

The necessity of federal attention to this problem is critical, and I thank my friend and Oklahoma colleague Mr. LUCAS for his leadership of this matter and his support and commitment to the restoration of these structures. I call upon my colleagues to recognize the importance of this legislation with their support of H.R. 728.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 728, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 728, the bill just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING REPUBLIC OF LATVIA ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF REESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENCE FROM FORMER SOVIET UNION

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 319) congratulating the Republic of Latvia on the 10th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence from the rule of the former Soviet Union.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 319

Whereas the United States had never recognized the forcible incorporation of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the former Soviet Union;

Whereas the declaration on May 4, 1990, of the reestablishment of full sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Latvia furthered the disintegration of the former Soviet Union;

Whereas Latvia since then has successfully built democracy, passed legislation on human and minority rights that conform to European and international norms, ensured the rule of law, developed a free market economy, and consistently pursued a course of integration into the community of free and democratic nations by seeking membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); and

Whereas Latvia, as a result of the progress of its political and economic reforms, has made, and continues to make, a significant contribution toward the maintenance of international peace and stability by, among other actions, its participation in NATO-led peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) congratulates Latvia on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence and the role it played in the disintegration of the former Soviet Union; and

(2) commends Latvia for its success in implementing political and economic reforms, which may further speed the process of that country's integration into European and Western institutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 319.

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

There was no objection.

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

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in very strong support for H. Con. Res. 319, a resolution congratulating the Republic of Latvia on the 10th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence from the former Soviet Union. This Member is pleased to be a cosponsor of this important statement of support.

Mr. Speaker, the Baltic States of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia had been prosperous and progressive independent nations, a set of three nations, prior to the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, an agreement that heralded 5 decades of repression.

The United States, of course, never recognized this unlawful act of international aggression. By 1990, the Soviet terror machine no longer held sway, and the long-standing courage and determination of the Latvian people was finally rewarded with freedom. Again, it was the United States that was among the first to recognize their independence when they broke free.

No one could have predicted the rapid reintegration with the West. Free elections have now become the norm, and the Saeima acts as a fully-functioning parliament. Inflation has been reduced, and Latvia has made major strides in privatization.

While the export market to Russia has collapsed, important new trading partnerships have been found in Poland, Germany and the West. Much remains to be done, but Latvians and Latvian-Americans can take justifiable pride at what has thus far been accomplished in Latvia.

For our part, the United States continues to work for the Baltic nations to deepen and broaden our relationship. As but one example, NATO military officers, including Americans, continue to work with the Latvian military directly and through NATO's Partnership For Peace program.

Latvia-Americans should also be proud of their contributions, with some retired military officers actually serving in key positions in the Latvian Armed Forces and the Ministry of Defense.

As the NATO Summit in Washington, D.C. last year concluded, Latvia joined in the Enhanced and More Operational Partnership, EMOP, a program designed to speed the day when Latvia can become a full contributing member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The goal, which this Member strongly endorses, is to move beyond the expressions of support and facilitate the concrete steps that will result in Latvia's further integration into the West.

In other areas of cooperation, Peace Corps volunteers now teach Latvian schools and help Latvian small businessmen and women with such basic tasks as accounting and marketing. This Member is particularly pleased that the United States has created a Baltic American Enterprise Fund designed to underwrite fledgling entrepreneurs from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

Finally, this Member would point out that the House of Representatives has been and is assisting the Latvian Saeima with such basic necessities as law books and computers, various kinds of library assistance.

In 1995, this Member was part of a bipartisan House task force which approved and oversaw this assistance to this parliamentary body, as we did in the other two Baltic States, and visited Latvia for that and other foreign policy security purposes. It should be noted, additionally, that such assistance most assuredly is not a hand-out. Rather, we are offering a helping hand to a nation with historically close ties to the United States. We are helping Latvians build a future where their country can continue to progress in its rightful place as a full member of the European family of democratic nations.

Mr. Speaker, this Member congratulates, in particular, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for crafting a resolution that merits

the support of all Members of this body. This Member urges support for H. Con. Res. 319.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me at the outset congratulate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) for crafting this very excellent resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his eloquent and cogent and strong statement. I want to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Nebraska, and I call on all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 319.

As we congratulate Latvia on the 10th anniversary of its renewed independence, I think it is important to recognize proudly that the United States stood on principle at the time of the beginning of the Second World War in refusing to accept the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia into the Soviet Union.

Not many of our fellow citizens know that the embassies of these three Baltic countries continued to function during the long decades of both the Second World War and the Cold War here in Washington, D.C., underscoring the principled commitment of the United States under Republican and Democratic administrations to the independence of the Baltic States.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, Latvia, along with Lithuania and Estonia, has made enormous progress in developing an economy that was stifled by the nonfunctional Soviet system and building an increasingly democratic and open and free society. I have had the privilege and the pleasure of visiting Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia during the crucial days of their attempted breaking away from Soviet control; and I have had the privilege of visiting in the Baltics repeatedly since, most recently just a few months ago.

It is reassuring, Mr. Speaker, that democracy is taking hold; that the orientation of Latvia and her two Baltic neighbors to democratic principles is strong; their desire to become admitted to the Europe Union is great; to become members of NATO; these are all manifestations of positive developments.

There is one aspect of development in these three countries that I would like to touch upon, which is as yet unfinished business. At the time of the early days of the Second World War, the Baltic states were whipsawed between Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union. As the German forces occupied the Baltic states, understandably perhaps, large numbers of citizens in these countries greeted the Nazis with joy because they represented liberation from the Soviet Union. Many joined Nazi military units.

Now, time has gone on, and most of the members of these military units are no longer alive. But some are, and it has been critical to remind our friends in the Baltic states that it is their moral and legal obligation to bring the perpetrators of crimes against humanity to justice, irrespective of their age and medical condition.

I have had the privilege of working with the presidents of all three Baltic countries and with members of parliament and, on the whole, I want to commend them for approaching this important remaining assignment from the dark period of the Second World War with diligence and sincere commitment. There is no doubt in my mind that under the current leadership of these three countries, with three strong democratically oriented presidents and strong democratically controlled parliaments, this job will be done and the three Baltic states will occupy their proper role in the family of democratic nations within the framework of the European Union and within the framework of NATO.

It is in that spirit that I want to congratulate the people of Latvia and the government of Latvia for the remarkable progress they have made during the course of the last decade, and I strongly urge all of my colleagues to approve this resolution.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the distinguished gentleman who gave a very articulate extemporaneous remark. He has followed the history of these Baltic states, and he has certainly followed their evolution since in fact they have gained their freedom; and I thank him for his outstanding remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the distinguished gentleman who, by his activism, by his leadership, and by his heritage has been recognized already in his time here in the House as a leader on matters related to the Baltic states.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 319, congratulating the Republic of Latvia on the 10th anniversary of the reestablishment, and I underscore reestablishment, of its independence from Russia.

I want to take this opportunity also to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), but especially the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who is the conscience of the House and who has been a good friend as we negotiated these new areas, which are unchartered waters for me. And I would be remiss if I did not mention the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who is the co-chair of the Baltic Caucus. I appreciate his friendship and support, as well as all of the original cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Latvia lost its freedom on August 23, 1939, when Nazi Germany and the U.S.S.R. signed a nonaggression pact and the Baltic states were placed in the Soviet sphere of influence. By August 1940, the nation had been placed under Soviet military occupation and was incorporated as a republic of the U.S.S.R. The United States never recognized the incorporation of these independent countries into the Soviet Union, and the Russian Federation currently has no claims on these independent countries today.

For the subsequent 50 years, the brave people of Latvia endured the slaughter of innocent citizens, deportations to Siberia, and heavy political oppression. Despite these hardships, the Latvian people kept independence alive in their minds and spirits, resisting occupation in silent and public ways, serving as a secret weapon against the tyranny of the Soviet Union.

On May 4, 1990, the people of Latvia solidified their full sovereignty, which served to further the disintegration of the Soviet Union. In just one decade, Latvia has successfully pursued policies to build a strong democracy, protect human rights, expand the rule of law, develop a free market system, and pursue a course of integration into the community of free and democratic nations, including the seeking of membership in the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Latvia, together with the Republics of Estonia and Lithuania, continues to make a significant contribution toward maintaining peace and stability in the surrounding region, notably in peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo. I applaud their participation and signature on the Vilnius statement signed on May 19 of this year, especially their commitment to individual liberty, the free market, and the rule of law.

Latvia is a nation that has made tremendous progress since its independence and has unlimited potential and optimism for the future. The story of Latvian independence deserves to be widely acknowledged and remembered as a successful nonviolent model for social and political change.

In the United States, we have imperfect individuals attempting to form a more perfect union. In Latvia, the attempt by imperfect individuals to form a more perfect democracy should be commended. That is why I urge my colleagues to join with me in passing House Concurrent Resolution 319 and remembering the good people of Latvia for all their perseverance and triumph over the monstrosity of communism.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank my very good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for his most generous comments, as

well as my very good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman for his remarks earlier, and also the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), as I said, for his leadership and his outstanding statement.

I take particular pleasure in being able to manage this legislation. Not only do we have a significant Lithuanian community in both Lincoln and Omaha, and a small Estonian one in Lincoln; but we have a relatively larger community of Latvians in Lincoln. They came to Nebraska in the early part of the 20th century for freedom, to escape religious persecution, and for economic benefits.

As a part of that immigration, shortly following them was a young dissident from Latvia. His name was Karlis Ulmanis. After receiving his bachelor's degree from the University of Nebraska, he worked for some time in Nebraska and Texas before returning to Latvia. There he became the president of Latvia between World War I and World War II.

He was long-tenured, and an outstanding and benevolent leader of Latvia during that period of time. When the Soviets came in, they seized him; and that is the last the world knew of what happened to Karlis Ulmanis.

Later, it was only justice that his grandnephew became the recent president of Latvia. For a period of time, his mother and he had to change their name in order to escape persecution from the Soviets. But the second Ulmanis did became a very distinguished and able president, and the Lincoln community is very pleased and proud of both the Ulmanises for their outstanding leadership of Latvia.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I thank my Latvian-American constituents for their outstanding support for the cause of freedom over the years for the Baltic states.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution and to commend the success the Republic of Latvia has achieved since the May 4, 1990 reestablishment of its full sovereignty and independence from the former Soviet Union.

Since the declaration of its independence, Latvia has established a democratic government, passed legislation on human and minority rights, ensured the rule of law and sustained the development of its free market economy.

Latvia has also consistently pursued a course of integration into the community of free and democratic nations by seeking membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). I support admitting the Baltic states into NATO and I hope my colleagues here in the House will support their entry also in the next round of NATO expansion.

Latvia has made great strides over the last ten years and this resolution helps to highlight this success. I thank Representative SHIMKUS for his efforts to bring House Concurrent Resolution 319 to the floor and the opportunity to congratulate Latvia on the last ten years of progress.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 319, which congratulates the Republic of Latvia on the 10th anniversary of its independence from the rule of the former Soviet regime.

I am certain that all of us in this Congress appreciate how difficult it has been for countries such as Latvia to move forward with badly-needed political and economic reforms over the last decade.

But, many of us can also recall the terrific challenges the Latvian people and their neighbors in Lithuania and Estonia had to overcome to regain their independence ten years ago.

This Resolution congratulates the Latvian people for their success—against all odds—in regaining their rightful independence, and commends them for carrying forward since then with the reforms that should lay the foundation for their full integration into European and Western institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Resolution and urge my colleagues to join in its adoption.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 319.

The question was taken.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONDEMNING 1994 ATTACK ON AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 531) condemning the 1994 attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, urging the Argentine Government to punish those responsible, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 531

Whereas on July 18, 1994, 86 innocent human beings were killed and 300 were wounded when the AMIA Jewish Community Center was bombed in Buenos Aires, Argentina;

Whereas the United States welcomes Argentine President Fernando de la Rua's political will to pursue the investigation of the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center to its ultimate conclusion;

Whereas circumstantial evidence attributes the attack to the terrorist group Hezbollah, based in Lebanon and sponsored by Iran;

Whereas evidence indicates that this bombing could not have been carried out without local assistance from elements of the Argentine security forces, some of which are reported to be sympathetic to anti-Semitic positions and to have participated in the desecration of Jewish cemeteries in recent years;

Whereas additional evidence indicates that the tri-border area where Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil meet, and which is known to be rife with terrorist activity as well as drug and arms smuggling, was used to channel resources for the purpose of carrying out the bombing attack;

Whereas the 6 years since the bombing have been marked by efforts to minimize the involvement of these Argentine security elements;

Whereas Argentine officials have acknowledged that there was negligence in the initial phases of the investigation and that the institutional and political conditions must be created to advance the investigation of this terrorist attack;

Whereas failure to duly punish the culprits of this act serves merely to reward these terrorists and help spread the scourge of terrorism throughout the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas the democratic leaders of the Western Hemisphere issued mandates at the 1994 and 1998 Summits of the Americas that they condemn terrorism in all its forms and that they will, using all legal means, combat terrorist acts anywhere in the Americas with unity and vigor;

Whereas the Government of Argentina supports the 1996 Declaration of Lima To Prevent, Combat and Eliminate Terrorism, which refers to terrorism as a serious form of organized and systematic violence that is intended to generate chaos and fear among the population, results in death and destruction, and is a reprehensible criminal activity, as well as the 1998 Commitment of Mar del Plata which calls terrorist acts serious common crimes that erode peaceful and civilized coexistence, affect the rule of law and the exercise of democracy, and endanger the stability of democratically elected constitutional governments and the socioeconomic development of our countries;

Whereas the Government of Argentina was successful in enacting a law on cooperation from defendants in terrorist matters, a law that will be helpful in pursuing full prosecution in this and other terrorist cases; and

Whereas it is the long-standing policy of the United States to stand firm against terrorist attacks wherever and whenever they occur and to work with its allies to ensure that justice is done: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reiterates its condemnation of the attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in July 1994, and honors the victims of this heinous act;

(2) strongly urges the Government of Argentina to fulfill its international obligations and its promise to the Argentine people by pursuing the local and international connections to this act of terrorism, wherever they may lead, and to duly punish all those who were involved;

(3) calls on the President to continue to raise this issue in bilateral discussions with Argentine officials and to underscore the United States concern regarding the 6-year delay in the resolution of this case;

(4) recommends that the United States Representative to the Organization of American States seek support from the countries comprising the Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism to assist, if required by the Government of Argentina, in the investigation of this terrorist attack;

(5) encourages the President to direct United States law enforcement agencies to

provide support and cooperation to the Government of Argentina, if requested, for purposes of the investigation into this bombing and terrorist activities in the tri-border area; and

(6) desires a lasting, warm relationship between the United States and Argentina built on mutual abhorrence of terrorism and commitments to peace, stability, and democracy in the Western Hemisphere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 531.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the sixth anniversary of the heinous terrorist act against the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Six years ago, on July 18, 1994, a dark cloud of fear and anguish enveloped this South American city when 86 innocent human beings, including frail little girls and boys, were killed, and 300 were wounded as a result of the bombing.

However, 6 years later, Mr. Speaker, sorrow, despair and frustration still permeate the air. Six years later, justice, peace, and security continue to be elusive abstract concepts. But as Argentina's current president, Fernando de la Rua, has stated, it is imperative to keep the memory alive, because forgetfulness is a shelter for impunity.

This leads to the primary reason why I introduced this resolution, to renew and redirect international attention in order to ensure that justice will be finally served. Further, this resolution serves to honor and remember the victims; to outline the evidence supporting the international and local connections to the bombing; to bring to the forefront reported attempts by elements of the Argentine security forces to derail the main investigation by hiding evidence and creating false leads.

The need to effectively address the alleged Argentine participation for this terrorist act was underscored by the de la Rua administration in April of this year when it established a task force to look into the corrupt police officers and their possible role in the financing of the attack, in providing the vehicle used in the bombing. This task force will also pursue undeveloped leads and information regarding the international Iranian terrorist network which has orchestrated and carried out horrific acts against defenseless human beings.

□ 1630

It was clear from the onset that this attack and the earlier one on the Israeli Embassy were part of a campaign of violence targeted at the Jewish community in Argentina and throughout the world by radical militant groups in the Middle East. Circumstantial evidence would later support this connection, attributing the bombing to the terrorist group Hezbollah based in Lebanon and sponsored by Iran.

Additional evidence indicates that the tri-border area, where Argentina, Paraguay and Brazil meet, were used to channel resources for the purpose of carrying out this terrorist attack. Other circumstantial data indicates that this bombing could not have been carried out without local assistance from elements of the Argentine security forces. This link was supported by the indictment of 15 military and police officers, with five described as ''necessary parties to the bombing'' charged with multiple counts of murder, conspiracy and corruption.

The wounds will not begin to heal until the investigation into the AMIA bombing is pursued with vigor and determination and until effective action is taken by all to ensure that justice is served. The scars will serve as a constant reminder of the need for vigilance in our hemisphere, of the need for democratic countries to unite in condemning such horrid acts and work together to protect the right of every citizen in every society to live in peace and liberty free from the threat of terrorism.

This resolution is an important first step toward achieving that goal. It is a call to action. It sends an unequivocal message to all that the United States considers the resolution of this case to be a priority, that it is prepared to take the necessary steps to ensure this end, working both with regional neighbors as well as with the Argentine government, providing them with assistance when requested.

Six years have passed. We cannot wait any longer. It is time for the rule of law to be seen and to be heard in this important case. We cannot allow justice to be held captive by inaction.

For the sake of the victims, for the sake of hemispheric and global security, and for the sake of justice, I ask our colleagues to support this resolution today.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first I want to commend my very good friend and distinguished colleague from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for crafting a very important, very powerful, and very eloquent resolution. And, of course, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a dark cloud hangs over the honor of Argentina. This neighbor of ours in this hemisphere has tolerated now two heinous terrorist acts, a terrorist act against the Embassy of Israel and the terrorist act against the Jewish Community Center in Argentina, to go unpunished for years.

The evidence is clear. Although the direct perpetrators are most likely to have been members of the terrorist group Hezbollah, supported by the Government of Iran, the complicity and participation of Argentinian police and security forces is beyond any doubt. This corrupt, far right-wing partnership with Islamic terrorism in our hemisphere cannot be tolerated.

I welcome the statement of the new president of Argentina assuring us that he will do his utmost at this late stage to bring the perpetrators to justice and to attempt to clean and clear the honor and reputation of Argentina. But we will not rest until these things happen.

Eighty-six innocent men, women and children lost their lives. Over 300 innocent men, women and children were wounded for no reason except their religious affiliation. There is no room in this hemisphere for terrorist acts of any kind, certainly for terrorist acts as hate crimes directed against various religious groups. It is long overdue for the authorities in Argentina to close this chapter, which is a chapter that has brought infamy to that nation.

Following the bombing of the Israeli Embassy, this bombing of a community center in the heart of Argentina brings back memories of the darkest days of the Second World War when innocent men, women and children, for no reason whatsoever, were massacred and murdered.

Argentina must come clean. The new President of Argentina now has an opportunity to instruct all authorities to pursue this case with diligence and determination. Until the perpetrators are brought to justice, a question mark will hang over the relationship of Argentina to all other civilized nations.

I commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and I call on all of my colleagues to approve this resolution.

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 531, for it properly places the U.S. Congress on record in marking the tragic occasion of the sixth anniversary of the July 18, 1994, terrorist bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires. Eighty-seven people lost their lives, and 200 to 300 people were injured in that attack.

This Member thanks his colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms.

ROS-LEHTINEN), from the Committee on International Relations, the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Policy and Trade, for introducing this resolution.

Last year, the Argentine Congress passed important legislation that allows Investigating Judge Juan Jose Galeano to engage in plea bargaining. Nonetheless, the trial of the Argentinian citizens charged with complicity in this terrorist bombing has, regrettably, been much delayed.

During a recent visit to the United States, Argentina's president, Fernando de la Rua, made a point of visiting the Holocaust museum and issuing a public apology for the role Argentina played in harboring Nazis during World War II.

President De la Rua said, ''Today, before you and before the world, I want to express my most sincere pain and to ask forgiveness that this happened, that Nazis were hidden among us.''

Solving this terrible crime and bringing those responsible to justice is the proper way to bring healing to the still open wounds in Argentina.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to join in unanimously supporting this resolution. Again, I commend my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his outstanding statement and especially the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her eloquant statement and for her introduction and able movement of this legislation to the House floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his powerful and eloquent statement. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for her diligent and outstanding work on this issue.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his eloquent words, for his skilled leadership, and for his deep knowledge of history that has helped us to pass this resolution today. I also thank our colleague the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his constant support of all items worthy of support, and certainly our fight against terrorism is on that list. I thank the gentleman for that.

I also thank the gentleman from California (Chairman GILMAN) for his assistance in allowing this resolution to be brought up to the floor so rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to quote from Ambassador Aviran of Israel, whom I believe encapsulated the need for this resolution and for justice. He said, ''Crimes that go unpunished are crimes that get repeated.''

The time to act is now. Six years more should not be allowed to pass before the guilty are brought to justice.

I would like to especially commend the organization B'nai B'rith for its efforts on behalf of the Argentine Jewish community and on behalf of justice in this case. May that day of justice come quickly.

Therefore, I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 531.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution properly places the U.S. Congress on record in marking the tragic occasion of the sixth anniversary of the July 18, 1994 terrorist bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Eight-seven people lost their lives and two hundred people were injured in this attack.

I thank my colleague from our International Relations Committee, the distinguished chairwoman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN of Florida, for introducing this resolution.

I have long been interested in seeing that this heinous crime is resolved and those responsible are brought to justice.

Last year, the Argentine Congress passed important legislation that allows Investigating Judge Juan Jose Galeano to engage in plea bargaining. Nonetheless, the trial of the Argentine citizens charged with complicity in this terrorist bombing has, regrettably, been unduly delayed. Six years is too long a time to let pass without justice.

When the local trial does finally get underway, I urge Argentina's authorities to invite and permit international observers to witness the trial proceedings.

During a recent visit to the United States, Argentina's president, Fernando de la Rua, made a point of visiting the Holocaust museum and issuing a public apology for the role Argentina played in harboring Nazis after World War II.

President De La Rua said, ''Today, before you and before the world, I want to express my most sincere pain and to ask forgiveness that this happened, that Nazis were hidden among us.''

I believe in President De La Rua's sincerity and thank him for his important statement.

Solving this terrible crime and bringing those responsible to justice is the proper way to bring healing to the still open wounds in Argentina.

I urge my colleagues to join me in adopting this important resolution.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 531 and would like to add my voice to those marking the sixth anniversary of the cowardly bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aries, Argentina. This searing event horrified the world and has, unfortunately, become a barometer for the political culture of Argentina.

While we commend the statements of interest and commitment made by President Fernando de la Rua, I, along with many in this House, remain wary, in light of the six years of stumbling, ineffectual investigation and the reality of justice denied. The truth in this matter points unmistakably to elements within the Argentine state and unfortunately, this reality has been a source of delay and obfuscation rather than a catalyst for action by Agentine investigators.

In addition to this disturbing procrastination on the part of investigators to dig deep into the roots of official involvement, the search for justice in Argentina has also skipped lightly over the possible involvement of Hizbollah, Iran and Syria. Notwithstanding the myriad statements pledging an absolute commitment to the search for truth and justice, the reality of the Argentine investigation has been a half-hearted, poorly funded, undermanned, uninspired, slow-motion search for answers.

Mr. Speaker, six years ago in Buenos Aires, 86 people were killed and hundreds more were injured by a car bomb created and delivered by an unknown group of conspirators, who targeted their victims because of their Jewish faith. Cowardly and offensive, the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center came little more than two years after the bombing of the Israeli embassy in the same city. By all accounts, Argentina's response to these two horrific crimes has been lackadaisical and disappointing. The victims of these crimes, old and young, male and female, deserve better than to have their quest for justice fade in a bureaucratic haze.

I want to commend my colleagues Congresswoman ROS-LEHTINEN and Congressman LANTOS for their excellent leadership on this important resolution, which I strongly urge this House to adopt. Putting the House on record on this matter is a vital step toward ensuring a genuine and effective investigation, and ultimately, a fair trial which provides just punishment for the guilty parties.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 531, as amended.

The question was taken.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 7 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 7 p.m.

□ 1900

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 7 p.m.

MAKING IN ORDER AT ANY TIME ON JULY 18, 2000, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 103, AUTHORIZING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT (NORMAL TRADE RELATIONS TREATMENT) TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on July 18 of 2000, or any day thereafter, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 103) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in opposition of the joint resolution, and a Member in support of the joint resolution; that pursuant to section 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion; and that the provision of section 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China for the remainder of the second session of the 106th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that it is the intention of this unanimous consent request that the 2 hours of debate be yielded fairly between Members of the majority and the minority parties on both sides of this issue.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 534, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 319, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 531, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 3125, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to resolution, H. Res. 534.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 534, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 391, nays 5, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 401]

YEAS—391

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—5

Frank (MA)
McDermott
Murtha
Stark
Visclosky

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Dixon
Wilson

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton
Blagojevich
Calvert
Campbell
Carson
Clayton
Coburn
Cook
Danner
Dickey
Dicks
Ehrlich
Ford
Gillmor
Granger
Gutierrez
Hutchinson
Kilpatrick
Klink
Markey
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Rush
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Thompson (MS)
Vento
Waxman
Wise
Young (FL)

☐ 1926

Mr. STARK changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. GORDON, OWENS and RAHALL changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. DIXON changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CONGRATULATING THE REPUBLIC OF LATVIA ON 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF REESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENCE FROM THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 319.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 319, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 402]

YEAS—398

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—36

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton
Blagojevich
Calvert
Campbell
Carson
Coburn
Cook
Danner
Dicks
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Ford
Gillmor
Goodling
Granger
Gutierrez
Hutchinson
Kilpatrick
Klink
Markey
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Porter
Rush
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Vento
Waxman
Wise
Young (FL)

□ 1934

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 402, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

CONDEMNING 1994 ATTACK ON THE AMIA JEWISH COMMUNITY CENTER IN BUENOS AIRES, ARGENTINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 531, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 531, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 403]

YEAS—402

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht

Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—31

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton
Blagojevich
Calvert
Campbell
Carson
Coburn
Cook
Dicks
Ehrlich
Ford
Granger
Gutierrez
Hutchinson
Kilpatrick
Klink
Markey
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Rush
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Vento
Waxman
Wise
Young (FL)

□ 1941

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNET GAMBLING PROHIBITION ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3125, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3125, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 159, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

YEAS—245

Aderholt
Allen
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Canady
Castle
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Cramer
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Kelly
King (NY)
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sandlin
Saxton
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Traficant
Turner
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)

NAYS—159

Andrews
Archer
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLay
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Hayworth
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Mascara
Matsui
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Murtha
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sherman
Simpson
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Snyder
Stark
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—30

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Barton
Blagojevich
Calvert
Campbell
Carson
Coburn
Cook
Dicks
Ehrlich
Ford
Granger
Gutierrez
Hutchinson
Kilpatrick
Klink
Markey
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Rush
Serrano
Sessions
Smith (WA)
Vento
Waxman
Wise
Young (FL)

□ 1951

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

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof), the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in my district, I was unable to record my vote on the following bills: H. Res. 534 (rollcall No. 401); H. Con. Res. 319 (rollcall No. 402); H. Res. 531 (rollcall No. 403); and H.R. 3125 (rollcall No. 404). Had I been present I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 401; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 402; ''aye'' on rollcall No. 403; and ''no'' on rollcall No. 404.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, July 17, 2000, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

ON THE NEED FOR MORE BORDER PATROL AGENTS ON AMERICA'S NORTHERN BORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind this House about the fine work of our border patrol officers. They put their lives at risk every day to slow the flow of illegal drugs into this country and to keep our border safe from dangerous aliens. Their work in helping to arrest a suspected terrorist near Port Angeles, Washington, last December was exemplary.

Due to the current inept management of the INS, however, the jobs of these officers are made much, much more difficult. Over the past two fiscal years, Congress has appropriated funds for the INS to hire 2,000 new Border Patrol Agents. The agency has failed to hire anywhere near that number, and the vast majority of the new agents they have hired have been assigned to the southern border.

There is no reason why northern border staffing should not be greatly increased. Since 1996, I have sent numerous communications to President Clinton, Attorney General Reno, and INS Commissioner Doris Meissner demanding a permanent end to the transfers of Northwestern Border Patrol Agents and urging higher staffing levels on the northern border.

Instead, Commissioner Meissner has recently ordered another reassignment of agents from the northern to the southern border. In addition, she has ordered every Border Patrol plane moved from the State of Washington. In a month's time, every plane along the entire northern border will be moved south.

A few days ago, in protest to these moves, the entire delegation from the State of Washington wrote to Immigration and Naturalization Service Commissioner Doris Meissner protesting her recent decision to transfer Washington State Border Patrol Agents and equipment to the Mexican border.

Ms. Meissner's latest raid on the northern border is unconscionable, especially because a July 8 story in the Seattle Times reports that ''When Meissner made this decision, she possessed a confidential February report by the Department of Justice's Office of the Inspector General which determined that 'The 311 Border Patrol Agents along the northern border cannot adequately patrol the approximately 4,000 mile border with Canada.' ''

The February report also notes that between 1993 and 1998, agents along the northern border were nine times more likely to encounter someone smuggling drugs and 14 times more likely to encounter someone smuggling weapons than agents along the southwest border.

Despite this overwhelming discrepancy, more than 95 percent of INS's Border Patrol Agents are on the southern border. In addition, INS Commissioner Meissner's decision to move personnel was made knowing that last year's arrest of suspected terrorist Ahmed Ressam highlighted additional reasons to maintain maximum coverage on the northern border.

I have also previously asked Commissioner Meissner to hire additional northern border agents, for which Congress has already appropriated the money. She has not only not hired additional agents, she has again relocated some of the few agents we have.

□ 2000

In addition, she removed all of the patrol planes from the Washington border. Most outrageous of all, it turns out she has made these relocations while refusing to release the contents of a Department of Justice report that specifically highlights the severe personnel shortages on the U.S.-Canadian border.

Relocating agents and equipment while hiding details of the dangerous understaffing problem at the northern border is a dereliction of duty. It is risky. It is wrong. It is irresponsible. If Commissioner Meissner cannot do an adequate job on our northern border, then we must get someone in the position who can.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL ADDRESSES HIV/AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I had the honor of joining the Ambassador of the United States to the United Nations, along with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), in New York.

We were invited to witness a historic debate at the U.N. Security Council on an issue of peacekeeping and security addressing the question of HIV/AIDS. For the first time, the world voice, the United Nations, took a unanimous stand to fight HIV/AIDS in the peacekeeping forces around the world.

Although we applaud their bravery, we realize that the military personnel that travel from one developing nation to another without the proper education and training are in harm's way, not only in terms of war, but in terms of the devastation of disease. Based upon our work, we are delighted that this kind of effort was made on behalf of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) who has been the moving force on fighting AIDS in this Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her leadership and also for her efforts in helping the orphans and the children of Africa who are suffering now as a result of their parents dying of AIDS. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership.

We participated in a mission last year. During that time in Southern Africa, we realized that we had to come back and do something. We looked in the eyes of babies, and there was no way that we could let these children live like this without us at least trying to do something for them.

This morning, I had the honor and the privilege to participate with the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) in actually witnessing the United Nation's Security Council's historic discussion and vote regarding the importance of HIV and AIDS education and prevention as it relates to peacekeeping forces.

We all know that an ounce of prevention is really worth a pound of cure. We should be proud of the fact that our own ambassador, Ambassador Holbrooke, has and continues to take

the lead in raising the moral concerns, the humanitarian concerns, and, yes, the security concerns of the AIDS pandemic. He has done remarkable work in little time to educate the world community; and that is, definitely, he has put forth and set forth a course to actually break the silence in the world with regard to this pandemic.

We were waging war on this. I am proud of the Congress in terms of our bipartisan efforts to wage war on this deadly disease. I think today the resolution that was passed by the Security Council really takes us one step forward in waging the battle that we must wage on this.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, might I say that the leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) in the United States Congress, along with the amendment on debt relief offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) last week brought us to where we needed to be by adding $42 million back into the Foreign Operations appropriations.

I think it is important for the American people to understand that as the world is endangered by the devastation of the elimination of large populations by HIV/AIDS, we need to recognize here in America that we are fully impacted.

I know for many it seems as if we are looking distant, far away, but AIDS can be compared to the times historically of the bubonic plague when large numbers of Europeans were devastated and eliminated with this disease.

This disease is killing one in five in South Africa. Forty million children will be orphaned. I am very proud that the Ambassador to the United Nations joined in the causes with, first, the Vice President speaking before the United Nations, then our respective Senators, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has just returned from Durban, South Africa, to say that we really are in a war.

As we fight for peace, peace is intertwined in fighting against this devastating disease. I would hope that we will continue this effort. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership, and, of course, I applaud the United Nations for its effort.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE ON H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY ELIMINATION RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–752) on the resolution (H. Res. 553) providing for consideration of a motion to go to conference on any Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TAKE BACK CONTROL OF URANIUM ENRICHING FACILITIES BEFORE AMERICA BECOMES DEPENDENT ON FOREIGN SOURCES FOR ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in Southern Ohio that is a part of the Appalachian area. I am very proud of my constituents.

Many of my constituents throughout the long years of the Cold War worked at a facility in southern Ohio which enriches uranium. During the early days of the Cold War, that facility enriched uranium which went into our nuclear weapons. In more recent years, that facility has produced enriched uranium necessary to create the fuel that produces the nuclear power generated in this country, the electricity through nuclear power.

Two years ago, this administration and this Congress privatized that industry; and just a few weeks ago, this new privatized corporation announced that it was closing the facility in my district, thereby terminating the employment of some nearly 2,000 men and women. These are individuals who have served our country well. Many of them have been exposed to dangerous chemicals and to radiation. They have developed cancers. Many have lost their lives.

Later on this week, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation which will set in motion a process whereby this government can once again assume ownership of this industry. Why would I do this, and why is it important to the economic and energy security of our Nation? It is because some 23 percent of the electricity generated in this country is generated through nuclear power. Only two facilities in this country enrich the uranium which is necessary to produce the fuel for these nuclear power plants.

The direction of this privatized corporation troubles me. I am very concerned that their ultimate goal is not to be producers of enriched uranium, but simply to become brokers of enriched uranium. It is my concern that their ultimate goal is, not only to close my facility, but also to close the facility in Paducah, Kentucky.

If that were to happen, Mr. Speaker, this Nation would become totally dependent on foreign sources for at least 20 percent of all of the electricity that is generated in this country. We cannot let that happen. As a body, as a group of elected Representatives of the people, we must not allow ourselves to become dependent on foreign sources for a huge portion of all of the electricity generated within this country.

I am calling tonight upon my colleagues to join me in the introduction of this legislation. It is essential and necessary. We made a mistake when we privatized this vital industry. We made a mistake when we turned it over to the private sector who are not necessarily loyal to this country or to the objectives of this government. They are not necessarily loyal to the energy security need of this Nation. Their primary objective is to their investors and their stockholders.

I am deeply troubled, Mr. Speaker, that the individual that oversaw the privatization process, the individual who was the CEO of the public corporation before it became private, was dealing with a major, major conflict of interest. As a government employee, he was making approximately $350,000 a year. Once this became a privatized corporation, his salary skyrocketed to $2.48 million a year. Not only that, but he convinced the board of directors to give him a golden parachute of $3.6 million. If he is fired or he loses his job, he can walk away with $3.6 million.

The workers in my district, many of them who have served this country as Cold War warriors who have exposed themselves to dangerous conditions, are being terminated of their jobs, many with only weeks to go before they qualify for retirement. It is simply wrong. It is wrong for my constituents. It is wrong for this Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in the efforts to once again take over the ownership of this vital industry and protect our country from being so totally dependent on foreign sources for energy.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL SEES HIV/AIDS AS GLOBAL CRISIS, NOT JUST A HEALTH PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am really here to join two previous speakers, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who were with me today at the United Nations Security Council in New York where the United Nation's Security Council for the first time in history voted for a united effort and attack on the AIDS crisis in the world and saw it as a security problem, not just a health challenge before us. It recognized a that HIV/AIDS is more than a health problem but actually a global crisis. It set a very important target to work towards the reduction of AIDS by 25 percent by the year 2010 in the age group of 15 to 24.

It was a very significant and groundbreaking action, but it is by no means an end. It is a beginning of many more steps that we have to take.

Earlier in January, I was there when Vice President GORE announced his support for this effort, and I applaud the leadership, not only of the Vice

President, but of Ambassador Holbrooke who have worked with the Security Council to bring it to the vote today on this important resolution.

It will look at AIDS as a long-term and domestic policy. It will set up a tracking system around the world. It will focus on training and education around the world, but also on the peacekeepers, testing voluntarily the peacekeepers, and making them aware of the crisis and the harm that it can be to their own health and to many others.

I might add that this body has also acted to combat the AIDS crisis. The Department of Defense legislation contained $10 million to really work, in a joint effort, with military organizations around the world to educate and combat AIDS. Just last week, in the Foreign Operations bill, there was a vote of $244 million for USAID to combat AIDS.

I also applaud the hard work of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on her ''Marshal Plan'' against AIDS, which was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services with strong bipartisan support with $100 million authorization for 1 year and $500 million over 5 years. That legislation is currently before the Senate. We hope it will likewise receive strong bipartisan support.

I wanted to join my colleagues in really applauding the first-ever action by the Security Council in recognizing AIDS as a health problem, a security problem in our new world of interdependence and globalization, in a very positive step that they took today in passing out this resolution which I will place in the RECORD as follows:

DRAFT SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON HIV/AIDS

The Security Council,

Recalling its meeting of 10 January 2000 chaired by the Vice President of the United States, at which it was briefed the President of the World Bank, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Program, and the Executive Director of the Joint United Nations Programme on the connection between the spread of HIV/AIDS and peace and security in Africa,

Deeply concerned by the extent of the HIV/AIDS pandemic worldwide and by the severity of the crisis in Africa in particular,

Bearing in mind that it has the primary responsibility under the Charter of the United Nations for international peace and security,

Recalling in this context, the Statement of its President on the role of the Security Council in the prevention of armed conflicts (S/PRST/1999/34),

Reaffirming the importance of a coordinated international response to the economic, health, social, cultural and humanitarian problems which are often the root causes of armed conflict,

Recognizing that the adverse effects of the spread of HIV/AIDS on all sectors of society, including individuals, families, workers, political leadership, and the military, have weakened the capacity of affected countries to maintain domestic and regional peace and security,

Further Recognizing that the spread and impact of the HIV/AIDS pandemic is greatly exacerbated by poverty and lack of development,

Further Recognizing that the HIV/AIDS pandemic not only poses a threat to stability and security, but is also exacerbated by conditions of violence and instability,

Recognizing that HIV/AIDS poses a truly global risk to all continents and peoples both civilian and military,

Expressing Concern at the damaging impact of HIV/AIDS on international peacekeeping operations.

Welcoming the March report of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping which affirmed the need to incorporate HIV/AIDS prevention training in aspects of the UNDPKO training for peacekeepers,

Welcoming the Report of the Secretary-General for the Millennium Assembly of the United Nations, and in particular, those sections where he notes that the spread of HIV/AIDS is a truly global crisis, that unless action is taken HIV/AIDS will be even more damaging in the future, and his call for coordinated and intensified international action to reduce the rate of new HIV infections by 25% by the year 2010,

Commending the efforts by UNAIDS to coordinate and intensify the work of the world's states and the UN organizations against the HIV/AIDS pandemic,

Commending the efforts of the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations to address this issue, including providing HIV/AIDS prevention awareness information to peacekeepers through its train-the-trainers courses and materials:

1. Requests the Secretary-General ensure the provision of mission-specific training of all peacekeepers on issues related to the prevention of the spread of HIV/AIDS, and ensure the further development of pre-deployment and on-going training of all peacekeepers on issues related to the prevention of the spread of HIV/AIDS,

2. Urges all states to acknowledge the problem of HIV/AIDS directly, including in uniformed national military forces, and develop, in consultation with the international community and UNAIDS, effective civilians and military personnel on the prevention of the spread of HIV/AIDS,

3. Urges all member states to institute voluntary and confidential counseling and testing for HIV/AIDS for civilians and members of uniformed national military forces, especially for troops to be deployed to international peacekeeping missions, because of the proven effects of testing to reduce high-risk behaviors,

4. Further urges countries to increase international cooperation among national military organizations to assist with the creation and execution of HIV/AIDS prevention, testing and treatment policies within the militaries,

5. Requests the Secretary General ensure that UNAIDS cooperate with member states, including those states that contribute peacekeeping troops, to establish voluntary consultations and a database to track these countries' HIV/AIDS prevention education, testing, deployment, counseling and treatment policies,

6. Calls upon the leadership of all UN organizations to address the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the context of their organization's respective mandates and to adjust their organization's activities accordingly to ensure they are assisting wherever possible in the global efforts against the HIV/AIDS pandemic

Decides to remain seized of the matter and to continue to seek information and guidance on this issue from all appropriate sources.

□ 2015

CONGRATULATIONS TO REVEREND VASHTI M. MCKENZIE OF BALTIMORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to salute and pay tribute to a friend, Bishop Vashti McKenzie, who was just elevated to be a bishop in the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Cincinnati just a few days ago. She is the first woman to achieve this high goal, and she is certainly very deserving.

Bishop Vashti McKenzie, whose church is within one block of my house in the 7th Congressional District of Maryland, for many, many years has labored in the vineyards of lifting up people, pastoring the Payne Memorial A.M.E. Church and being a wonderful, wonderful pastor, a wonderful wife, and one who has constantly been about the business of empowering not only her church members but her community.

Bishop McKenzie is a member of the Delta Sigma Theta sorority, and she has been a very active member and she has constantly done things within the 7th Congressional District to address the question of how to empower people. She recently spent a tremendous amount of time working with the banks in Baltimore trying to make sure that they were not redlining. She spent a tremendous amount of effort pulling together banks and making sure that their lending practices were consistent throughout the entire Baltimore metropolitan area.

But more important than that, even when she was not even considering running for the position of bishop, she constantly worked in the vineyards. I have often said that when one is unknown, unseen, unappreciated and unapplauded, it is what they do in those moments that really count. So I take a moment not only to salute Bishop Vashti McKenzie, but I also take a moment to salute the African Methodist Episcopal Church. There are so many churches that do not even want women to be pastors, and here is a church that not only have many pastors throughout these United States but has decided to elevate one of its daughters to be a bishop.

It is with great honor that I recognize and thank Bishop Vashti McKenzie for all of her work; and, Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to congratulate her for her accomplishments.

TAXES AND THEIR IMPACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just come back from the district, and I

spent my entire weekend traveling throughout the district. Interestingly, the subject that came up time and time again were the death taxes. So this evening I am going to talk a little about taxes. I think it is a good forum for us to discuss really four basic taxes, and so I am going to address those with my colleagues here this evening.

The first, of course, is the death tax. I will go into some detail about what that exactly encompasses and why it is so punitive on the citizens of this country; why it is an unjust tax; why there is no justification for the death tax in our tax system; what it does to open space and to the preservation of open space in districts such as mine, the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado.

Then I will move on and talk about the capital gains tax reduction that the Republicans put into place and what capital gains means as far as creation of capital and why it is critical for the economic well-being of our country.

From there, I will move on to talk a little about the marriage penalty. To the best of my knowledge, only in the United States of America, only in the United States of America do we tax couples because they are married. This, by the way, is the leading country in the world which advocates family. We advocate marriage. We want people to get together and tie that bond, the very basic entity of the family foundation which has made this country great. But Uncle Sam comes along, not to be left out of the game, and puts a tax on it. We will talk a little about that.

Finally, I also want to talk about our homes. Every homeowner, every one of our constituents, colleagues, who are homeowners out there in this fine country of ours, we need to talk about what happens when they sell that home for a profit; what used to happen and what now happens as a result of the Republican leadership. And, frankly, that was a bipartisan vote, but it is a Republican bill; and we will discuss what it did to those homeowners and how it helps homeowners in this country.

It has some bearing for every one of my colleagues in this Chamber because the majority of our constituents own homes. And in these good economic times, a lot of our constituents have the opportunity to sell their homes; or if they sell their home, they will sell it for a profit.

But first of all let us begin with the tax that I think is without justification, a tax which was initiated as a vendetta, as a way to get even with the wealthy families, the families who met success in America: the Fords, the Carnegies, the Vanderbilts, the Rockefellers.

Back then the feeling was, how dare those people make that much money; we have to figure out a way, without working for it, to take the wealth from them and transfer it to us, the Government, in Washington, D.C. What better approach than to put a tax on them on the day they die. The day that person dies, Uncle Sam will be at the door, right behind the mortician, except that Uncle Sam gets to collect before the mortician, by the way, on the death tax.

So we will talk a little about what this death tax means; how it impacts things in the environment, like open space in Colorado; how it devastates families who were brought up and who lived the American Dream; how everyone's dream, those my age, is to leave something for the generation behind them, and how that dream has been dashed; what the impact is for the generation ahead of me that wanted to leave something for this generation to get kind of a head start, how it has been demolished in many cases; and what the impact is of death tax transferring, spinning money right out of the community to be transferred, without work, without value, simply transferred from our local community to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. under the death tax.

One of the best articles I have read is out of a newspaper which I read on a regular basis, the Wall Street Journal. Excellent editorials, by the way, colleagues. I would urge all my colleagues to read those. It was interesting to me that the TV talk host, Oprah Winfrey, is quoted as saying, ''I think it is irritating that once I die 55 percent of my money goes to the government of the United States.''

Why is that irritating? Because that individual may have already paid nearly 50 percent. What Oprah is referring to is that the money being taxed upon that person's death, if that estate qualifies, is property upon which that individual may have already paid taxes on. It is not money that was put away in some little chuckhole somewhere and not had taxes paid on it. It is money, in many cases, that has been taxed not only once, but twice and sometimes three times.

Let me go on with her quote: ''When you leave a house or money to people, then they're taxed at 55 percent. So you've got to leave them enough so once they're taxed they still have some money.''

When we talk about taxes in a country, we have to look around the world. It is, after all, America that is the symbol of free enterprise. It is the dream in America that a person can start out and if they can figure out a better mousetrap, a better way of doing things, a product that will benefit the people, give value to the people, then that person is rewarded the fruits of their labor. That is the American concept.

Look at other countries. Look at some of the countries that have the reputations for high taxes in this world. Look at Switzerland. Not only Switzerland, but look at Germany, or look at Belgium. Even their death taxes are lower than the United States. Only one country that I can find in research, as cited by the Wall Street Journal article, Japan, has a higher rate than the United States.

Now, as my colleagues know, the administration, the President and the Vice President, as a team, are prepared to veto the elimination of the death tax. The U.S. House, by a bipartisan vote, meaning Democrats and Republicans, supported the Republican bill to eliminate the death tax. The Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, adopted the Senate bill, the Republican Senate bill, to eliminate the death tax. Yet this bipartisan effort will be vetoed in the next few days by the President and Vice President team.

A lot of us hoped, however, that they would just leave it alone. When we started this year, we were surprised when we got the President and Vice President's budget, which not only of course does not call for elimination of the death tax, it increases the death tax, and increases it by $9.5 billion. Today we are sending them a bill that will finally allow equity in regards to this, to eliminate it; but the President and the Vice President see fit to veto it.

Now, some of my colleagues or their constituents out there may say, well, that does not impact me, the death tax is only for the wealthy. Interesting statistic I saw the other day. The American Association of General Contractors pointed out that a contractor, somebody who wants to go out and dig some dirt, who purchases the three basic tools necessary to move dirt, a bulldozer, a dump truck and a front-end loader, that contractor in America that buys a front-end loader, a bulldozer and a dump truck, their estate is now in the status that it will be faced with the death tax upon their death.

Look, colleagues, this does not just apply to the wealthiest of Americans, this applies to a lot of Americans; and it applies to Americans who do not necessarily have high cash flow. This contractor who has a bulldozer, a dump truck, and a backhoe may have no cash flow, or their business is just breaking even, and upon the death of this contractor, the Federal Government comes in and they will crush that business because the only way that estate can pay that estate tax is to sell the bulldozer or sell the dump truck or sell the front-end loader. Now, how, as a contractor, when the business needs those three basic pieces of equipment, how can the business be operated with just two of the three? It cannot.

The same thing applies to ranchers and farmers, in particular, in rural America. My State, for example: Colorado, the district I represent, the Third Congressional District of Colorado, geographically larger than the State of Florida, essentially all the mountains of Colorado. Do my colleagues understand what is happening to our ranching community out there because of this death tax?

I wish the President's policy wonks and the Vice President's policy wonks

would come out to Colorado and see what they are doing to open space. They are forcing it to go into 35-acre ranchettes because the family, who is part of a ranching operation, does not have heavy cash flow. In some cases, not even positive cash flow. When the head of the family passes away and the estate is activated for the death tax, what choice do they have? It is like the contractor who has to sell one of the three or maybe two of the three pieces of equipment.

□ 2030

It demolishes it. The contractor's business is gone. And that is what is happening to ranches in Colorado. Yet our President and Vice President decided that it was appropriate not only to have a death tax imposed upon all of us but to increase the death tax this year in their budget by $9.5 billion.

Let us go on with this article. I think it is very interesting. ''Then there are casualties,'' speaking about the death tax, again from the Wall Street Journal, July 29, 1999, ''then there are casualties in small business, particularly family businesses. Hardest hit are owners of asset-rich enterprises and areas like farming or timber that, while growing, may not throw off much cash. In theory, again, the law provides a break for these families. However, the reality is that prohibitive estate taxes force the heirs to dismantle their legacy to pay the taxes on it.''

That is what is happening to Colorado ranches. That is what is happening to ranches all around this country. Let me tell you, the very wealthiest people in this country are the ones that can afford the legions of attorneys and accountants to figure out how to preserve that, but the middle class in America who does not have the money to acquire the attorneys and the CPAs for the protection of that estate are suffering.

Why should they suffer? It is one thing, we all have a tax burden. The citizens of this country acknowledge and know that we have to pay our fair share in taxes and the people who acquire these estates under the umbrella of the American dream they know they have to pay taxes and they pay them as they acquire their property. But then at the end, for the United States Government to step in through the door of death and say now that you have died it has become a taxable event, we all know what are taxable events. If you buy something at the store, you pay, it is a taxable event. If you buy a car, it is taxed, it is a taxable event. You get a license plate, it is a taxable event.

But the U.S. Government and the President and Vice President think that the policy should be that when you die, it is an event so remarkable that it should be taxed, so remarkable that it should be taxed, regardless of the impacts of what that tax does.

I have heard and I have read some editorials lately, not many, most of the editorials I read support doing away with the death tax, but I read a couple that say, hey, what are you talking about? All you are doing is hitting the rich people. How wrong those people are.

Interestingly, one of those articles I saw in the Wall Street Journal, and it was not an editorial but it was a guest comment; and I thought to myself, I wonder if the author of that article had ever been outside of the boundaries of the Potomac River to the farmlands and to the ranchlands and to the small businesses in America and asked those people what is it going to be like when mom or dad dies and you have got to pay estate taxes? What kind of impact does it have on your community?

Let us talk about that for a minute. What happens to the community? Some people as they write in these editorials think that the only impact is upon the family with whom the death occurred. My gosh, they need to open their eyes, my colleagues, because it goes much further than just the family that has the death.

I will give my colleagues an example. In my district, I had a friend of mine who lived the American dream, who went out with soil in his hand and worked it and worked hard; and he was rewarded through life. He figured out a better mousetrap. He figured out how to build a better road. He knew how to work harder. He knew how to count his pennies. And, as a result, he got the fruits of his labor.

Do you know what he did with the fruits of his labor, the money that he made? He made some money. Do you know what he did with it? He invested it in the community. He underwrote 75 percent of the local Episcopal church budget, 75 percent of it, every year. You could go to my buddy Joe and he would write the check. The United Way, the Cancer Society, the Lung Society, M.S., high school yearbook, you name it, Joe helped provide in that community. And it was money that Joe made but he kept in the community and it circulated.

Joe also gave people jobs. He hired people to work in his construction company. He hired people to help him on his land. And those people then took their money home to their families in that community. That money was important to that community.

And what happened when Joe died? Guess who comes in from Washington, D.C., as if they reserved a private jet just to fly into this small community in Colorado to go and smile over the deceased because it is a taxable event. They came into that community and they hit his estate, when you combine it with capital gains at a rate in excess of 80 percent, 80 cents on every dollar, and by the way, every dollar that had already been taxed at the time it was accumulated, any interest or investment or return since then was taxed, 80 percent on every dollar.

Do you know what happened to the 57 percent of the local Episcopal church budget that was underwritten? Gone overnight. Do you know what happened to your major contributions, to your charities and the community, the United Way, the Cancer Society, Lung Society? Gone overnight. Do you know what happened to jobs in that community that were there as a result of the investments that he made in that community? Gone overnight.

And yet our President and our Vice President are willing to stand down there and veto the elimination of this unjustified death tax. It is not fair.

I have a wonderful little niece. She is 2 years old. She has a way of crossing her arms and looking you in the eye and she says, ''it's not fair.'' That is exactly what is happening here.

How can you justify in any regard other than the fact that you want to be vindictive against people who have been successful in our society, how can you justify a taxable event upon their death? How can you look at the surviving members of their family or how can we look at the young people, look at the 20-some-year-olds in this country who are out there working 60 and 70 hours a week, who have the energy that we all my age remember well, the opportunity to be something, the opportunity to make it your own way, you want it your way, make it your way, the American free enterprise system, only to know that your goal, and it was a goal I have had ever since my wife and I had our first child, it was a mutual goal, and that is we dedicated ourselves a certain portion of the hard-earned money that we made, and we are not wealthy, but the hard-earned money we made we dedicated a portion of that because we wanted the next generation to maybe have a home or maybe our son and daughter who wants to be a contractor and go out and buy those three basic pieces of equipment, a backhoe, a dump truck and a bulldozer.

Whoever dreamed when we were young and those were the days, whoever dreamed when those were the days that it would be the United States Government that, upon your death, would call it a taxable event and come in and take away the dreams that you and your spouse have had for a long time, take away the prosperity that a community enjoys?

Where does that money go? It spends right out of your community, right out of your family, right out of your estate. It spends East where and it comes to Washington, D.C., to be redistributed by the Government.

Is it fair? Of course it is not fair.

Let me go on. I am particularly addressing right now ethnic minority groups. It is worth noting that a good share of those people who are vulnerable are owned by two groups whom high tax leftists claim to protect, women and minorities.

A survey of black-owned businesses by Kenneshaw State College in Georgia found six in ten firms by women and minorities, six in ten firms reported that the estate tax makes the survival

of their business after the current generation significantly more difficult or impossible. Close to a third of those people said their heirs would have to sell their businesses just to pay the taxes.

Let me read a few letters that I have gotten in my office that are right on point when we talk about the impact that happens by this Government upon its own people. Colleagues, it is happening to our constituents simply because they die and simply because they have lived the American dream and they have had success.

Now, look, if you want to be vindictive, if you are against people being successful, then I guess you are satisfied with this death tax. And apparently that is perhaps the policy of the White House, because they are going to veto a bipartisan bill, Democrat and Republican. Although it is a Republican bill, the Democrats voted for it, some of them; and in the Senate Republican bill, some Democrats voted for it. The President still chooses to veto it.

This gentleman is named Mr. Roberts. ''My family has ranched in northern Colorado for 125 years. My sons are the sixth generation to work this land. We want to continue, but the Internal Revenue Service is forcing almost all ranchers and many farmers out of business. The problem is the death tax. The demand for our land is very high, and 35-acre ranchettes are selling in this area for as high as $4,500 per acre. We have many thousands of acres. We want to keep it as open space, but the United States Government is making it impossible because we will have to pay 55 percent of the valuation of that acreage upon my parents' death.

''Ranchers are barrel scrapping by these days, anyway. But since we want to save the ranch, we are in trouble. The family has been able to scrape up the death taxes as each generation dies up to now. This time I think we're done for. Our only other option is to give the ranch to a nonprofit organization. And they all want it.

''My dad is 90. We don't have much time left. We are one of only two or three ranchers left around this area. Most ranches have been subdivided. One of the last to go was a family that had been there as long as ours. When the old folks died, the kids borrowed money to pay the taxes. Soon they had to start selling cattle to pay the interest. When they ran out of cattle, their ranch was foreclosed on and is now being developed. The family now lives in a trailer near town, and the father works as a highway flagman.

''If you want to stop sprawl, you better ask the U.S. Government to get off the backs of family farms and ranches.''

The next letter, Ron Edwards:

''Dear Representative McInnis,

I'm writing to bring to your attention an issue of utmost importance to me and my family, employees, and the businesses: elimination of the death tax. I urge you to support and pass the death tax repeal legislation this year. Family-owned businesses need relief from those death taxes now. We are celebrating 66 years in business.''

Now, that is the American dream. That is the American dream, Mr. Speaker, 66 years in business. Six generations in this letter, six generations on the same ranch. Do my colleagues want to be a part of the team that ruins those six generations? Do they want to be a part of the team that comes in here after 66 years of business? Let me continue.

''My grandfather, Vic Edwards, started with a fruit and vegetable farm in 1933 at our location in Colorado. The business grew into a grocery store and then a lawn and garden center. My father, Vic Edwards, is 80 years old, and he is in poor health. No business can remain competitive in a tax regime that imposes rates as high as 55 percent upon the death of the owner. Our tax law should encourage rather than discourage the perpetuation of these businesses.''

Let me repeat that. Our tax laws, Mr. Speaker, should encourage the continuity of these businesses, not discourage the continuity. This guy works in his family grocery store and that is what he is telling us, Mr. Speaker. He is saying we should encourage the continuity of these businesses, encourage them to go on, not destroy it.

☐ 2045

If you support that death tax, you are going to destroy a lot of these family businesses. Leonard Harris, first-generation owner of a food center in Chicago, Illinois. His store is one of less than 20 African-American-owned supermarket companies in the United States. Mr. Harris has said, my focus has been putting my earnings back into grow the business. For this reason, cash resources to pay the Federal death taxes based on the valuation, the way valuation is made, would force my family to sell the store in order to pay the IRS within 9 months of my death. Our yearly earnings would not cover the payment of this tax. I should know. I started my career as a certified public accountant. So here is an African American, first generation in business, taking the cash flow, the profits out of that business, putting it back into the business to create more business, to create capital, to create jobs, to create an economic solid block in a community. Now he is saying, ''Look, it isn't going to go beyond one generation if this government continues to put the death tax on us.''

Rich Newman, Sr. Our company was founded in 1917 by Rich Newman's father and uncle and currently operates 33 grocery stores in Illinois, Missouri, Kansas and Iowa and provides jobs for 3,000 people. 3,000 people. When Rich's father passed away suddenly in 1969, the family was faced with a death tax of several hundred thousand dollars which by law was due within several months. The Newman family had to use all of the resources from the sale of the company's wholesale operations to pay the death tax bill. These proceeds could have been put to a better use by being reinvested in retail stores and new jobs. The sale of the wholesale side of the business provided the funds to pay the estate taxes. Now Mr. Newman, to preserve what is left of the business, has estimated over the years he has spent in excess of $600,000 just on accountants and CPAs to help him figure out how to pass that business on to the next generation without the death tax.

Brookhart Building Centers in Grand Junction and Montrose, Colorado. Those are two thriving communities in my district out in Colorado. Last September the Brookhart Building Centers had to be sold in order to avoid paying the death tax. The owner said that it was the hardest decision the family had made in 52 years of business. And it was a decision that was not brought on by their failure because maybe they did not work hard enough. The decision to sell was not brought on because they did not have a good product to sell. It was not brought on because they could not service the community. It was not brought on by dissatisfaction of consumers. It was brought on by the Federal bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. which decided that they are going to tax this family upon the death and they are going to break that business apart. Watt said the current death taxes forced his father to make the sale prior to his father's death in order to protect our family. Can you believe that? We have a constituent, colleagues, talking about in order to protect our family from the government, in order to protect our family from a death tax, from a taxable event which was put in in the early 1900s just as a vindictive tool to get at the Rockefellers and the Carnegies, in order to protect our family and our employees. Remember what I said about the community impact? To protect our employees, too, and our community from a forced liquidation upon the death of the father and the wife, Betty, the best thing now would be to sell the company. And it was sold.

Let me conclude with one other article and then we will move on to some other taxes. But listen to this. I do not like reading from scripts. But this is an important one. I hope you have the patience to listen to this. I think it is very moving. I think it shows you exactly how punishing, how punitive the death tax is and how unfair and how unjustified they are and how the President and the Vice President of this country with their policy can not only veto the bill, bipartisan bill to get rid of it, the President and the Vice President have actually proposed raising the death tax by 9.5 billion in their budget they proposed. This came out of the Aspen Times.

There are lots of tales to be told about the conversion of former ranches into luxury homes or golf courses

throughout the valley. Sometimes it was a simple financial decision, a choice to take advantage of soaring development values in the face of plummeting cattle prices, but for other families the passing of a parent meant the passing of a way of life. Listen to that sentence, colleagues. But for other families, the simple death of a parent meant the death of a way of life. The death of a parent meant the death of a way of life for the whole family. We have been around a long time, said Dwight. The family roots are dug deep along Capital Creek Road in Old Snow Mass and for nearly a century, heritage and hard work were enough to sustain those who lived on our 13-acre stretch of land. But it all changed. Until Dwight's father's death, each generation, each generation in that 100 years, presided over a working cattle ranch which was both the lifeblood and the livelihood of the clan, the Monron clan. His later years were lean times for Dwight's father but the fate of this ranch was not at risk until the government came around to collect its due on the death of Dwight. The tax bill came to $750,000. And what it took to pay the bill was this. We had to sell half the ranch, the ability of the Monron cattle to migrate in the winter months in 10 years, until we were able to pay our final last installment. What those taxes took was also something very vital, the ability of the next generation to support their family by working the land that had been theirs for such a long, long time.

So the government came in and not only took the money but they took away the future ability of this family to continue ranching operations. It is just like the contractor. If you come in and you have the three pieces of equipment, the bulldozer, the dump truck and the backhoe and you take one of those pieces of equipment away, you can no longer function as a construction operation. What those taxes have done to our family is exactly that. Now one of our heirs works full time as a mechanic, the son, works full time as a mechanic for the school district and then works on the ranch when he gets home at night. He doesn't mind the long hours he has to put in. What does get under his skin is the memory of how IRS agents overseeing his father's taxes either didn't recognize the devastation that was about to occur or didn't care. It was just pay us or we'll seize everything. If anything's left over, you can keep it, or if you can't make ends meet on what's left, you can hit the streets. He has no intention of selling the remaining 640 acres but he wonders if his daughters will be willing to go through what he has gone through just to keep the ranch intact. With only half of the land to graze and falling beef prices, the ranch itself is only making enough to cover its operating costs and annual property taxes. It is the day job at the school district that pays the doctor bills, the car insurance, the grocery bills and everything else. There has always been hope that things will change before his daughters have to make decisions. But he wonders if people really think about the permanent changes that take place when the ranch is sold. It's not just a loss to the family, it is a loss to the community. It is a loss to the people who work on that ranch. There are some movements in the right direction but are they moving quickly enough? Because once our land is sold to developers, it is gone forever. It will never again have the integrity of a ranch.

That is what your estate, those death taxes are doing. Some of you out there, colleagues, who are supporters of the death tax and claim to be guardians of the environment, well, you are not doing it in rural America because in rural America you are costing us, you are forcing us to develop those communities. By now you should have drawn the conclusion, I hope, that the death tax is fundamentally flawed. There is no basis for it. There is no justification for it. The only reason really it came about were two reasons: One, vindictively to settle a score with the wealthy people. It was jealousy in my opinion that drove it. And, two, the government as usual looks for an easy way to take money without earning it and transfer it to somebody else who did not work for it. Remember that every time you give a dollar to somebody that is not working, you are taking it from somebody who is. Every debit has a credit, every credit has a debit. That is exactly what we are doing with this death tax. We ought to, every one of us to the person in these chambers, ought to stand up to the President and the Vice President of this country and say, sign the bill to eliminate the death tax, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President. Quit standing by and letting our small businesses, our family ranches and our family farms be destroyed. Quit standing by, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, with this policy and letting our communities, our minority communities who are now finally getting the opportunity, the fair opportunities that should have been given to them a long time ago only to find out now that the very government which espouses its push for affirmative action and equality and so on and on forth is the very one who steps in on the day of death and says, come here, we want the money, we want the money to transfer.

Let us move on to another tax I want to visit with you about. This one you will feel good about. It is a big break if you own a home. There are a lot of young people out here today. Our country now has homeowners that I think probably are the youngest age in the history of our country, or certainly in recent years. I mean people in their 20's, early 20's are able to buy a home, and economically it is probably the largest investment most of those families will make during their lifetime. Let me show you what happened in the past if you sold that home for a profit. We will just take a couple of examples here. Let us say as an individual you have bought a home for $100,000 and over time you sold the home, let us say 10 years later you sold the home for $350,000. So your profit, and this applies to every homeowner in the country, your profit if you own a home was $250,000 and you were taxed on $250,000, although you could defer the tax by rolling it over into a home of greater or higher value or if you were over, I think, 62, you got a once-in-a-lifetime exemption I think of $125,000. We felt that this was punitive. Let me say to you, I am not up here to get in a partisan battle. But the Democrats, frankly, you could have gotten rid of that death tax a long time ago, and you could have done something when you held control for 40 something years on these home taxes. But I am proud to say you joined us, you joined the Republicans in doing away with this tax. In my opinion, this tax break on the profit of your home when you sold it is probably the biggest tax break that you have seen in our tax structure, I would guess in the last 15 years.

How so? We changed the law completely. It is the Republicans' position that, sure we need to have taxes, we do not disagree with taxes. But we believe we are under a fiduciary duty to take the taxes that are necessary to give you the functions that you demand. But beyond that, we think you should have the tax back. The money in your pocket works a lot more effectively than the money back here. Take, for example, if you won the lottery and you won $2 million, do you think for one minute, any one of my colleagues out here, that you would take that $2 million and send it to the government in Washington, D.C. to invest? Of course you would not. Or even to distribute. Of course you would not. If you wanted to give it to the poor people, would you send your money to Washington to be distributed to the poor people? Of course not. Because of the inefficiencies. This is one of the inefficiencies we saw in the government. So what we did is we put in a tax bill. Let us take the same example. The individual, again, buys the house for $100,000, again sells the home for $350,000, realizing a profit of $250,000. Under our bill, which became law, it is the law today, this is not a hope, it is not a dream we are hoping for, it is here. The Republican tax break passed. Your taxes today, zero. The amount you were taxed on before, $250,000. What we have said today, and everyone out there who owns a home, listen up, colleagues. Any of you that own a home now under our tax law as a result of that Republican bill, and I am proud of it, I am proud as a Republican to say we did this, now as a result of that, you get to take the first $250,000 of net profit, not gross profit, of net profit from the sale of your home per person. So, remember, most homes are owned by individuals.

□ 2100

In those cases, it is $500,000, the $250,000 per person doubled, $500,000, we get to take the first $500,000 of our net profit. I said net income, I meant net profit, I stand corrected, of your net profit; and we get to put it into your pocket taxfree. That is great.

Mr. Speaker, that is a tremendous tax benefit that many, many people in this country do not realize; but, colleagues, every time we go back to our districts, we should tell homeowners, which are most of the people that we represent, we should tell them what an opportunity now exists out there for them. They are not going to be penalized when they sell their home at a profit up to $500,000.

The benefit of what we did in this bill is it is renewable every 2 years. If we have a colleague outside of maybe Vail or Aspen, Colorado, where we have really escalating profits, or the Hamptons, most people are not going to make that kind of money every 2 years, there is maybe an exception here and there; but the reality of it is, this is a blue collar working family, middle income, lower income tax break of significant portions. I am very proud of that.

Mr. Speaker, keep that in mind, any of my colleagues, any of our constituents that we hear, they are saying we are selling our home or we are getting ready to move or we may have some constituents that say to us, we are getting ready to buy a new house; and in a lot of those cases, they are also selling their old house.

We ought to take just a moment and explain to our constituents what a great tax benefit they have ahead of them. In fact, they do not have to roll it over. It goes straight to their pocket. By the way, unless our constituent takes that money and digs a hole and puts it in the ground, that is the only exception, unless that happens, the money then will regurgitate in the community; they will take their money; they will put it in the bank. The bank will loan it out or they will take their money and build a bigger and better house, so we will have contractors and workers going. That money circulates.

The beauty of this tax break, the big beauty of this tax break is it keeps the money in your community; that is one of my issues with the death taxes. The death tax, taxing death as an event takes the money from your local community and moves it east to Washington, D.C. This took money from your local community and moved it from your community east to Washington, D.C.

This law that we have passed and if the President and Vice President will sign the repeal of the death tax, it will keep money in your community. It will be money that will be used for our local charities, not for the national ones. It will be money that will keep local people employed. It is money in your community. It spends in your community. It is worth it.

MARRIAGE PENALTY

Let me talk for a moment about something else, the marriage penalty. Can we believe it? I mean, can we really believe it that in the United States a country that prides itself upon encouragement of family, that talks about the great foundation, accurately talks about the great foundation of our country is family, and yet this government always is looking for a taxable event, always trying to figure out how to put another tax on us. They figured out well, we take them on death. Guess what else, there is another ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, I think they look at ceremonies. There is a ceremony called a wedding. Let us go ahead and put a tax on a marriage. That certainly is a good way to espouse family relations; that certainly is a good way to encourage people to be married and living as a family unit. Our government actually penalizes people for being married. They tax them for being married.

We have had a long time to change that. It has not changed. Again, I stand proud as a Republican. One of our priorities was to eliminate not just the death tax, not just give a break on the sale of your home, which is now a law, but also to go out to those people that are being taxed as a result of being married and say this is a mistake in policy.

We are not above ourselves to admit that Washington sometime back made a mistake. Washington should have never taxed the marriages. Washington should not have a death tax. The House tax was excessive. Let us get rid of the marriage tax. I was surprised that we would have opposition to that.

I was also surprised that we had no votes on the repeal for the death tax. Frankly, I was shocked that the President not only did not oppose eliminating the death tax, but also proposed a $9 billion increase. We actually had people on this floor back to the marriage tax who opposed it who said we ought to be penalized.

Mr. Speaker, remember, here we are, we are penalized at death, and now when we get married on that great day. We have a bill working its way through. We have a bill which will take the eraser to the death tax, that will be in front of the President in the next 3 or 4 days. He has promised to veto it, unfortunately. I hope we all remember the President's and the Vice President's policy is to support the death tax.

We also have another bill making its way down to the White House, and that is to eliminate the marriage penalty. We want to get rid of the marriage penalty. Now, the President also has promised to veto on that; although, in the last few weeks the President and Vice President said let us make a deal, kind of like the movie show, ''Let Us Make a Deal,'' we go ahead and support a brand new massive spending program for prescription care in this country. It is a massive obligation of taxpayer dollars, billions and billions and billions of dollars, and we will be fair and eliminate the marriage tax penalty. No deal; no bargain.

The marriage penalty is a tax that is not justified. It should not be there. The same way with the death tax; no deal. It is not right. It is not fair. It is not justified. Stand up, Washington, D.C., and have enough gumption to say these things are not good tax policy. It does not work out in theory, and it does not work out in reality.

I would urge the President and the Vice President to change their policy. I would urge the Vice President and the President to repeal, to get rid of the death tax, join Republicans, by the way, Democrats, join Republicans and Democrats in the House of Representatives and then in the United States Senate to get rid of the death tax. Join Republicans on the Republican bill, Democrats in both the House and Senate to get rid of the marriage penalty.

I say to the President and the Vice President that the President down there has an opportunity to change it; do not play let us make a deal. On its face, standing alone the marriage penalty is fundamentally flawed, and obviously the death tax is unfair.

CAPITAL GAINS TAXATION

Let me, with my remaining time, speak about another issue, and that is called capital gains taxation. Now, capital gains taxation really used to be a description that we applied to the wealthy people who had lots of investments. Those were the ones that made the so-called capital gains.

Guess what has happened? The small, little things happened in the last few years with the economic boom; a lot of people in America are now facing capital gains. There are mutual funds. There are retirement funds, the sale of their land or the sale of investments. Investments in this country are not restricted to the upper class or to the wealthy. And more than ever in the history of our country, the middle class and even the lower-income class are now making investments, monetary investments.

Mr. Speaker, we felt that in order to encourage this, that is what creates capital, not taxation, taxation does not create capital. Taxation is simply a transfer from your pocket to the Government's pocket. What creates capital is us out there plowing a field or making a product or delivering a service, but we felt the encouragement out there was being disassembled by a punitive tax called the capital gains tax. That tax was at 28 percent.

Mr. Speaker, 28 cents on every dollar, 28 cents out of every dollar that we made on the sale of an investment went east to Washington, D.C.; that is right where it went. We felt that tax was too punitive. We felt the tax should be eliminated.

If we eliminate the tax, what happens to the 28 cents? The 28 cents, it does not go to Washington, D.C. No, it stays in your community. It stays at home where it is going to be invested, where it is going to create jobs.

We had to have negotiations on this. The President would not agree with us, the President and the Vice President. They would not go with our bill of no capital gains, and we had to have their signature or enough votes to override the veto which we did not have. So we made a compromise. We at least have gotten this far. We dropped the 28 cents to 20 cents.

Mr. Speaker, that does not sound like a lot, but wait until we sell our investment and the tax, the IRS comes knocking on your door, all of a sudden 8 cents on the dollar savings, it adds up. It makes a difference.

Now, our goal is not to be satisfied with the 20-cent capital gains, because capital gains, the taxation itself simply is not a creation of wealth, it is a transfer of wealth. Again, it moves the money from our community to Washington, D.C.

Our idea, and we will not stop until we get to this point, our idea is eliminate the capital gains taxation, so when we make money on our investment we send zero dollars to D.C.; we keep all of the money, all of it, 100 percent of it in our community to invest in new projects.

I will give my colleagues an idea. There is a farming family in New Castle, Colorado, a good, good, family. I was out visiting them not long ago, actually, about 3 or 4 years ago. I remember to this day what the father said. He said, You see those fields, Scott. He said they are not being worked, they are being wasted. He said, by all rights, there should be a young couple, a couple that has just gotten married, 23, 24 years old, a kid or two, and they want to work the land. There should be a young couple working on that land up there.

He said, But because of the capital gains taxation and the government, because of the taxing policy of the government, I cannot afford to sell it. So as a result, that land sits empty, and that young couple will never have the opportunity that my wife and I had many years ago when the ranching generation or farming generation ahead of us allowed us to go up and work the field, allowed us to have our turn with our hand in the soil. It makes a difference.

Let me wrap up this evening with the time that I have remaining telling my colleagues why I talked about taxes. I am so focused on what is good at the local level, at the community level. Our Federal Government is important, and we have to finance the Federal Government to operate. But we have seen over the years a vast expansion of what the Federal Government is expected to do in our lives.

We have seen a dramatic dilution of individual responsibility; and more than that, we have seen a focus shifting government from the local level to the Federal level and a lot of that follows tax dollars. I think that the best government is the government at the communitywide level, at the State level.

Obviously, we need to have that Federal Government; but our real focus of power in this country should be at the local level, not the Federal level. In order to do that, we need to come up with policy that encourages money to stay in the community, that encourages money that stays in the community to create capital, not take the capital from the community in a transfer transaction and send it to Washington, D.C. for redistribution, because the dollar that goes out of our community, one, is a transfer, it is not a creation. The dollar that goes out of our community will never come back to our community as a dollar; some of it is necessary.

We need a national defense. We need a national commerce system. We need a national highway system. We need a commitment to education. We need a commitment to certain health care with closely defined parameters; but we also need to recognize that taxes, if they are unfair, are punitive or if they are in the excess, then we ought to have enough courage to stand up to the American people.

By the way, it is not an act of courage. It is a fiduciary responsibility of all of us in these Chambers to stand up and say, hey, we collected too many tax dollars. We are overcharging our constituents.

□ 2115

It is a fiduciary duty of us to stand up and say, is it right, colleagues, for us to tax people because they are married? It is a fiduciary responsibility on our part to stand up and say, is it really a taxable event because somebody dies and they leave property that has been taxed and taxed already? Is that a taxable event?

It is a fiduciary responsibility of ours to stand up and say, gosh, does the 28 percent capital gains rate really make sense? Does it really encourage American free enterprise? Does it encourage those young people, those couples just starting out, individuals starting out in their early twenties, does it really encourage them to be prosperous?

Remember, when our people in this country are prosperous, our country as a whole is prosperous. If our local communities are prosperous, then our States are prosperous. When our States are prosperous, the Federal government is. It makes sense to keep those dollars in the community.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members tomorrow to pick up a phone and call the President and the Vice President and say to them, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, they need to listen to the American people. Let us get rid of this death tax. Death should not be a taxable event. Hang up the phone, pick it back up and call them back, Mr. President and Mr. Vice President, it is not fair to tax people in this country for being married. Regardless of the ramifications to the dollars coming in, it is fundamentally not fair to tax on death and it is fundamentally not fair to tax on marriage. It is a big difference. We have an obligation to be fair to the people we represent.

I hope all Members take me up on that challenge and make every attempt they can to persuade the President and the Vice President to change their policies and not veto our bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage penalty, and to not veto our bipartisan effort to get rid of the death tax.

THE NEED OF SENIOR CITIZENS TO HAVE A MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House this evening, as I have many times, to the need for senior citizens to have a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

I do not really think it is necessary tonight to go into the reasons why this is necessary. We all know that the price of prescription drugs continues to rise, that seniors as a particular group have tremendous out-of-pocket expenses, and that many of them do not have access not only not under Medicare but in general to any kind of prescription drug insurance.

Many times seniors have to make choices between whether they are going to pay their bills, the rent, buy food, as opposed to having access and being able to buy prescription drugs that are really important for them to survive, for them to be able to live a decent life and to not have to worry about whether they are going to be here the next day. The President, President Clinton, has made it quite clear that this is a major priority if not the number one priority for him.

I listened to the previous speaker, the gentleman from Colorado, talk about the marriage penalty, the estate tax repeal. I would remind my colleagues and the American people that the Republicans are in the majority. It is very difficult for us as Democrats to get a proposal up and considered unless the Republicans who are in the majority allow that, allow us to bring it to the floor.

The President and myself and most of the Democrats have not been happy with the marriage penalty repeal and the estate tax repeal that the Republican leadership has proposed, not because we do not want to see changes with regard to tax on married couples, not because we do not want to see changes in the estate tax, because we have proposed changes, but the President has said and the Democratic leadership has said that the bills that the Republicans have proposed essentially spend too much and spend too much on a small percentage of the people impacted by the estate tax who are very wealthy, whereas the Democratic proposal protects the small business

owner, the ranchers, the people, the overwhelming majority that are paying the estate tax. The same is true for the marriage penalty.

But the President is making an effort to try to get something accomplished around here, because I think most people know that not a great deal is being accomplished in this Congress. The Republicans, my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) brings up his proposal for the marriage penalty, his proposal for the estate tax. It differs from the Democratic proposal, so we do not come to agreement. Nothing gets accomplished.

What the President has said is, Look, I will take some form of estate tax repeal, I will take some sort of adjustment in the marriage penalty that benefits the average person, but along with that we want the Republican leadership to agree to provide a Medicare prescription drug plan, the one that the President and the one that the Democrats have proposed.

I ask my colleagues, not only my friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), but my colleagues in general, what better way to try to accomplish something, what better way than to take some of the Republican proposals and take some of the Democratic proposals, particularly this one on prescription drugs, and try to accomplish that goal?

In fact, last week when we voted on the Republican marriage penalty legislation the Democrats proposed a motion to recommit that would do just that, that would even take the Republican plan, as long as the Medicare prescription drug proposal was added to it. And, of course, the Republicans rejected that and nothing was accomplished.

If we are going to accomplish anything, we have to work out things together. The most important thing for the Democrats, certainly one of the most important things for the Democrats, is that we get a Medicare prescription drug plan passed so our seniors have access and everyone is covered; just like they are covered now by Medicare for hospitalization, for their doctors' bills, that they get a prescription drug benefit. It is absolutely crucial that that happen, and certainly we can afford it if we all get together and figure out how to deal with this budget.

I wanted to point out that, unfortunately, when the Republicans a few weeks ago proposed a prescription drug program and had a vote on the House floor with regard to their prescription drug program, which is not part of Medicare, that they would not allow the Democratic proposal to be considered. Once again, we were shut out. Once again, the Democrats were told no, they do not even want to consider our proposal on the House floor.

What are they afraid of? I think their problem is that they are afraid that if we look at the Democratic plan, which seeks to include prescription drugs within Medicare, that ultimately there would be overwhelming support for it with the American people and probably even within the Republican caucus among the Republicans here as well, if they only had a chance to vote on it; to have the opportunity for us to be heard and to explain it and to finally have a vote.

What the Republicans have done instead is they decided maybe a month ago, I actually have an article that was in the June 15 New York Times, about 2 weeks ago or maybe 3 weeks ago they asked a pollster to do a poll. Basically the pollster came back, this was Glenn Bolger, a pollster with Public Opinion Strategies, a Virginia firm, and warned the House Republicans that the prescription drug issue was a political problem for them.

In other words, they realized that politically if they ran for reelection in November and they did not have a prescription drug plan of some sort, that they would probably be defeated and would no longer be the majority here in the House of Representatives.

So Mr. Bolger basically told them that the best thing to do is to at least start talking about the prescription drug issue, talk about how seniors are negative impacted, seniors suffer, and we have to do something about the problem.

In fact, Mr. Bolger went so far as to advise, and I quote from this New York Times article on June 15, ''It is more important to communicate that you have a plan than it is to communicate what is in the plan.'' Basically what Mr. Bolger said is, ''Look, come up with some rhetoric, if you will, about prescription drugs, suggest some sort of program, but do not worry too much about what is in it, or certainly do not worry about whether it will ever pass or be signed by the President. Just bring something up on the floor of the House and vote on it, talk about it, and nothing will ever happen, but at least you will have something. You can say you approved something, so when you go to the voters in November you will have something to say.''

This is the impetus, if you will, for the House Republican prescription drug plan called the Medicare RX 2000 Act. It is an illusory plan. It provides no real prescription drug coverage to anyone, to seniors or anyone. Instead, what it does is it says, ''We will give you some money, depending on your income, and you can go out and see if you can get, with your own money and the little bit that we subsidize, see if you can get a drug company to sell you a prescription drug-only policy.''

Think about that a minute. We have this great program called Medicare that was started in the sixties and that almost all seniors take advantage of which provides for their hospitalization, which provides for their doctor bills, most of their doctor bills to be cared for.

Instead of doing what the Democrats say, which is just bring prescription drugs under the rubric of Medicare and administer it essentially under Medicare, which is a proven program, instead, the Republicans say, no, go out and see if you can get a private insurance company to sell you a drugs-only policy.

Now, what the Republican leadership forgot to tell anyone is that the insurance industry itself does not want to sell those policies. We had representatives from the insurance lobby that came to the Committee on Commerce, that has jurisdiction over Medicare prescription drugs, and they basically told the committee, we do not want to sell these drug prescription policies. We will not sell them.

There is a good reason why they will not sell them: They cannot make any money. It is like some of my colleagues use the analogy of a haircut. Everybody gets a haircut. Everybody who is a senior, or at least 99, 95 percent, needs some kind of prescription drugs. So insurance companies do not want to underwrite something that is essentially a benefit that everybody is getting because they cannot make any money. They operate on risk. They assume some people will get coverage and others will not, and they pool their resources, and they make money because some people do not take advantage of the benefit.

We cannot do that with prescription drugs with seniors. Almost everybody is going to have the benefit and need the benefit. That is certainly why it makes sense to include it as a benefit under Medicare. Just like we include hospitalization and we include doctor bills, we include prescription drugs as a benefit.

Let me just talk a little bit about the Democratic proposal and explain really how very simple it is and why it makes sense.

Right now if one is over 65 and signs up for Medicare, which almost everyone does, they get their hospitalization through Part A, and if they pay a monthly premium of about $45 or so, they get their doctor bills paid for mostly under Part B.

What Democrats are saying, ''We will do the same thing. You pay a certain amount per month and we will set up a program called Part C or Part D of Medicare whereby we will pay a certain percentage of the prescription drugs,'' just like they get their doctor bills paid for.

What the Democrats say is that we will guarantee the benefit. Not only will we guarantee the benefit through Medicare if they want it, if they voluntarily sign up for it like they do for Part B, but it covers all the medicines that are medically necessary as determined by their doctor, not the insurance company. So they sign up, they are guaranteed the prescription drug benefit, and the nature of what kind of drugs they get, what kind of medicine they get, is determined by their physician in consultation with them, not by the insurance company.

Now, the Republican bill not only is not under Medicare, not only will not work because what insurance company is going to sell it, but beyond that, they do not even say to the insurance company what they have to cover. The insurance company, if they decide to sell a policy, they may decide, well, we will give certain drugs and we will determine what prescription drugs they need. They do not define what the benefit is, is essentially what I am trying to get across.

But most important, the Republican proposal, which just says, go out and shop around and see if you can find an insurance company that will sell you a policy, does not address the issue of price. We know that one of the major problems right now with prescription drugs is that seniors who do not get prescription drug coverage through their pension or their employer after they retire, or because they may sign up with an HMO, if they have prescription drug coverage, that is the way they usually get it. But if one has to go out and buy prescription drugs themselves because one does not have an HMO or coverage through their employer where they have worked over the years, they pay a much higher price for the drugs than the HMO or those employer pension benefit plans because they do not have the ability basically to negotiate a price.

□ 2130

Well, what the Democrats are saying is we are going to address that price issue, too, because we are going to say that the agency that is in charge of the Medicare program can negotiate a price or at least can set up in different regions of the country someone who will negotiate a better price for you because now there are so many people in the Medicare program, 30 million, 40 million seniors who these drug companies essentially we are at the mercy of, because if they want to sell them and sell to the government program, they have to offer the better price that they are offering to the HMO or to the employer benefit plan.

So the Democratic plan basically operates under the rubric of Medicare, is voluntary if one wants to sign up, guarantees one the benefit, guaranteeing all medical care, medically necessary drugs as determined by one's physician and also seeks to address the problem of price.

The Republican bill does none of the above. Frankly, I would say that the Republican proposal would never work and is nothing more than an effort to try to talk about something and try to give the impression that they care.

But most important, going back to what I said initially, the Republican proposal passed the House of Representatives, but it is not moving in the Senate. The President is not going to sign it. Why do we not try to get together, Democrat and Republican, and come up with a proposal like what the President has suggested where we have the Medicare prescription drug program, and then we address the issue of the marriage penalty and the estate tax in a way that benefits the average American.

Now, I wanted to, just in case my colleagues doubt that when I talk about this Republican proposal for prescription drugs to be doomed to failure, there was a very interesting article that appeared, I think it was the Saturday before last, July 8, in the New York Times on the front page which talked about the Nevada experience.

I think a lot of my colleagues know that what often happens in Congress is that one or more of the 50 States tries something within their own State to see if it works; and if it does, then Members usually from that State look at the idea and say, gee, that is a good idea, why do we not try it on the Federal level.

Well, interestingly enough, within the State of Nevada, within the last 6 months, they decided to implement, on a State level, something that is almost exactly like what the Republicans propose for a prescription drug program here; in other words, basically giving some money, depending on one's income, that one will put with whatever other resources one has to go out and buy a prescription drug only insurance policy.

It has not worked. Not only when I say it has not worked, I do not mean that it even has a chance at working, because when the State of Nevada put out this proposal to the insurance company and said, okay, we will entertain proposals from insurance companies to sell this kind of insurance, not one single insurance company in the whole State offered to do it.

I think they had one company that did not qualify under the law for some reason that asked to do it, and the State knew that they were not qualified to do it, so they did not consider it. But not one insurance company that was qualified offered to do it.

Now, what better reason could one have to not adopt that type of a program? But what do the Republicans do here in Congress? They see the Nevada example, which was adopted by Republicans, their Republican Governor, and they seek to enact it into law here.

Usually what we do in Congress is, if the States are doing something that is good, we copy it, and we institute it on a national level. I cannot think of a single circumstance where we had a State try something that failed and then we adopted it anyway. It makes no sense to me other than going back to what I said before, which is the Republicans did not really want to pass something that would actually be enacted into law and become a law and actually be utilized by anybody. So they did not. They just wanted something to talk about.

I wanted to, just interesting, if I could, just quote a little bit from this New York Times article. But this was in the New York Times on July 8 of this year, about a week or 2 ago, and I am just going to read from a few quotes here. I do not usually like to quote, but this is so appropriate.

It says, ''Nevada has adopted a prescription drug program for the elderly very similar to one approved last month by the United States House of Representatives, but is off to a rocky road.

''Insurance companies have spurned Nevada's invitation to provide coverage. The risks and the costs are too high, they say, and the subsidies offered by the state are too low.

Nevada's experience offers ominous lessons for Congress, especially Republicans, who want to subsidize insurance companies to entice them into providing drug benefits for elderly and disabled people on Medicare.''

''In March, the State invited hundreds of insurance companies to bid for its business providing drug coverage for 10,000 to 14,000 people age 62 or older. Only one company responded, but it was ineligible because it was not licensed to sell insurance in Nevada.''

Now, what they did in Nevada is, within the legislature, they set up a task force that was going to review whatever proposals came forward by insurance companies to see if they qualified.

Barbara F. Buckley, a state assemblywoman who co-chairs this task force monitoring what was going on said, ''I have my doubts that an insurance company will be able to offer meaningful drug benefits under this program. If an insurance company does bid on it but the benefits are paltry, senior citizens will be up in arms.''

The article goes on and on. But the point is well made. This does not work. No insurance company wants to offer it. This is a ruse. This is a sham. This is not a serious effort to address the issue.

The Democrats have a serious plan. But we do not have an opportunity to bring it up. We will continue to be here every night until we have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) who really, more than anybody else in the Congress, brought this issue to the forefront and particularly pointed out the problem with price discrimination that exists for many seniors and the problem of, because he is in the State of Maine, and he so witnessed it firsthand, about how people will go over into Canada and be able to buy drugs for significantly less than in the United States. That is simply not fair.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me, and I thank him for all the good work he has done on this issue. He has been a real leader and has been sort of pounding away.

We have learned, have we not, since our time here in the Congress that the status quo is the status quo, and it is very hard to change. It only gets changed if people speak out again and

again and again about an injustice until something is done about it.

While the gentleman from New Jersey was talking about the State of Nevada, and its failed effort to rely on private insurance companies to provide prescription drug coverage, I was reminded how proud I am of my home State of Maine, which has taken a different tact.

Basically what the State of Maine did in the last legislative session through the leadership of Chellie Pingree, a State Senator, Mark Lawrence who is running for the U.S. Senate, and some others, was to adopt a law which provides that the State of Maine will negotiate lower prices for all of those people, seniors and others, who are not now covered with prescription drug insurance of one kind or another. So about 300,000 people in Maine would be covered under this plan.

The way the law is written, the State would essentially act as what is calmed as a pharmacy benefit manager. They would negotiate prices with the pharmaceutical industry to get a reduced price based on the fact that they represent 300,000 people, the kinds of discounts that Aetna and Cigna and United negotiate for their beneficiaries, and the kind of discount that I have suggested we really should do for Medicare beneficiaries here.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, is very simple. It involves the creation of no new bureaucracy. It does not involve any significant expenditure of Federal money, but it would allow pharmacies to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal Government. The best price is usually what the VA pays for drugs or what Medicaid pays for drugs for people who qualify for their programs.

It is real simple, a real simple idea. If one is part of a big pool, one ought to get a decent discount. That is all we are suggesting for Medicare beneficiaries. But that is only through that piece of legislation. But that is only part of a solution.

The other part of the solution, of course, is to get a real Medicare reform, a benefit under Medicare so that those people for whom a discount is not enough would be able to get assistance in covering their prescription drugs.

Basically, the Maine legislation is a path that would get discounted prices for our seniors without a significant cost to the government.

I was listening earlier to some of the commentary from folks on the other side of the aisle about tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts, how, with this huge new surplus, we really need to, first thing, is to have tax cuts, tax cuts larger than any we have seen certainly in my lifetime here in the Congress. We see them in a variety of different proposals.

A year ago, the Republican majority came to us with a suggestion for a tax cut that was $800 billion. Now they have carved it up into pieces, but the total is still $800 billion. What is really tragic about this proposal is, not that there are tax cuts themselves, because there should be tax cuts. We ought to eliminate the marriage penalties. We ought to reduce the estate taxes. We can provide relief in a number of other ways. But we should not take the whole on-budget surplus and spend it all on tax cuts.

Why? Because we learn something, we teach our kids something that we hopefully learned ourselves; and that is, when we have responsibilities to others, we need to meet those responsibilities before we give ourselves presence. What I mean by that is this, Medicare is going to be under increasing pressure. Right now, there are 39 million Medicare beneficiaries. But when we get out to about 2030, there will be close to 75 million to 80 million Medicare beneficiaries. At that point, it is obvious Medicare needs to be shored up. It needs more funding. We cannot get there just going along the way we are right now.

The real tragedy, the real tragedy, in New Jersey, we see it all across this country, and I am glad that people from Maine pointed it out to me so long ago now, too many seniors just cannot do it. They cannot take their prescription drugs. While folks on the other side of the aisle are talking about an estate tax repeal that would benefit primarily the 1 percent of the wealthiest taxpayers in the country, though I believe we should have estate tax relief, still our priority ought to be let us take care of those people who simply cannot afford to take the medical care that their doctors tell them they have to take.

Every day in this country, people are trying to decide, can I afford to buy the food I need today? Can I afford to pay the electric bill? Can I afford to pay the rent? Or can I somehow scrape together enough to take the full dosage of the prescription drugs that I am supposed to?

When I talk to people in Maine, many of them are taking one pill out of three. They are cutting pills in half. They are not filling their prescriptions, because they cannot do it.

That is not what health care is supposed to be like in this country. It is not supposed to be like that. In this country, one would have thought, the wealthiest country on earth, at the moment in its history when it is most prosperous, we could at least provide prescription drugs for our seniors.

The truth is we can. There is no question, with the surpluses that are projected, that we can provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit for our seniors. Absolutely no question.

What have we got? We have got the kind of proposal that went through here a few weeks ago on a three-vote margin, not even close to a bipartisan approach, that basically said, what we need to do for our seniors for prescription drugs is turn them over to HMOs and insurance companies; and if we give enough money to the HMOs and insurance companies, maybe, just maybe, we will not require it, but maybe, just maybe, they will provide insurance for our seniors.

Now, this might seem logical except that the insurance industry says, no, there is no way we are going to provide insurance for prescription drugs for seniors. No way. That is what Chip Kahn, the head of the Health Insurance Association of America has said. Leaders of the Blue Cross plans have made the same point. Why? Because everybody is a claimant. If one is a senior, the chances are good, 85 percent, that one is on some form of prescription medication. So everybody is a claimant.

I say to people in Maine, if Maine were a low-lying State, and every year 85 percent of the people made a claim for flood insurance, one would not be able to buy flood insurance in Maine, not at all, not at any price. Well, the same is true for prescription medication for seniors, and the health insurance industry knows that.

Who does not know it in this country? Well, the pharmaceutical industry does not know it because the pharmaceutical industry is out there basically promoting this private insurance scheme. The Republicans from this House do not get it either, because they are basically proposing a plan that the health insurance industry is saying we will never comply with, we will never provide this kind of insurance.

I come back to what I said about responsibility. This country at this moment in its history can afford to provide prescription drug coverage for seniors, not to pay for all of the drugs that every senior needs, but a decent health care plan. We can afford it.

□ 2145

And what holds us back, what holds us back is the view of the majority that the one thing we cannot tolerate in this country is strengthening Medicare; the one thing we cannot tolerate is strengthening a government health care plan for our seniors. It has to be done through the private sector.

Well, look at the private sector. I do not know in how many States this is true, but I know it is true in a lot of places; but as of July 1, 700,000 people in this country who had some form of prescription drug coverage through their HMO simply got dropped by their HMO. Why? Because it was not profitable to cover them.

In Maine, there were a grand total of 1,700 people under Medicare managed care, under an Aetna plan. And as of July 1, Aetna announced they are pulling out of the State of Maine. So there will be no coverage under managed care plans in Maine for seniors who need prescription drug coverage.

What that means for my State is probably about 50 percent of all the seniors in Maine have absolutely no coverage at all for their prescription

drugs. And many of the people that I know are supposed to take $200, $300, $400, $600, $1,000 a month in prescription medications. They cannot begin to do that.

What we have in this country now is a rationing system that rations prescription drugs by wealth, by how wealthy we are. What kind of system is that? It is not fair, it is not right, it is completely antithetical to what we should have in terms of health care for our seniors in this country.

People can stand up here and talk about the need to eliminate what they call the death tax. I am not talking about relief, because I think we need relief for our small businesses. I think we need relief for family farmers. I think the rate should come down, and I think the exemption should go up. Reform is one thing, but repeal is another. What repeal does is put Bill Gates and Steve Forbes and the mega-billionaires in this country ahead of people who today cannot afford their prescription drugs, cannot afford the medication that keeps them out of the hospital, that extends their lives, that improves their lives. They cannot do it.

We are stuck in this Congress. We are stuck because the majority simply cannot abide strengthening Medicare. The majority simply cannot abide having Medicare benefits receive the same kind of discounts and benefits that the people who are lucky enough to have private health insurance through Aetna or Cigna get. And there are lots of complaints about health care in this country. Individuals working for a company that provides a quality health care plan, they get their prescription drugs covered. But seniors, 12 percent of the population, buy a third of all prescription drugs, and somewhere between 40 and 60 percent have either no coverage at all or very inadequate coverage.

We need to act. We need to act this year. There is no reason why we cannot. The Democratic plan was a comprehensive plan that would have provided a benefit, would have provided a discount, would have worked, did not rely on insurance companies saying they would not do anything. That plan should have come to this floor and been debated, the way substitutes to Republican legislation normally is, but the Republican majority would not allow a full debate and vote on that particular issue. I think that is the scandal. That is the real scandal.

We have a responsibility here to take the most serious problems in this country and deal with them. We ought to be thinking about the country as a whole, what will strengthen this country; what will be the best for our citizens; and deal with our responsibilities: to improve Social Security, to strengthen Medicare, to provide a prescription drug benefit, to invest in education, and, sure, to have some targeted tax cuts and to pay down the debt. Do not squander this moment of prosperity simply on tax cuts, which inevitably are weighted to wealthier people in this country.

There is a real choice, a real debate going on in this House right now, and it seems to me that what we are trying to do on the Democratic side is live up to a wide range of responsibilities. We are trying to figure out what is best for all of us, all Americans, all the people in this country together. We are not saying, as the other side is, me, me, me. Give me money. We are saying we. We are saying we have got to hang together. And when we have our parents and grandparents unable to buy, unable to take medication that their doctors tell them they have to take, we ought to do something about it. And we ought to do it this year, now, before we go home.

I thank the gentleman very much for all he is doing on this topic. I still hope, I still hope that as we get closer to November that we will have some of our colleagues on the Republican side come forward with a plan, and not a plan that is a showpiece, not a plan that is just there to basically look like something has been done even if it is not understood, but a plan that will mean something to millions of American seniors who today simply cannot take the medication they should, cannot eat well, cannot pay the rent, cannot do all those things that they expected to do in their retirement years.

So I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague from Maine. The gentleman mentioned a number of things that I wanted to comment on. The tragedy is, of course, that what we really want to do is get something done around here. That is what the gentleman has said and that is what the Democrats have been saying.

I do not know if the gentleman was here earlier when our colleague from Colorado delivered his special order before me; but I think, as my colleague just mentioned, he talked about the marriage penalty and the estate tax, and I do not think the President could be more plain when a couple of weeks ago he said, look, I will take a version of the marriage tax penalty repeal, and I want to eliminate the estate tax for most of the people that are now paying it, so give me that with the prescription drug plan under Medicare, that the gentleman and I have been talking about; and I will sign it as one big package, which accomplishes all these goals in one fell swoop. But the Republicans will not do it.

The only reason I can think that they will not do it goes back to what the gentleman said before, which is, for some reason, ideologically they just do not like Medicare. When Medicare was started by Lyndon Johnson in the 1960s, with a Democratic Congress, most of the Republicans voted against it because they said it was government-controlled or socialism.

Obviously, this idea of prescription drug-only insurance policies is not going to work, because the insurance companies would not sell them. But even if they did, what we would essentially be doing is privatizing Medicare. We would set the stage to go back to that old Republican ideology that says that we should not have any kind of government health program for the seniors. So who is to say they would not next say, okay, let us privatize the doctor bills. Instead of having a part B, seniors can go out and buy insurance coverage for that. Or let us privatize hospital care, so go out and buy insurance for that.

It is a very dangerous precedent. I just think that they have a problem with the Medicare program.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will yield once again. I find talking to people in Maine, where we have had a number of changes, and I hear about this from other colleagues here in the House as well, by and large, there are a lot of mergers going on in the health care insurance industry. Lots of mergers. We are getting now to about five major companies plus the Blue Cross plans, and that is about all there is in terms of companies that really represent more than 4 or 5 million people in this country. But what happens every time there is a change, and this happened with my parents and other people I know, it throws the seniors into a position of trying to figure out what to do next.

If they have to change their health care plan, the first question that comes up is, well, will a new health care plan allow me to see the doctor I am seeing now. Sometimes yes, sometimes no. It is that kind of change, where the benefits change and the premiums change and the way claims are handled changes that just really frustrate and upset so many seniors.

Not to mention, not to mention the small business people and the self-employed in this country who are now buying catastrophic coverage only because they cannot afford the cost of health care, of group health insurance, or sometimes individual insurance, which is now vanishing from Maine as well. But what I am really troubled by is costs are going up everywhere. And it is one thing for people who are employed to cope with those changes, but it is another for seniors to try to cope with the constant changes with changes in plans, with being pushed off one insurance plan into another plan, if they can find it, for supplemental coverage, I mean, and it is just too much. It is too much.

Medicare works. Its administrative costs are 3 percent. Turn to the private insurance market, and we are talking administrative costs of roughly 30 percent. Medicare is efficient. Now, one of the strengths of Medicare is its stability and predictability and equity, and one of its weaknesses is it has not changed very often, and there are all sorts of problems with it. I do not disagree with that. But it is there. It does not cover only those people in urban areas. It covers every senior in this country who signs up.

Basically, it provides the equity. It can be strengthened; it can work. We simply need to make it work before we go home.

Mr. PALLONE. One of the things I was looking at in that article that talks about the Nevada experience that I quoted before, it is interesting, I just noticed that Nevada is the only State that has gone this route of trying to get to buy private insurance. It mentioned there are 14 States, including my own State of New Jersey that have programs to help older people obtain prescription medicines, but in every one of those cases the State is the insurer. The State is running the program. Just like Medicare, essentially. Obviously, Nevada's proposal does not work, so why would we want to emulate that when the other 14 States are doing the opposite?

The other thing the gentleman pointed out, which I think is real important, is we actually have some statistics about the HMOs that are quitting Medicare. And, of course, we make the same argument as Democrats. Right now, the HMOs, which is a form of private insurance that a lot of seniors have relied on to get their prescription drug coverage, they are pulling out all over the place. This study that came out, I guess within the last couple of weeks, said that in the last 2 years, HMOs have pulled out of more than 400 counties and at least 33 States, directly affecting 734,000 Medicare beneficiaries.

And they say that as of July 1, or I guess it is July 3, which was the deadline when they had to notify if they wanted to get out by January 1 of 2001, we have Cigna, which I think the gentleman mentioned, Cigna Corporation is ending coverage for 104,000 Medicare beneficiaries, including those in my State. They are dropping 4,800 in northern New Jersey alone, not just the whole State. And Aetna, with 676,000 Medicare beneficiaries, said it would pull out of some markets also. And we have to, I guess, get more information about that. So we are getting hundreds of thousands of seniors that were relying on HMOs to provide their drug coverage that are now canceling.

One of the things I hear from the Republicans is, they say, well, we want to give seniors choice. That is what we want to let them go out and buy private insurance because they will have choice. But even for seniors who are in HMOs now, or who have employer plans that they are getting it through after they retire, we provide under other Democratic proposal for the majority of the prescription drug costs for those plans. It is anything from like 51 percent to 70 percent, depending, that we are going to be paying for by the Federal Government under our proposal.

So I would argue they will have more choice. Because the bottom line is they will have no choice with the Republican plan, because no insurance company will provide it. With us, if they want to stay in their HMO or if they want to stay in their employer plan, they are more likely to offer it because we are going to be paying anywhere from 50 percent to two-thirds of the cost. So to argue that somehow we are not providing choice, we are providing choices, lots of choices, in addition to the fact that they can just stay in their regular Medicare and get the prescription drug plan.

So I am more and more convinced every day that the Republicans are just talking, going back to that original pollster memo. They are not really serious; they are just talking about it. And that is basically it.

I wanted to thank the gentleman for joining me. This is certainly not the last our colleagues will hear from us. We tried last week to put our prescription description drug plan on the marriage penalty, and we are going to try every maneuver we can to get it up here and voted on before this session is completed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4576

Mr. LEWIS of California submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 106–754)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4576) ''making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes'', having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, for military functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $22,175,357,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $17,772,297,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $6,833,100,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; and for payments pursuant to section 156 of Public Law 97–377, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402 note), to section 229(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 429(b)), and to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $18,174,284,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10302, and 3038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $2,473,001,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Navy Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,576,174,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty under section 10211 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Marine Corps platoon leaders class, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $448,886,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 10211, 10305, and 8038 of title 10, United States Code, or while serving on active duty under section 12301(d) of title 10, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $971,024,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under section 10211, 10302, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $3,782,536,000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under section 10211, 10305, or 12402 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while serving on duty under section 12301(d) of title 10 or section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, in connection with performing duty specified in section 12310(a) of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty or other duty, and expenses authorized by section 16131 of title 10, United States Code; and for payments to the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund, $1,641,081,000.

TITLE II

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Army, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $10,616,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Army, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $19,144,431,000 and, in addition, $50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: Provided, That of the funds made available under this heading, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be transferred to ''National Park Service—Construction'' within 30 days of enactment of this Act, only for necessary infrastructure repair improvements at Fort Baker, under the management of the Golden Gate Recreation Area: Provided further, That of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than $355,000,000 shall be made available only for conventional ammunition care and maintenance.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Navy and the Marine Corps, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $5,146,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $23,419,360,000 and, in addition, $50,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Marine Corps, as authorized by law, $2,778,758,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Air Force, as authorized by law; and not to exceed $7,878,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of the Air Force, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes, $22,383,521,000 and, in addition, $50,000,000, shall be derived by transfer from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, that of the funds available under this heading, $500,000 shall only be available to the Secretary of the Air Force for a grant to Florida Memorial College for the purpose of funding minority aviation training.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as authorized by law, $11,844,480,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be available for the CINC initiative fund account; and of which not to exceed $30,000,000 can be used for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, to be expended on the approval or authority of the Secretary of Defense, and payments may be made on his certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes: Provided, That of the amount provided under this heading, $5,000,000, to remain available until expended, is available only for expenses relating to certain classified activities, and may be transferred as necessary by the Secretary of Defense to operation and maintenance, procurement, and research, development, test and evaluation appropriations accounts, to be merged with and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Army Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,562,118,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Navy Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $978,946,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Marine Corps Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $145,959,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the operation and maintenance, including training, organization, and administration, of the Air Force Reserve; repair of facilities and equipment; hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and transportation; care of the dead; recruiting; procurement of services, supplies, and equipment; and communications, $1,903,659,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses of training, organizing, and administering the Army National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, and repairs to structures and facilities; hire of passenger motor vehicles; personnel services in the National Guard Bureau; travel expenses (other than mileage), as authorized by law for Army personnel on active duty, for Army National Guard division, regimental, and battalion commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; supplying and equipping the Army National Guard as authorized by law; and expenses of repair, modification, maintenance, and issue of supplies and equipment (including aircraft), $3,333,835,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For operation and maintenance of the Air National Guard, including medical and hospital treatment and related expenses in non-Federal hospitals; maintenance, operation, repair, and other necessary expenses of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, including repair of facilities, maintenance, operation, and modification of aircraft; transportation of things, hire of passenger motor vehicles; supplies, materials, and equipment, as authorized by law for the Air National Guard; and expenses incident to the maintenance and use of supplies, materials, and equipment, including such as may be furnished from stocks under the control of agencies of the Department of Defense; travel expenses (other than mileage) on the same basis as authorized by law for Air National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, for Air National Guard commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard Bureau regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau, $3,474,375,000.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses directly relating to Overseas Contingency Operations by United States military forces, $3,938,777,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer these funds only to military personnel accounts; operation and maintenance accounts within this title; the Defense Health Program appropriation; procurement accounts; research, development, test and evaluation accounts; and to working capital funds: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

For salaries and expenses necessary for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed

Forces, $8,574,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 can be used for official representation purposes.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $389,932,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Army, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Navy, $294,038,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Navy, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Navy, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Air Force, $376,300,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of the Air Force, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Air Force, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of Defense, $21,412,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris of the Department of Defense, or for similar purposes, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of Defense, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the Department of the Army, $231,499,000, to remain available until transferred: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall, upon determining that such funds are required for environmental restoration, reduction and recycling of hazardous waste, removal of unsafe buildings and debris at sites formerly used by the Department of Defense, transfer the funds made available by this appropriation to other appropriations made available to the Department of the Army, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For expenses relating to the Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid programs of the Department of Defense (consisting of the programs provided under sections 401, 402, 404, 2547, and 2551 of title 10, United States Code), $55,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

For assistance to the republics of the former Soviet Union, including assistance provided by contract or by grants, for facilitating the elimination and the safe and secure transportation and storage of nuclear, chemical and other weapons; for establishing programs to prevent the proliferation of weapons, weapons components, and weapon-related technology and expertise; for programs relating to the training and support of defense and military personnel for demilitarization and protection of weapons, weapons components and weapons technology and expertise, $443,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003: Provided, That of the amounts provided under this heading, $25,000,000 shall be available only to support the dismantling and disposal of nuclear submarines and submarine reactor components in the Russian Far East.

QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, resulting from unfunded shortfalls in the repair and maintenance of real property of the Department of Defense (including military housing and barracks), $160,500,000, for the maintenance of real property of the Department of Defense (including minor construction and major maintenance and repair), which shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002, as follows:

Army, $100,000,000;
Navy, $20,000,000;
Marine Corps, $10,000,000;
Air Force, $20,000,000; and
Defense-Wide, $10,500,000:

Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated under this heading for Defense-Wide activities, the entire amount shall only be available for grants by the Secretary of Defense to local educational authorities which maintain primary and secondary educational facilities located within Department of Defense installations, and which are used primarily by Department of Defense military and civilian dependents, for facility repairs and improvements to such educational facilities: Provided further, That such grants to local educational authorities may be made for repairs and improvements to such educational facilities as required to meet classroom size requirements: Provided further, That the cumulative amount of any grant or grants to any single local education authority provided pursuant to the provisions under this heading shall not exceed $1,500,000.

TITLE III

PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,571,812,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: Provided, That of the $189,601,000 appropriated under this heading for the procurement of UH–60 helicopters, $78,520,000 shall be available only for the procurement of eight such aircraft to be provided to the Army Reserve.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, equipment, including ordnance, ground handling equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,320,681,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of weapons and tracked combat vehicles, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $2,472,524,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $1,220,516,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of vehicles, including tactical, support, and non-tracked combat vehicles; the purchase of not to exceed 35 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and the purchase of

12 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $200,000 per vehicle; communications and electronic equipment; other support equipment; spare parts, ordnance, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $4,497,009,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of aircraft, equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $8,477,138,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For construction, procurement, production, modification, and modernization of missiles, torpedoes, other weapons, and related support equipment including spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $1,461,600,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $498,349,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of vessels as authorized by law, including armor and armament thereof, plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; procurement of critical, long leadtime components and designs for vessels to be constructed or converted in the future; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, as follows:

Carrier Replacement Program, $4,053,653,000;

Carrier Replacement Program (AP), $21,869,000;

NSSN, $1,198,012,000;

NSSN (AP), $508,222,000;

CVN Refuelings, $698,441,000;

CVN Refuelings (AP), $25,000,000;

Submarine Refuelings, $210,414,000;

Submarine Refuelings (AP), $72,277,000;

DDG–51 destroyer program, $2,703,559,000;

DDG–51 destroyer program (AP), $456,843,000;

LPD–17 (AP), $560,700,000;

LHD–8, $460,000,000;

ADC(X), $338,951,000;

LCAC landing craft air cushion program, $15,615,000; and

For craft, outfitting, post delivery, conversions, and first destination transformation transportation, $291,077,000;

In all: $11,614,633,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2005: Provided, That additional obligations may be incurred after September 30, 2005, for engineering services, tests, evaluations, and other such budgeted work that must be performed in the final stage of ship construction: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the construction or conversion of any naval vessel to be constructed in shipyards in the United States shall be expended in foreign facilities for the construction of major components of such vessel: Provided further, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used for the construction of any naval vessel in foreign shipyards: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby granted the authority to enter into a contract for an LHD–1 Amphibious Assault Ship which shall be funded on an incremental basis: Provided further, That the amount made available for the LPD–17 program may be obligated for expenditure for the procurement of contractor furnished and government furnished material and equipment, and necessary advance construction activities.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

For procurement, production, and modernization of support equipment and materials not otherwise provided for, Navy ordnance (except ordnance for new aircraft, new ships, and ships authorized for conversion); the purchase of not to exceed 63 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of one vehicle required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $200,000; expansion of public and private plants, including the land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $3,557,380,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

For expenses necessary for the procurement, manufacture, and modification of missiles, armament, military equipment, spare parts, and accessories therefor; plant equipment, appliances, and machine tools, and installation thereof in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; vehicles for the Marine Corps, including the purchase of not to exceed 33 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and expansion of public and private plants, including land necessary therefor, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title, $1,233,268,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, lease, and modification of aircraft and equipment, including armor and armament, specialized ground handling equipment, and training devices, spare parts, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $7,583,345,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, and modification of missiles, spacecraft, rockets, and related equipment, including spare parts and accessories therefor, ground handling equipment, and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes including rents and transportation of things, $2,863,778,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

For construction, procurement, production, and modification of ammunition, and accessories therefor; specialized equipment and training devices; expansion of public and private plants, including ammunition facilities authorized by section 2854 of title 10, United States Code, and the land necessary therefor, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; and procurement and installation of equipment, appliances, and machine tools in public and private plants; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway; and other expenses necessary for the foregoing purposes, $647,808,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For procurement and modification of equipment (including ground guidance and electronic control equipment, and ground electronic and communication equipment), and supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of not to exceed 173, passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the purchase of one vehicle required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $200,000; lease of passenger motor vehicles; and expansion of public and private plants, Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in such plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land, for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon, prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $7,763,747,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) necessary for procurement, production, and modification of equipment, supplies, materials, and spare parts therefor, not otherwise provided for; the purchase of not to exceed 115 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; the purchase of 10 vehicles required for physical security of personnel, notwithstanding price limitations applicable to passenger vehicles but not to exceed $250,000 per vehicle; expansion of public and private plants, equipment, and installation thereof in such

plants, erection of structures, and acquisition of land for the foregoing purposes, and such lands and interests therein, may be acquired, and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title; reserve plant and Government and contractor-owned equipment layaway, $2,346,258,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES

For activities by the Department of Defense pursuant to sections 108, 301, 302, and 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2078, 2091, 2092, and 2093), $3,000,000 only for microwave power tubes and the wireless vibration sensor supplier initiative and to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

For procurement of aircraft, missiles, tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, other weapons, and other procurement for the reserve components of the Armed Forces, $100,000,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003: Provided, That the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components shall, not later than 30 days after the enactment of this Act, individually submit to the congressional defense committees the modernization priority assessment for their respective Reserve or National Guard component.

TITLE IV

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $6,342,552,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $9,494,374,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002: Provided, That funds appropriated in this paragraph which are available for the V–22 may be used to meet unique requirements of the Special Operation Forces.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation, including maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $14,138,244,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

For expenses of activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), necessary for basic and applied scientific research, development, test and evaluation; advanced research projects as may be designated and determined by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to law; maintenance, rehabilitation, lease, and operation of facilities and equipment, $11,157,375,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the independent activities of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation in the direction and supervision of operational test and evaluation, including initial operational test and evaluation which is conducted prior to, and in support of, production decisions; joint operational testing and evaluation; and administrative expenses in connection therewith, $227,060,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002.

TITLE V

REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

For the Defense Working Capital Funds, $916,276,000: Provided, That during fiscal year 2001, funds in the Defense Working Capital Funds may be used for the purchase of not to exceed 330 passenger carrying motor vehicles for replacement only for the Defense Security Service.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND

For National Defense Sealift Fund programs, projects, and activities, and for expenses of the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as established by section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744), $400,658,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That none of the funds provided in this paragraph shall be used to award a new contract that provides for the acquisition of any of the following major components unless such components are manufactured in the United States: auxiliary equipment, including pumps, for all shipboard services; propulsion system components (that is; engines, reduction gears, and propellers); shipboard cranes; and spreaders for shipboard cranes: Provided further, That the exercise of an option in a contract awarded through the obligation of previously appropriated funds shall not be considered to be the award of a new contract: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive the restrictions in the first proviso on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AIRLIFT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For National Defense Airlift Fund programs, projects, and activities, $2,840,923,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That these funds shall only be available for transfer to the appropriate C–17 program P–1 line items of Title III of this Act for the purposes specified in this section: Provided further, That the funds transferred under the authority provided within this section shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this section is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

TITLE VI

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, for medical and health care programs of the Department of Defense, as authorized by law, $12,117,779,000, of which $11,414,393,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed 2 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2002; of which $290,006,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2003, shall be for Procurement; of which $413,380,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002, shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation, and of which $10,000,000 shall be available for HIV prevention educational activities undertaken in connection with U.S. military training, exercises, and humanitarian assistance activities conducted in African nations.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the destruction of the United States stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in accordance with the provisions of section 1412 of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (50 U.S.C. 1521), and for the destruction of other chemical warfare materials that are not in the chemical weapon stockpile, $980,100,000, of which $600,000,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance to remain available until September 30, 2002, $105,700,000 shall be for Procurement to remain available until September 30, 2003, and $274,400,000 shall be for Research, development, test and evaluation to remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That of the funds available under this heading, $1,000,000 shall be available until expended each year only for a Johnston Atoll off-island leave program: Provided further, That the Secretaries concerned shall, pursuant to uniform regulations, prescribe travel and transportation allowances for travel by participants in the off-island leave program: Provided further, That the amount available under Operation and maintenance shall also be available for the conveyance, without consideration, of the Emergency One Cyclone II Custom Pumper truck subject to Army Loan DAAMO1–98–L–0001 to the Umatilla Indian Tribe, the current lessee.

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For drug interdiction and counter-drug activities of the Department of Defense, for transfer to appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military personnel of the reserve components serving under the provisions of title 10 and title 32, United States Code; for Operation and maintenance; for Procurement; and for Research, development, test and evaluation, $869,000,000: Provided, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation for the same time period and for the same purpose as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided under this heading is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For expenses and activities of the Office of the Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $147,545,000, of which $144,245,000 shall be for Operation and maintenance, of which not to exceed $700,000 is available for emergencies and extraordinary expenses to be expended on the approval or authority of the Inspector General, and payments may be made on the Inspector General's certificate of necessity for confidential military purposes; and of which $3,300,000 to remain available until September 30, 2003, shall be for Procurement.

TITLE VII

RELATED AGENCIES

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM FUND

For payment to the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System Fund, to maintain the proper funding level for continuing the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, $216,000,000.

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Intelligence Community Management Account, $148,631,000, of which $22,577,000 for the Advanced Research and Development Committee shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $34,100,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Justice for the National Drug Intelligence Center to support the Department of Defense's counter-drug intelligence responsibilities, and of the said amount, $1,500,000 for Procurement shall remain available until September 30, 2003, and $1,000,000 for Research, development,

test and evaluation shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided further, That the National Drug Intelligence Center shall maintain the personnel and technical resources to provide timely support to law enforcement authorities to conduct document exploitation of materials collected in federal, state, and local law enforcement activity.

PAYMENT TO KAHO'OLAWE ISLAND CONVEYANCE, REMEDIATION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FUND

For payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund, as authorized by law, $60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION TRUST FUND

For the purposes of title VIII of Public Law 102–183, $6,950,000, to be derived from the National Security Education Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

TITLE VIII

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 8002. During the current fiscal year, provisions of law prohibiting the payment of compensation to, or employment of, any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the Department of Defense: Provided, That salary increases granted to direct and indirect hire foreign national employees of the Department of Defense funded by this Act shall not be at a rate in excess of the percentage increase authorized by law for civilian employees of the Department of Defense whose pay is computed under the provisions of section 5332 of title 5, United States Code, or at a rate in excess of the percentage increase provided by the appropriate host nation to its own employees, whichever is higher: Provided further, That this section shall not apply to Department of Defense foreign service national employees serving at United States diplomatic missions whose pay is set by the Department of State under the Foreign Service Act of 1980: Provided further, That the limitations of this provision shall not apply to foreign national employees of the Department of Defense in the Republic of Turkey.

SEC. 8003. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 8004. No more than 20 percent of the appropriations in this Act which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year: Provided, That this section shall not apply to obligations for support of active duty training of reserve components or summer camp training of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8005. Upon determination by the Secretary of Defense that such action is necessary in the national interest, he may, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, transfer not to exceed $2,000,000,000 of working capital funds of the Department of Defense or funds made available in this Act to the Department of Defense for military functions (except military construction) between such appropriations or funds or any subdivision thereof, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: Provided, That such authority to transfer may not be used unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which funds are requested has been denied by the Congress: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall notify the Congress promptly of all transfers made pursuant to this authority or any other authority in this Act: Provided further, That no part of the funds in this Act shall be available to prepare or present a request to the Committees on Appropriations for reprogramming of funds, unless for higher priority items, based on unforeseen military requirements, than those for which originally appropriated and in no case where the item for which reprogramming is requested has been denied by the Congress.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8006. During the current fiscal year, cash balances in working capital funds of the Department of Defense established pursuant to section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, may be maintained in only such amounts as are necessary at any time for cash disbursements to be made from such funds: Provided, That transfers may be made between such funds: Provided further, That transfers may be made between working capital funds and the ''Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Defense'' appropriation and the ''Operation and Maintenance'' appropriation accounts in such amounts as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Office of Management and Budget, except that such transfers may not be made unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress of the proposed transfer. Except in amounts equal to the amounts appropriated to working capital funds in this Act, no obligations may be made against a working capital fund to procure or increase the value of war reserve material inventory, unless the Secretary of Defense has notified the Congress prior to any such obligation.

SEC. 8007. Funds appropriated by this Act may not be used to initiate a special access program without prior notification 30 calendar days in session in advance to the congressional defense committees.

SEC. 8008. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available to initiate: (1) a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year of the contract or that includes an unfunded contingent liability in excess of $20,000,000; or (2) a contract for advance procurement leading to a multiyear contract that employs economic order quantity procurement in excess of $20,000,000 in any 1 year, unless the congressional defense committees have been notified at least 30 days in advance of the proposed contract award: Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate a multiyear contract for which the economic order quantity advance procurement is not funded at least to the limits of the Government's liability: Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to initiate multiyear procurement contracts for any systems or component thereof if the value of the multiyear contract would exceed $500,000,000 unless specifically provided in this Act: Provided further, That no multiyear procurement contract can be terminated without 10-day prior notification to the congressional defense committees: Provided further, That the execution of multiyear authority shall require the use of a present value analysis to determine lowest cost compared to an annual procurement.

Funds appropriated in title III of this Act may be used for multiyear procurement contracts as follows:

Javelin missile; M2A3 Bradley fighting vehicle; DDG–51 destroyer; and UH–60/CH–60 aircraft.

SEC. 8009. Within the funds appropriated for the operation and maintenance of the Armed Forces, funds are hereby appropriated pursuant to section 401 of title 10, United States Code, for humanitarian and civic assistance costs under chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code. Such funds may also be obligated for humanitarian and civic assistance costs incidental to authorized operations and pursuant to authority granted in section 401 of chapter 20 of title 10, United States Code, and these obligations shall be reported to the Congress on September 30 of each year: Provided, That funds available for operation and maintenance shall be available for providing humanitarian and similar assistance by using Civic Action Teams in the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands and freely associated states of Micronesia, pursuant to the Compact of Free Association as authorized by Public Law 99–239: Provided further, That upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that such action is beneficial for graduate medical education programs conducted at Army medical facilities located in Hawaii, the Secretary of the Army may authorize the provision of medical services at such facilities and transportation to such facilities, on a nonreimbursable basis, for civilian patients from American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, and Guam.

SEC. 8010. (a) During fiscal year 2001, the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense may not be managed on the basis of any end-strength, and the management of such personnel during that fiscal year shall not be subject to any constraint or limitation (known as an end-strength) on the number of such personnel who may be employed on the last day of such fiscal year.

(b) The fiscal year 2002 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2002 Department of Defense budget request shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress as if subsections (a) and (b) of this provision were effective with regard to fiscal year 2002.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to military (civilian) technicians.

SEC. 8011. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available by this Act shall be used by the Department of Defense to exceed, outside the 50 United States, its territories, and the District of Columbia, 125,000 civilian workyears: Provided, That workyears shall be applied as defined in the Federal Personnel Manual: Provided further, That workyears expended in dependent student hiring programs for disadvantaged youths shall not be included in this workyear limitation.

SEC. 8012. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before the Congress.

SEC. 8013. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to make contributions to the Department of Defense Education Benefits Fund pursuant to section 2006(g) of title 10, United States Code, representing the normal cost for future benefits under section 3015(d) of title 38, United States Code, for any member of the armed services who, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, enlists in the armed services for a period of active duty of less than 3 years, nor shall any amounts representing the normal cost of such future benefits be transferred from the Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pursuant to section 2006(d) of title 10, United States Code; nor shall the Secretary of Veterans Affairs pay such benefits to any such member: Provided, That these limitations shall not apply to members in combat arms skills or to members who enlist in the armed services on or after July 1, 1989, under a program continued or established by the Secretary of Defense in fiscal year 1991 to test the cost-effective use of special recruiting incentives involving not more than 19 noncombat arms skills approved in advance by the Secretary of Defense: Provided further, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for the basic pay and allowances of any member of the Army participating as a full-time student and receiving benefits paid by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from the Department of Defense Education Benefits

Fund when time spent as a full-time student is credited toward completion of a service commitment: Provided, That this subsection shall not apply to those members who have reenlisted with this option prior to October 1, 1987: Provided further, That this subsection applies only to active components of the Army.

SEC. 8014. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to convert to contractor performance an activity or function of the Department of Defense that, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, is performed by more than 10 Department of Defense civilian employees until a most efficient and cost-effective organization analysis is completed on such activity or function and certification of the analysis is made to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: Provided, That this section and subsections (a), (b), and (c) of 10 U.S.C. 2461 shall not apply to a commercial or industrial type function of the Department of Defense that: (1) is included on the procurement list established pursuant to section 2 of the Act of June 25, 1938 (41 U.S.C. 47), popularly referred to as the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act; (2) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or by a qualified nonprofit agency for other severely handicapped individuals in accordance with that Act; or (3) is planned to be converted to performance by a qualified firm under 51 percent ownership by an Indian tribe, as defined in section 450b(e) of title 25, United States Code, or a Native Hawaiian organization, as defined in section 637(a)(15) of title 15, United States Code.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8015. Funds appropriated in title III of this Act for the Department of Defense Pilot Mentor-Protege Program may be transferred to any other appropriation contained in this Act solely for the purpose of implementing a Mentor-Protege Program developmental assistance agreement pursuant to section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2301 note), as amended, under the authority of this provision or any other transfer authority contained in this Act.

SEC. 8016. None of the funds in this Act may be available for the purchase by the Department of Defense (and its departments and agencies) of welded shipboard anchor and mooring chain 4 inches in diameter and under unless the anchor and mooring chain are manufactured in the United States from components which are substantially manufactured in the United States: Provided, That for the purpose of this section manufactured will include cutting, heat treating, quality control, testing of chain and welding (including the forging and shot blasting process): Provided further, That for the purpose of this section substantially all of the components of anchor and mooring chain shall be considered to be produced or manufactured in the United States if the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured in the United States exceeds the aggregate cost of the components produced or manufactured outside the United States: Provided further, That when adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis, the Secretary of the service responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes.

SEC. 8017. None of the funds appropriated by this Act available for the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS) or TRICARE shall be available for the reimbursement of any health care provider for inpatient mental health service for care received when a patient is referred to a provider of inpatient mental health care or residential treatment care by a medical or health care professional having an economic interest in the facility to which the patient is referred: Provided, That this limitation does not apply in the case of inpatient mental health services provided under the program for persons with disabilities under subsection (d) of section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, provided as partial hospital care, or provided pursuant to a waiver authorized by the Secretary of Defense because of medical or psychological circumstances of the patient that are confirmed by a health professional who is not a Federal employee after a review, pursuant to rules prescribed by the Secretary, which takes into account the appropriate level of care for the patient, the intensity of services required by the patient, and the availability of that care.

SEC. 8018. Funds available in this Act may be used to provide transportation for the next-of-kin of individuals who have been prisoners of war or missing in action from the Vietnam era to an annual meeting in the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

SEC. 8019. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may, by executive agreement, establish with host nation governments in NATO member states a separate account into which such residual value amounts negotiated in the return of United States military installations in NATO member states may be deposited, in the currency of the host nation, in lieu of direct monetary transfers to the United States Treasury: Provided, That such credits may be utilized only for the construction of facilities to support United States military forces in that host nation, or such real property maintenance and base operating costs that are currently executed through monetary transfers to such host nations: Provided further, That the Department of Defense's budget submission for fiscal year 2002 shall identify such sums anticipated in residual value settlements, and identify such construction, real property maintenance or base operating costs that shall be funded by the host nation through such credits: Provided further, That all military construction projects to be executed from such accounts must be previously approved in a prior Act of Congress: Provided further, That each such executive agreement with a NATO member host nation shall be reported to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate 30 days prior to the conclusion and endorsement of any such agreement established under this provision.

SEC. 8020. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to demilitarize or dispose of M–1 Carbines, M–1 Garand rifles, M–14 rifles, .22 caliber rifles, .30 caliber rifles, or M–1911 pistols.

SEC. 8021. No more than $500,000 of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used during a single fiscal year for any single relocation of an organization, unit, activity or function of the Department of Defense into or within the National Capital Region: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the congressional defense committees that such a relocation is required in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 8022. In addition to the funds provided elsewhere in this Act, $8,000,000 is appropriated only for incentive payments authorized by section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544): Provided, That a subcontractor at any tier shall be considered a contractor for the purposes of being allowed additional compensation under section 504 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1544).

SEC. 8023. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated or otherwise available for any Federal agency, the Congress, the judicial branch, or the District of Columbia may be used for the pay, allowances, and benefits of an employee as defined by section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, or an individual employed by the government of the District of Columbia, permanent or temporary indefinite, who—

(1) is a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, as described in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code, or the National Guard, as described in section 101 of title 32, United States Code;

(2) performs, for the purpose of providing military aid to enforce the law or providing assistance to civil authorities in the protection or saving of life or property or prevention of injury—

(A) Federal service under sections 331, 332, 333, or 12406 of title 10, United States Code, or other provision of law, as applicable; or

(B) full-time military service for his or her State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a territory of the United States; and

(3) requests and is granted—

(A) leave under the authority of this section; or

(B) annual leave, which may be granted without regard to the provisions of sections 5519 and 6323(b) of title 5, United States Code, if such employee is otherwise entitled to such annual leave:

Provided, That any employee who requests leave under subsection (3)(A) for service described in subsection (2) of this section is entitled to such leave, subject to the provisions of this section and of the last sentence of section 6323(b) of title 5, United States Code, and such leave shall be considered leave under section 6323(b) of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 8024. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to perform any cost study pursuant to the provisions of OMB Circular A–76 if the study being performed exceeds a period of 24 months after initiation of such study with respect to a single function activity or 48 months after initiation of such study for a multi-function activity.

SEC. 8025. Funds appropriated by this Act for the American Forces Information Service shall not be used for any national or international political or psychological activities.

SEC. 8026. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the Secretary of Defense may adjust wage rates for civilian employees hired for certain health care occupations as authorized for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs by section 7455 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 8027. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to reduce or disestablish the operation of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron of the Air Force Reserve, if such action would reduce the WC–130 Weather Reconnaissance mission below the levels funded in this Act.

SEC. 8028. (a) Of the funds for the procurement of supplies or services appropriated by this Act, qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped shall be afforded the maximum practicable opportunity to participate as subcontractors and suppliers in the performance of contracts let by the Department of Defense.

(b) During the current fiscal year, a business concern which has negotiated with a military service or defense agency a subcontracting plan for the participation by small business concerns pursuant to section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) shall be given credit toward meeting that subcontracting goal for any purchases made from qualified nonprofit agencies for the blind or other severely handicapped.

(c) For the purpose of this section, the phrase ''qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped'' means a nonprofit agency for the blind or other severely handicapped that has been approved by the Committee for the Purchase from the Blind and Other Severely Handicapped under the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 46–48).

SEC. 8029. During the current fiscal year, net receipts pursuant to collections from third party

payers pursuant to section 1095 of title 10, United States Code, shall be made available to the local facility of the uniformed services responsible for the collections and shall be over and above the facility's direct budget amount.

SEC. 8030. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur obligations of not to exceed $350,000,000 for purposes specified in section 2350j(c) of title 10, United States Code, in anticipation of receipt of contributions, only from the Government of Kuwait, under that section: Provided, That upon receipt, such contributions from the Government of Kuwait shall be credited to the appropriations or fund which incurred such obligations.

SEC. 8031. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $21,417,000 shall be available for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation, of which $19,417,000 shall be available for Civil Air Patrol Corporation operation and maintenance to support readiness activities which includes $2,000,000 for the Civil Air Patrol counterdrug program: Provided, That funds identified for ''Civil Air Patrol'' under this section are intended for and shall be for the exclusive use of the Civil Air Patrol Corporation and not for the Air Force or any unit thereof.

SEC. 8032. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act are available to establish a new Department of Defense (department) federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), either as a new entity, or as a separate entity administrated by an organization managing another FFRDC, or as a nonprofit membership corporation consisting of a consortium of other FFRDCs and other non-profit entities.

(b) No member of a Board of Directors, Trustees, Overseers, Advisory Group, Special Issues Panel, Visiting Committee, or any similar entity of a defense FFRDC, and no paid consultant to any defense FFRDC, except when acting in a technical advisory capacity, may be compensated for his or her services as a member of such entity, or as a paid consultant by more than one FFRDC in a fiscal year: Provided, That a member of any such entity referred to previously in this subsection shall be allowed travel expenses and per diem as authorized under the Federal Joint Travel Regulations, when engaged in the performance of membership duties.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the department from any source during fiscal year 2001 may be used by a defense FFRDC, through a fee or other payment mechanism, for construction of new buildings, for payment of cost sharing for projects funded by Government grants, for absorption of contract overruns, or for certain charitable contributions, not to include employee participation in community service and/or development.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds available to the department during fiscal year 2001, not more than 6,227 staff years of technical effort (staff years) may be funded for defense FFRDCs: Provided, That of the specific amount referred to previously in this subsection, not more than 1,009 staff years may be funded for the defense studies and analysis FFRDCs.

(e) The Secretary of Defense shall, with the submission of the department's fiscal year 2002 budget request, submit a report presenting the specific amounts of staff years of technical effort to be allocated for each defense FFRDC during that fiscal year.

SEC. 8033. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act shall be used to procure carbon, alloy or armor steel plate for use in any Government-owned facility or property under the control of the Department of Defense which were not melted and rolled in the United States or Canada: Provided, That these procurement restrictions shall apply to any and all Federal Supply Class 9515, American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM) or American Iron and Steel Institute (AISI) specifications of carbon, alloy or armor steel plate: Provided further, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for the procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That these restrictions shall not apply to contracts which are in being as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8034. For the purposes of this Act, the term ''congressional defense committees'' means the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 8035. During the current fiscal year, the Department of Defense may acquire the modification, depot maintenance and repair of aircraft, vehicles and vessels as well as the production of components and other Defense-related articles, through competition between Department of Defense depot maintenance activities and private firms: Provided, That the Senior Acquisition Executive of the military department or defense agency concerned, with power of delegation, shall certify that successful bids include comparable estimates of all direct and indirect costs for both public and private bids: Provided further, That Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 shall not apply to competitions conducted under this section.

SEC. 8036. (a)(1) If the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines that a foreign country which is party to an agreement described in paragraph (2) has violated the terms of the agreement by discriminating against certain types of products produced in the United States that are covered by the agreement, the Secretary of Defense shall rescind the Secretary's blanket waiver of the Buy American Act with respect to such types of products produced in that foreign country.

(2) An agreement referred to in paragraph (1) is any reciprocal defense procurement memorandum of understanding, between the United States and a foreign country pursuant to which the Secretary of Defense has prospectively waived the Buy American Act for certain products in that country.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress a report on the amount of Department of Defense purchases from foreign entities in fiscal year 2001. Such report shall separately indicate the dollar value of items for which the Buy American Act was waived pursuant to any agreement described in subsection (a)(2), the Trade Agreement Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), or any international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Buy American Act'' means title III of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

SEC. 8037. Appropriations contained in this Act that remain available at the end of the current fiscal year as a result of energy cost savings realized by the Department of Defense shall remain available for obligation for the next fiscal year to the extent, and for the purposes, provided in section 2865 of title 10, United States Code.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8038. Amounts deposited during the current fiscal year to the special account established under 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) and to the special account established under 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1) are appropriated and shall be available until transferred by the Secretary of Defense to current applicable appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense under the terms and conditions specified by 40 U.S.C. 485(h)(2) (A) and (B) and 10 U.S.C. 2667(d)(1)(B), to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 8039. The President shall include with each budget for a fiscal year submitted to the Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, materials that shall identify clearly and separately the amounts requested in the budget for appropriation for that fiscal year for salaries and expenses related to administrative activities of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the defense agencies.

SEC. 8040. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available for ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'' may be obligated for the Young Marines program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8041. During the current fiscal year, amounts contained in the Department of Defense Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account established by section 2921(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101–510; 10 U.S.C. 2687 note) shall be available until expended for the payments specified by section 2921(c)(2) of that Act: Provided, That none of the funds made available for expenditure under this section may be transferred or obligated until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a report which details the balance available in the Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery Account, all projected income into the account during fiscal years 2001 and 2002, and the specific expenditures to be made using funds transferred from this account during fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 8042. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, not more than $119,200,000 shall be available for payment of the operating costs of NATO Headquarters: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this section for Department of Defense support provided to NATO forces in and around the former Yugoslavia.

SEC. 8043. During the current fiscal year, appropriations which are available to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance may be used to purchase items having an investment item unit cost of not more than $100,000.

SEC. 8044. (a) During the current fiscal year, none of the appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds shall be used for the purchase of an investment item for the purpose of acquiring a new inventory item for sale or anticipated sale during the current fiscal year or a subsequent fiscal year to customers of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds if such an item would not have been chargeable to the Department of Defense Business Operations Fund during fiscal year 1994 and if the purchase of such an investment item would be chargeable during the current fiscal year to appropriations made to the Department of Defense for procurement.

(b) The fiscal year 2002 budget request for the Department of Defense as well as all justification material and other documentation supporting the fiscal year 2002 Department of Defense budget shall be prepared and submitted to the Congress on the basis that any equipment which was classified as an end item and funded in a procurement appropriation contained in this Act shall be budgeted for in a proposed fiscal year 2002 procurement appropriation and not in the supply management business area or any other area or category of the Department of Defense Working Capital Funds.

SEC. 8045. None of the funds appropriated by this Act for programs of the Central Intelligence Agency shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year, except for funds

appropriated for the Reserve for Contingencies, which shall remain available until September 30, 2002: Provided, That funds appropriated, transferred, or otherwise credited to the Central Intelligence Agency Central Services Working Capital Fund during this or any prior or subsequent fiscal year shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 8046. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available in this Act for the Defense Intelligence Agency may be used for the design, development, and deployment of General Defense Intelligence Program intelligence communications and intelligence information systems for the Services, the Unified and Specified Commands, and the component commands.

SEC. 8047. Of the funds appropriated by the Department of Defense under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available only for the mitigation of environmental impacts, including training and technical assistance to tribes, related administrative support, the gathering of information, documenting of environmental damage, and developing a system for prioritization of mitigation and cost to complete estimates for mitigation, on Indian lands resulting from Department of Defense activities.

SEC. 8048. Amounts collected for the use of the facilities of the National Science Center for Communications and Electronics during the current fiscal year pursuant to section 1459(g) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986, and deposited to the special account established under subsection 1459(g)(2) of that Act are appropriated and shall be available until expended for the operation and maintenance of the Center as provided for in subsection 1459(g)(2).

SEC. 8049. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to fill the commander's position at any military medical facility with a health care professional unless the prospective candidate can demonstrate professional administrative skills.

SEC. 8050. (a) None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be expended by an entity of the Department of Defense unless the entity, in expending the funds, complies with the Buy American Act. For purposes of this subsection, the term ''Buy American Act'' means title III of the Act entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes'', approved March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

(b) If the Secretary of Defense determines that a person has been convicted of intentionally affixing a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in America, the Secretary shall determine, in accordance with section 2410f of title 10, United States Code, whether the person should be debarred from contracting with the Department of Defense.

(c) In the case of any equipment or products purchased with appropriations provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that any entity of the Department of Defense, in expending the appropriation, purchase only American-made equipment and products, provided that American-made equipment and products are cost-competitive, quality-competitive, and available in a timely fashion.

SEC. 8051. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be available for a contract for studies, analysis, or consulting services entered into without competition on the basis of an unsolicited proposal unless the head of the activity responsible for the procurement determines—

(1) as a result of thorough technical evaluation, only one source is found fully qualified to perform the proposed work;

(2) the purpose of the contract is to explore an unsolicited proposal which offers significant scientific or technological promise, represents the product of original thinking, and was submitted in confidence by one source; or

(3) the purpose of the contract is to take advantage of unique and significant industrial accomplishment by a specific concern, or to insure that a new product or idea of a specific concern is given financial support:

Provided, That this limitation shall not apply to contracts in an amount of less than $25,000, contracts related to improvements of equipment that is in development or production, or contracts as to which a civilian official of the Department of Defense, who has been confirmed by the Senate, determines that the award of such contract is in the interest of the national defense.

SEC. 8052. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to establish a field operating agency; or

(2) to pay the basic pay of a member of the Armed Forces or civilian employee of the department who is transferred or reassigned from a headquarters activity if the member or employee's place of duty remains at the location of that headquarters.

(b) The Secretary of Defense or Secretary of a military department may waive the limitations in subsection (a), on a case-by-case basis, if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate that the granting of the waiver will reduce the personnel requirements or the financial requirements of the department.

(c) This section does not apply to field operating agencies funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program.

SEC. 8053. Funds appropriated by this Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2001 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

SEC. 8054. Notwithstanding section 303 of Public Law 96–487 or any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to lease real and personal property at Naval Air Facility, Adak, Alaska, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2667(f), for commercial, industrial or other purposes: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Navy may remove hazardous materials from facilities, buildings, and structures at Adak, Alaska, and may demolish or otherwise dispose of such facilities, buildings, and structures.

(RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 8055. Of the funds provided in Department of Defense Appropriations Acts, the following funds are hereby rescinded as of the date of enactment of this Act, or October 1, 2000, whichever is later, from the following accounts in the specified amounts:

''Aircraft Procurement, Army, 2000/2002'', $7,000,000;

''Missile Procurement, Army, 2000/2002'', $6,000,000;

''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, 2000/2002'', $7,000,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Army, 2000/2002'', $5,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2000/2002'', $16,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2000/2002'', $24,125,000;

''Weapons Procurement, Navy, 2000/2002'', $3,853,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps, 2000/2002'', $1,463,000;

''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, 2000/2004'', $19,644,000;

''Other Procurement, Navy, 2000/2002'', $12,032,000;

''Procurement, Marine Corps, 2000/2002'', $3,623,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $32,743,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $5,500,000;

''Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $1,232,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $19,902,000;

''Procurement, Defense-Wide, 2000/2002'', $6,683,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2000/2001'', $20,592,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, 2000/2001'', $35,621,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2000/2001'', $53,467,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, 2000/2001'', $36,297,000;

''Defense Health Program, 2000/2002'', $808,000; and

''Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army, 2000/2002'', $1,103,000:

Provided, That these reductions shall be applied proportionally to each budget activity, activity group and subactivity group and each program, project and activity within each appropriation account: Provided further, That such proportionate reduction shall not be applied to any funds that will not remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2000: Provided further, That the following additional amounts are hereby rescinded as of the date of enactment of this Act, or October 1, 2000, whichever is later, from the following accounts in the specified amounts:

''Other Procurement, Army, 1999/2001'', $3,000,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 1999/2001'', $12,300,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 1999/2001'', $8,000,000;

''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, 2000/2002'', $23,000,000;

''Other Procurement, Army, 2000/2002'', $29,300,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Navy, 2000/2002'', $6,500,000;

''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $24,000,000;

''Missile Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $36,192,000;

''Other Procurement, Air Force, 2000/2002'', $20,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, 2000/2001'', $22,000,000;

''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, 2000/2001'', $30,000,000; and

''Reserve Mobilization Income Insurance Fund'', $13,000,000.

SEC. 8056. None of the funds available in this Act may be used to reduce the authorized positions for military (civilian) technicians of the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve for the purpose of applying any administratively imposed civilian personnel ceiling, freeze, or reduction on military (civilian) technicians, unless such reductions are a direct result of a reduction in military force structure.

SEC. 8057. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be obligated or expended for assistance to the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

SEC. 8058. During the current fiscal year, funds appropriated in this Act are available to compensate members of the National Guard for duty performed pursuant to a plan submitted by a Governor of a State and approved by the Secretary of Defense under section 112 of title 32, United States Code: Provided, That during the performance of such duty, the members of the National Guard shall be under State command and control: Provided further, That such duty shall be treated as full-time National Guard duty for purposes of sections 12602(a)(2) and (b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8059. Funds appropriated in this Act for operation and maintenance of the Military Departments, Combatant Commands and Defense Agencies shall be available for reimbursement of pay, allowances and other expenses which

would otherwise be incurred against appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve when members of the National Guard and Reserve provide intelligence or counterintelligence support to Combatant Commands, Defense Agencies and Joint Intelligence Activities, including the activities and programs included within the National Foreign Intelligence Program (NFIP), the Joint Military Intelligence Program (JMIP), and the Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA) aggregate: Provided, That nothing in this section authorizes deviation from established Reserve and National Guard personnel and training procedures.

SEC. 8060. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to reduce the civilian medical and medical support personnel assigned to military treatment facilities below the September 30, 2000 level: Provided, That the Service Surgeons General may waive this section by certifying to the congressional defense committees that the beneficiary population is declining in some catchment areas and civilian strength reductions may be consistent with responsible resource stewardship and capitation-based budgeting.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8061. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be transferred to or obligated from the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the total cost for the planning, design, construction and installation of equipment for the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation will not exceed $1,222,000,000.

SEC. 8062. (a) None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for any fiscal year for drug interdiction or counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(b) None of the funds available to the Central Intelligence Agency for any fiscal year for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities may be transferred to any other department or agency of the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriations law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8063. Appropriations available in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' for increasing energy and water efficiency in Federal buildings may, during their period of availability, be transferred to other appropriations or funds of the Department of Defense for projects related to increasing energy and water efficiency, to be merged with and to be available for the same general purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred.

SEC. 8064. None of the funds appropriated in fiscal year 2000 and by this Act may be used for the procurement of vessel propellers and ball and roller bearings other than those produced by a domestic source and of domestic origin: Provided, That the Secretary of the military department responsible for such procurement may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes: Provided further, That this restriction shall not apply to the purchase of ''commercial items'', as defined by section 4(12) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act, except that the restriction shall apply to ball or roller bearings purchased as end items.

SEC. 8065. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to American Samoa, and funds available to the Department of Defense shall be made available to provide transportation of medical supplies and equipment, on a nonreimbursable basis, to the Indian Health Service when it is in conjunction with a civil-military project.

SEC. 8066. None of the funds in this Act may be used to purchase any supercomputer which is not manufactured in the United States, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes that is not available from United States manufacturers.

SEC. 8067. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Naval shipyards of the United States shall be eligible to participate in any manufacturing extension program financed by funds appropriated in this or any other Act.

SEC. 8068. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, each contract awarded by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year for construction or service performed in whole or in part in a State (as defined in section 381(d) of title 10, United States Code) which is not contiguous with another State and has an unemployment rate in excess of the national average rate of unemployment as determined by the Secretary of Labor, shall include a provision requiring the contractor to employ, for the purpose of performing that portion of the contract in such State that is not contiguous with another State, individuals who are residents of such State and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be able to acquire promptly the necessary skills: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirements of this section, on a case-by-case basis, in the interest of national security.

SEC. 8069. During the current fiscal year, the Army shall use the former George Air Force Base as the airhead for the National Training Center at Fort Irwin: Provided, That none of the funds in this Act shall be obligated or expended to transport Army personnel into Edwards Air Force Base for training rotations at the National Training Center.

SEC. 8070. (a) LIMITATION ON TRANSFER OF DEFENSE ARTICLES AND SERVICES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year may be obligated or expended to transfer to another nation or an international organization any defense articles or services (other than intelligence services) for use in the activities described in subsection (b) unless the congressional defense committees, the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are notified 15 days in advance of such transfer.

(b) COVERED ACTIVITIES.—This section applies to—

(1) any international peacekeeping or peace-enforcement operation under the authority of chapter VI or chapter VII of the United Nations Charter under the authority of a United Nations Security Council resolution; and

(2) any other international peacekeeping, peace-enforcement, or humanitarian assistance operation.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE.—A notice under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A description of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(2) A statement of the value of the equipment, supplies, or services to be transferred.

(3) In the case of a proposed transfer of equipment or supplies—

(A) a statement of whether the inventory requirements of all elements of the Armed Forces (including the reserve components) for the type of equipment or supplies to be transferred have been met; and

(B) a statement of whether the items proposed to be transferred will have to be replaced and, if so, how the President proposes to provide funds for such replacement.

SEC. 8071. To the extent authorized by subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may issue loan guarantees in support of United States defense exports not otherwise provided for: Provided, That the total contingent liability of the United States for guarantees issued under the authority of this section may not exceed $15,000,000,000: Provided further, That the exposure fees charged and collected by the Secretary for each guarantee shall be paid by the country involved and shall not be financed as part of a loan guaranteed by the United States: Provided further, That the Secretary shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, and International Relations in the House of Representatives on the implementation of this program: Provided further, That amounts charged for administrative fees and deposited to the special account provided for under section 2540c(d) of title 10, shall be available for paying the costs of administrative expenses of the Department of Defense that are attributable to the loan guarantee program under subchapter VI of chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8072. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense under this Act shall be obligated or expended to pay a contractor under a contract with the Department of Defense for costs of any amount paid by the contractor to an employee when—

(1) such costs are for a bonus or otherwise in excess of the normal salary paid by the contractor to the employee; and

(2) such bonus is part of restructuring costs associated with a business combination.

SEC. 8073. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to transport or provide for the transportation of chemical munitions or agents to the Johnston Atoll for the purpose of storing or demilitarizing such munitions or agents.

(b) The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to any obsolete World War II chemical munition or agent of the United States found in the World War II Pacific Theater of Operations.

(c) The President may suspend the application of subsection (a) during a period of war in which the United States is a party.

SEC. 8074. None of the funds provided in title II of this Act for ''Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction'' may be obligated or expended to finance housing for any individual who was a member of the military forces of the Soviet Union or for any individual who is or was a member of the military forces of the Russian Federation.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8075. During the current fiscal year, no more than $30,000,000 of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'' may be transferred to appropriations available for the pay of military personnel, to be merged with, and to be available for the same time period as the appropriations to which transferred, to be used in support of such personnel in connection with support and services for eligible organizations and activities outside the Department of Defense pursuant to section 2012 of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 8076. For purposes of section 1553(b) of title 31, United States Code, any subdivision of appropriations made in this Act under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' shall be considered to be for the same purpose as any subdivision under the heading ''Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy'' appropriations in any prior year, and the 1 percent limitation shall apply to the total amount of the appropriation.

SEC. 8077. During the current fiscal year, in the case of an appropriation account of the Department of Defense for which the period of availability for obligation has expired or which has closed under the provisions of section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, and which has a

negative unliquidated or unexpended balance, an obligation or an adjustment of an obligation may be charged to any current appropriation account for the same purpose as the expired or closed account if—

(1) the obligation would have been properly chargeable (except as to amount) to the expired or closed account before the end of the period of availability or closing of that account;

(2) the obligation is not otherwise properly chargeable to any current appropriation account of the Department of Defense; and

(3) in the case of an expired account, the obligation is not chargeable to a current appropriation of the Department of Defense under the provisions of section 1405(b)(8) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991, Public Law 101–510, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1551 note): Provided, That in the case of an expired account, if subsequent review or investigation discloses that there was not in fact a negative unliquidated or unexpended balance in the account, any charge to a current account under the authority of this section shall be reversed and recorded against the expired account: Provided further, That the total amount charged to a current appropriation under this section may not exceed an amount equal to 1 percent of the total appropriation for that account.

SEC. 8078. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall submit to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2001, a detailed report identifying, by amount and by separate budget activity, activity group, subactivity group, line item, program element, program, project, subproject, and activity, any activity for which the fiscal year 2002 budget request was reduced because the Congress appropriated funds above the President's budget request for that specific activity for fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 8079. Funds appropriated in title II of this Act and for the Defense Health Program in title VI of this Act for supervision and administration costs for facilities maintenance and repair, minor construction, or design projects may be obligated at the time the reimbursable order is accepted by the performing activity: Provided, That for the purpose of this section, supervision and administration costs includes all in-house Government cost.

SEC. 8080. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may waive reimbursement of the cost of conferences, seminars, courses of instruction, or similar educational activities of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies for military officers and civilian officials of foreign nations if the Secretary determines that attendance by such personnel, without reimbursement, is in the national security interest of the United States: Provided, That costs for which reimbursement is waived pursuant to this section shall be paid from appropriations available for the Asia-Pacific Center.

SEC. 8081. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may permit the use of equipment of the National Guard Distance Learning Project by any person or entity on a space-available, reimbursable basis. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall establish the amount of reimbursement for such use on a case-by-case basis.

(b) Amounts collected under subsection (a) shall be credited to funds available for the National Guard Distance Learning Project and be available to defray the costs associated with the use of equipment of the project under that subsection. Such funds shall be available for such purposes without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 8082. Using funds available by this Act or any other Act, the Secretary of the Air Force, pursuant to a determination under section 2690 of title 10, United States Code, may implement cost-effective agreements for required heating facility modernization in the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany: Provided, That in the City of Kaiserslautern such agreements will include the use of United States anthracite as the base load energy for municipal district heat to the United States Defense installations: Provided further, That at Landstuhl Army Regional Medical Center and Ramstein Air Base, furnished heat may be obtained from private, regional or municipal services, if provisions are included for the consideration of United States coal as an energy source.

SEC. 8083. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3902, during the current fiscal year, interest penalties may be paid by the Department of Defense from funds financing the operation of the military department or defense agency with which the invoice or contract payment is associated.

SEC. 8084. None of the funds appropriated in title IV of this Act may be used to procure end-items for delivery to military forces for operational training, operational use or inventory requirements: Provided, That this restriction does not apply to end-items used in development, prototyping, and test activities preceding and leading to acceptance for operational use: Provided further, That this restriction does not apply to programs funded within the National Foreign Intelligence Program: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8085. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $800,000,000 to reflect working capital fund cash balance and rate stabilization adjustments, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $40,794,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $271,856,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $5,006,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $294,209,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $10,864,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve'', $31,669,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve'', $563,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve'', $43,974,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard'', $15,572,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', $85,493,000.

SEC. 8086. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts provided in all appropriation accounts in titles III and IV of this Act are hereby reduced by 0.7 percent: Provided, That these reductions shall be applied on a prorata basis to each line item, program element, program, project, subproject, and activity within each appropriation account: Provided further, That not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees listing the specific funding reductions allocated to each category listed in the preceding proviso pursuant to this section.

SEC. 8087. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to approve or license the sale of the F–22 advanced tactical fighter to any foreign government.

SEC. 8088. (a) The Secretary of Defense may, on a case-by-case basis, waive with respect to a foreign country each limitation on the procurement of defense items from foreign sources provided in law if the Secretary determines that the application of the limitation with respect to that country would invalidate cooperative programs entered into between the Department of Defense and the foreign country, or would invalidate reciprocal trade agreements for the procurement of defense items entered into under section 2531 of title 10, United States Code, and the country does not discriminate against the same or similar defense items produced in the United States for that country.

(b) Subsection (a) applies with respect to—

(1) contracts and subcontracts entered into on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) options for the procurement of items that are exercised after such date under contracts that are entered into before such date if the option prices are adjusted for any reason other than the application of a waiver granted under subsection (a).

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to a limitation regarding construction of public vessels, ball and roller bearings, food, and clothing or textile materials as defined by section 11 (chapters 50–65) of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule and products classified under headings 4010, 4202, 4203, 6401 through 6406, 6505, 7019, 7218 through 7229, 7304.41 through 7304.49, 7306.40, 7502 through 7508, 8105, 8108, 8109, 8211, 8215, and 9404.

SEC. 8089. Funds made available to the Civil Air Patrol in this Act under the heading ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'' may be used for the Civil Air Patrol Corporation's counterdrug program, including its demand reduction program involving youth programs, as well as operational and training drug reconnaissance missions for Federal, State, and local government agencies; for administrative costs, including the hiring of Civil Air Patrol Corporation employees; for travel and per diem expenses of Civil Air Patrol Corporation personnel in support of those missions; and for equipment needed for mission support or performance: Provided, That the Department of the Air Force should waive reimbursement from the Federal, State, and local government agencies for the use of these funds.

SEC. 8090. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the TRICARE managed care support contracts in effect, or in final stages of acquisition as of September 30, 2000, may be extended for 2 years: Provided, That any such extension may only take place if the Secretary of Defense determines that it is in the best interest of the Government: Provided further, That any contract extension shall be based on the price in the final best and final offer for the last year of the existing contract as adjusted for inflation and other factors mutually agreed to by the contractor and the Government: Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, all future TRICARE managed care support contracts replacing contracts in effect, or in the final stages of acquisition as of September 30, 2000, may include a base contract period for transition and up to seven 1-year option periods.

SEC. 8091. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate an employee of the Department of Defense who initiates a new start program without notification to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Office of Management and Budget, and the congressional defense committees, as required by Department of Defense financial management regulations.

SEC. 8092. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to support any training program involving a unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of Defense has received credible information from the Department of State that the unit has committed a gross violation of human rights, unless all necessary corrective steps have been taken.

(b) MONITORING.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall ensure that prior to a decision to conduct any training program referred to in subsection (a), full consideration is given to all credible information available to the Department of State relating to human rights violations by foreign security forces.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, may

waive the prohibition in subsection (a) if he determines that such waiver is required by extraordinary circumstances.

(d) REPORT.—Not more than 15 days after the exercise of any waiver under subsection (c), the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees describing the extraordinary circumstances, the purpose and duration of the training program, the United States forces and the foreign security forces involved in the training program, and the information relating to human rights violations that necessitates the waiver.

SEC. 8093. The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may carry out a program to distribute surplus dental equipment of the Department of Defense, at no cost to the Department of Defense, to Indian health service facilities and to federally-qualified health centers (within the meaning of section 1905(l)(2)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396d(l)(2)(B))).

SEC. 8094. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $856,900,000 to reflect savings from favorable foreign currency fluctuations, to be distributed as follows:

''Military Personnel, Army'', $177,200,000;

''Military Personnel, Navy'', $53,400,000;

''Military Personnel, Marine Corps'', $14,200,000;

''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $147,600,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $272,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $47,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $2,200,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $96,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $26,400,000; and

''Defense Health Program'', $20,700,000.

SEC. 8095. None of the funds appropriated or made available in this Act to the Department of the Navy shall be used to develop, lease or procure the ADC(X) class of ships unless the main propulsion diesel engines and propulsors are manufactured in the United States by a domestically operated entity: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that adequate domestic supplies are not available to meet Department of Defense requirements on a timely basis and that such an acquisition must be made in order to acquire capability for national security purposes or there exists a significant cost or quality difference.

SEC. 8096. Of the funds made available in this Act, not less than $65,200,000 shall be available to maintain an attrition reserve force of 18 B–52 aircraft, of which $3,200,000 shall be available from ''Military Personnel, Air Force'', $36,900,000 shall be available from ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', and $25,100,000 shall be available from ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'': Provided, That the Secretary of the Air Force shall maintain a total force of 94 B–52 aircraft, including 18 attrition reserve aircraft, during fiscal year 2001: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense shall include in the Air Force budget request for fiscal year 2002 amounts sufficient to maintain a B–52 force totaling 94 aircraft.

SEC. 8097. The budget of the President for fiscal year 2002 submitted to the Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, and each annual budget request thereafter, shall include separate budget justification documents for costs of United States Armed Forces' participation in contingency operations for the Military Personnel accounts, the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund, the Operation and Maintenance accounts, and the Procurement accounts: Provided, That these budget justification documents shall include a description of the funding requested for each anticipated contingency operation, for each military service, to include active duty and Guard and Reserve components, and for each appropriation account: Provided further, That these documents shall include estimated costs for each element of expense or object class, a reconciliation of increases and decreases for ongoing contingency operations, and programmatic data including, but not limited to troop strength for each active duty and Guard and Reserve component, and estimates of the major weapons systems deployed in support of each contingency: Provided further, That these documents shall include budget exhibits OP–5 and OP–32, as defined in the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation, for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund for fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

SEC. 8098. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this or other Department of Defense Appropriations Acts may be obligated or expended for the purpose of performing repairs or maintenance to military family housing units of the Department of Defense, including areas in such military family housing units that may be used for the purpose of conducting official Department of Defense business.

SEC. 8099. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for any advanced concept technology demonstration project may only be obligated 30 days after a report, including a description of the project and its estimated annual and total cost, has been provided in writing to the congressional defense committees: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying to the congressional defense committees that it is in the national interest to do so.

SEC. 8100. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of establishing all Department of Defense policies governing the provision of care provided by and financed under the military health care system's case management program under 10 U.S.C. 1079(a)(17), the term ''custodial care'' shall be defined as care designed essentially to assist an individual in meeting the activities of daily living and which does not require the supervision of trained medical, nursing, paramedical or other specially trained individuals: Provided, That the case management program shall provide that members and retired members of the military services, and their dependents and survivors, have access to all medically necessary health care through the health care delivery system of the military services regardless of the health care status of the person seeking the health care: Provided further, That the case management program shall be the primary obligor for payment of medically necessary services and shall not be considered as secondarily liable to title XIX of the Social Security Act, other welfare programs or charity based care.

SEC. 8101. During the current fiscal year—

(1) refunds attributable to the use of the Government travel card and refunds attributable to official Government travel arranged by Government Contracted Travel Management Centers may be credited to operation and maintenance accounts of the Department of Defense which are current when the refunds are received; and

(2) refunds attributable to the use of the Government Purchase Card by military personnel and civilian employees of the Department of Defense may be credited to accounts of the Department of Defense that are current when the refunds are received and that are available for the same purposes as the accounts originally charged.

SEC. 8102. (a) REGISTERING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS WITH DOD CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used for a mission critical or mission essential information technology system (including a system funded by the defense working capital fund) that is not registered with the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense. A system shall be considered to be registered with that officer upon the furnishing to that officer of notice of the system, together with such information concerning the system as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe. An information technology system shall be considered a mission critical or mission essential information technology system as defined by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) CERTIFICATIONS AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH CLINGER-COHEN ACT.—(1) During the current fiscal year, a major automated information system may not receive Milestone I approval, Milestone II approval, or Milestone III approval, or their equivalent, within the Department of Defense until the Chief Information Officer certifies, with respect to that milestone, that the system is being developed in accordance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.). The Chief Information Officer may require additional certifications, as appropriate, with respect to any such system.

(2) The Chief Information Officer shall provide the congressional defense committees timely notification of certifications under paragraph (1). Each such notification shall include, at a minimum, the funding baseline and milestone schedule for each system covered by such a certification and confirmation that the following steps have been taken with respect to the system:

(A) Business process reengineering.

(B) An analysis of alternatives.

(C) An economic analysis that includes a calculation of the return on investment.

(D) Performance measures.

(E) An information assurance strategy consistent with the Department's Global Information Grid.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''Chief Information Officer'' means the senior official of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary of Defense pursuant to section 3506 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term ''information technology system'' has the meaning given the term ''information technology'' in section 5002 of the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (40 U.S.C. 1401).

(3) The term ''major automated information system'' has the meaning given that term in Department of Defense Directive 5000.1.

SEC. 8103. During the current fiscal year, none of the funds available to the Department of Defense may be used to provide support to another department or agency of the United States if such department or agency is more than 90 days in arrears in making payment to the Department of Defense for goods or services previously provided to such department or agency on a reimbursable basis: Provided, That this restriction shall not apply if the department is authorized by law to provide support to such department or agency on a nonreimbursable basis, and is providing the requested support pursuant to such authority: Provided further, That the Secretary of Defense may waive this restriction on a case-by-case basis by certifying in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate that it is in the national security interest to do so.

SEC. 8104. None of the funds provided in this Act may be used to transfer to any nongovernmental entity ammunition held by the Department of Defense that has a center-fire cartridge and a United States military nomenclature designation of ''armor penetrator'', ''armor piercing (AP)'', ''armor piercing incendiary (API)'', or ''armor-piercing incendiary-tracer (API–T)'', except to an entity performing demilitarization services for the Department of Defense under a contract that requires the entity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Department of Defense that armor piercing projectiles are either: (1)

rendered incapable of reuse by the demilitarization process; or (2) used to manufacture ammunition pursuant to a contract with the Department of Defense or the manufacture of ammunition for export pursuant to a License for Permanent Export of Unclassified Military Articles issued by the Department of State.

SEC. 8105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, may waive payment of all or part of the consideration that otherwise would be required under 10 U.S.C. 2667, in the case of a lease of personal property for a period not in excess of 1 year to any organization specified in 32 U.S.C. 508(d), or any other youth, social, or fraternal non-profit organization as may be approved by the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, or his designee, on a case-by-case basis.

SEC. 8106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, that not more than 35 percent of funds provided in this Act, may be obligated for environmental remediation under indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contracts with a total contract value of $130,000,000 or higher.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8107. Of the funds made available under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $10,000,000 shall be transferred to the Department of Transportation to enable the Secretary of Transportation to realign railroad track on Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson.

SEC. 8108. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used for the support of any nonappropriated funds activity of the Department of Defense that procures malt beverages and wine with nonappropriated funds for resale (including such alcoholic beverages sold by the drink) on a military installation located in the United States unless such malt beverages and wine are procured within that State, or in the case of the District of Columbia, within the District of Columbia, in which the military installation is located: Provided, That in a case in which the military installation is located in more than one State, purchases may be made in any State in which the installation is located: Provided further, That such local procurement requirements for malt beverages and wine shall apply to all alcoholic beverages only for military installations in States which are not contiguous with another State: Provided further, That alcoholic beverages other than wine and malt beverages, in contiguous States and the District of Columbia shall be procured from the most competitive source, price and other factors considered.

SEC. 8109. During the current fiscal year, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance may also pay, or authorize payment for, the expenses of providing or facilitating education and training for appropriate military and civilian personnel of foreign countries in disaster management, peace operations, and humanitarian assistance: Provided, That not later than April 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the training of foreign personnel conducted under this authority during the preceding fiscal year for which expenses were paid under the section: Provided further, That the report shall specify the countries in which the training was conducted, the type of training conducted, and the foreign personnel trained.

SEC. 8110. (a) The Department of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements with the Veterans Administration and federally-funded health agencies providing services to Native Hawaiians for the purpose of establishing a partnership similar to the Alaska Federal Health Care Partnership, in order to maximize Federal resources in the provision of health care services by federally-funded health agencies, applying telemedicine technologies. For the purpose of this partnership, Native Hawaiians shall have the same status as other Native Americans who are eligible for the health care services provided by the Indian Health Service.

(b) The Department of Defense is authorized to develop a consultation policy, consistent with Executive Order No. 13084 (issued May 14, 1998), with Native Hawaiians for the purpose of assuring maximum Native Hawaiian participation in the direction and administration of governmental services so as to render those services more responsive to the needs of the Native Hawaiian community.

(c) For purposes of this section, the term ''Native Hawaiian'' means any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now comprises the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 8111. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be made available for reconstruction activities in the Republic of Serbia (excluding the province of Kosovo) as long as Slobodan Milosevic remains the President of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

SEC. 8112. In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of $7,500,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', to be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only for a grant to the United Service Organizations Incorporated, a federally chartered corporation under chapter 2201 of title 36, United States Code. The grant provided for by this section is in addition to any grant provided for under any other provision of law.

SEC. 8113. Of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', up to $5,000,000 shall be available to provide assistance, by grant or otherwise, to public school systems that have unusually high concentrations of special needs military dependents enrolled: Provided, That in selecting school systems to receive such assistance, special consideration shall be given to school systems in States that are considered overseas assignments.

SEC. 8114. In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of $5,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', to be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only for a grant to the High Desert Partnership in Academic Excellence Foundation, Inc., for the purpose of developing, implementing, and evaluating a standards and performance based academic model at schools administered by the Department of Defense Education Activity.

SEC. 8115. (a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Air Force may convey at no cost to the Air Force, without consideration, to Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota relocatable military housing units located at Grand Forks Air Force Base and Minot Air Force Base that are excess to the needs of the Air Force.

(b) PROCESSING OF REQUESTS.—The Secretary of the Air Force shall convey, at no cost to the Air Force, military housing units under subsection (a) in accordance with the request for such units that are submitted to the Secretary by the Operation Walking Shield Program on behalf of Indian tribes located in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Minnesota.

(c) RESOLUTION OF HOUSING UNIT CONFLICTS.—The Operation Walking Shield program shall resolve any conflicts among requests of Indian tribes for housing units under subsection (a) before submitting requests to the Secretary of the Air Force under paragraph (b).

(d) INDIAN TRIBE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Indian tribe'' means any recognized Indian tribe included on the current list published by the Secretary of Interior under section 104 of the federally Recognized Indian Tribe Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–454; 108 Stat. 4792; 25 U.S.C. 479a–1).

SEC. 8116. Of the amounts appropriated in the Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', $51,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of adjusting the cost-share of the parties under the Agreement between the Department of Defense and the Ministry of Defence of Israel for the Arrow Deployability Program.

SEC. 8117. The Secretary of Defense shall fully identify and determine the validity of health care contract liabilities, requests for equitable adjustment, and claims for unanticipated health care contract costs: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall establish an equitable and timely process for the adjudication of claims, and recognize actual liabilities during the Department's planning, programming and budgeting process: Provided further, That not later than March 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the scope and extent of health care contract claims, and on the action taken to implement the provisions of this section: Provided further, That nothing in this section should be construed as congressional direction to liquidate or pay any claims that otherwise would not have been adjudicated in favor of the claimant.

SEC. 8118. Funds available to the Department of Defense for the Global Positioning System during the current fiscal year may be used to fund civil requirements associated with the satellite and ground control segments of such system's modernization program.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8119. Of the amounts appropriated in this Act under the heading, ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $115,000,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to transfer such funds to other activities of the Federal Government.

SEC. 8120. (a) REPORT TO THE CONGRESSIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEES.—Not later than May 1, 2001, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on work-related illnesses in the Department of Defense workforce, including the workforce of Department contractors and vendors, resulting from exposure to beryllium or beryllium alloys.

(b) PROCEDURE, METHODOLOGY, AND TIME PERIODS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall use the same procedures, methodology, and time periods in carrying out the work required to prepare the report under subsection (a) as those used by the Department of Energy to determine work-related illnesses in the Department of Energy workforce associated with exposure to beryllium or beryllium alloys. To the extent that different procedures, methodology, and time periods are used, the Secretary shall explain in the report why those different procedures, methodology, or time periods were used, why they were appropriate, and how they differ from those used by the Department of Energy.

(c) REPORT ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the precautions used by the Department of Defense and its contractors and vendors to protect their current employees from beryllium-related disease.

(2) Identification of elements of the Department of Defense and of contractors and vendors to the Department of Defense that use or have used beryllium or beryllium alloys in production of products for the Department of Defense.

(3) The number of employees (or, if an actual number is not available, an estimate of the number of employees) employed by each of the Department of Defense elements identified under paragraph (2) that are or were exposed during the course of their Defense-related employment to beryllium, beryllium dust, or beryllium fumes.

(4) A characterization of the amount, frequency, and duration of exposure for employees identified under paragraph (3).

(5) Identification of the actual number of instances of acute beryllium disease, chronic beryllium disease, or beryllium sensitization that have been documented to date among employees of the Department of Defense and its contractors and vendors.

(6) The estimated cost if the Department of Defense were to provide workers' compensation benefits comparable to benefits provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act to employees, including former employees, of Government organizations, contractors, and vendors who have contracted beryllium-related diseases.

(7) The Secretary's recommendations on whether compensation for work-related illnesses in the Department of Defense workforce, including contractors and vendors, is justified or recommended.

(8) Legislative proposals, if any, to implement the Secretary's recommendations under paragraph (7).

SEC. 8121. Of the amounts made available in title II of this Act for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $1,900,000 shall be available only for the purpose of making a grant to the San Bernardino County Airports Department for the installation of a perimeter security fence for that portion of the Barstow-Daggett Airport, California, which is used as a heliport for the National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California, and for installation of other security improvements at that airport.

SEC. 8122. The Secretary of Defense may during the current fiscal year and hereafter carry out the activities and exercise the authorities provided under the demonstration program authorized by section 9148 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1993 (Public Law 102–396; 106 Stat. 1941).

SEC. 8123. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the source selection for the Interim Armored Vehicle program (also referred to as the Family of Medium Armored Vehicles program), the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a detailed report on that program. The report shall include the following:

(1) The required research and development cost for each variant of the Interim Armored Vehicle to be procured and the total research and development cost for the program.

(2) The major milestones for the development program for the Interim Armored Vehicle program.

(3) The production unit cost of each variant of the Interim Armored Vehicle to be procured.

(4) The total procurement cost of the Interim Armored Vehicle program.

(b) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report (in both classified and unclassified versions) on the joint warfighting requirements to be met by the new medium brigades for the Army. The report shall describe any adjustments made to operational plans of the commanders of the unified combatant commands for use of those brigades. The report shall be submitted at the time that the President's budget for fiscal year 2002 is transmitted to Congress.

SEC. 8124. None of the funds made available in this Act or the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79) may be used to award a full funding contract for low-rate initial production for the F–22 aircraft program until—

(1) the first flight of an F–22 aircraft incorporating Block 3.0 software has been conducted;

(2) the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that all Defense Acquisition Board exit criteria for the award of low-rate initial production of the aircraft have been met; and

(3) upon completion of the requirements under (1) and (2) above, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation submits to the congressional defense committees a report assessing the adequacy of testing to date to measure and predict performance of F–22 avionics systems, stealth characteristics, and weapons delivery systems.

SEC. 8125. (a) The total amount expended by the Department of Defense for the F–22 aircraft program (over all fiscal years of the life of the program) for engineering and manufacturing development and for production may not exceed $58,028,200,000. The amount provided in the preceding sentence shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Air Force in the manner provided in section 217(c) of Public Law 105–85 (111 Stat. 1660). This section supersedes any limitation previously provided by law on the amount that may be obligated or expended for engineering and manufacturing development under the F–22 aircraft program and any limitation previously provided by law on the amount that may be obligated or expended for the F–22 production program.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) apply during the current fiscal year and subsequent fiscal years.

SEC. 8126. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act under Title IV for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO) is hereby reduced by $14,000,000 to reflect a reduction in system engineering, program management, and other support costs.

SEC. 8127. The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization and its subordinate offices and associated contractors, including the Lead Systems Integrator, shall notify the congressional defense committees 15 days prior to issuing any type of information or proposal solicitation under the NMD Program with a potential annual contract value greater than $5,000,000 or a total contract value greater than $30,000,000.

SEC. 8128. Up to $3,000,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading, ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'' in this Act for the Pacific Missile Range Facility may be made available to contract for the repair, maintenance, and operation of adjacent off-base water, drainage, and flood control systems critical to base operations.

SEC. 8129. In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $20,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $20,000,000 to the National Center for the Preservation of Democracy for the renovation of buildings and for other purposes to assist in carrying out the intent of 50 U.S.C. App. 1989.

SEC. 8130. Of the funds made available under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', not less than $7,000,000 shall be made available by grant or otherwise, to the North Slope Borough, to provide assistance for health care, monitoring and related issues associated with research conducted from 1955 to 1957 by the former Arctic Aeromedical Laboratory.

SEC. 8131. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'' may be transferred or obligated for Department of Defense expenses not directly related to the conduct of overseas contingencies: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report no later than thirty days after the end of each fiscal quarter to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives that details any transfer of funds from the ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'': Provided further, That the report shall explain any transfer for the maintenance of real property, pay of civilian personnel, base operations support, and weapon, vehicle or equipment maintenance.

SEC. 8132. In addition to amounts made available elsewhere in this Act, $1,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense to be available for payment to members of the uniformed services for reimbursement for mandatory pet quarantines as authorized by law.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8133. The Secretary of the Navy may transfer funds from any available Department of the Navy appropriation to any available Navy ship construction appropriation for the purpose of liquidating necessary ship cost changes for previous ship construction programs appropriated in law: Provided, That the Secretary may transfer not to exceed $300,000,000 under the authority provided by this section: Provided further, That the funding transferred shall be available for the same time period as the appropriation from which transferred: Provided further, That the Secretary may not transfer any funds until 30 days after the proposed transfer has been reported to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided by this section is in addition to any other transfer authority contained elsewhere in this Act.

SEC. 8134. In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $2,100,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $2,100,000 to the National D-Day Museum.

SEC. 8135. In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $5,000,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That the Secretary of the Army shall make available a grant of $5,000,000 only to the Chicago Public Schools for conversion and expansion of the former Eighth Regiment National Guard Armory (Bronzeville).

SEC. 8136. In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', to accelerate the disposal and scrapping of ships of the Navy Inactive Fleet and Maritime Administration National Defense Reserve Fleet: Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Transportation shall develop criteria for selecting ships for scrapping or disposal based on their potential for causing pollution, creating an environmental hazard and cost of storage: Provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Transportation shall report to the congressional defense committees no later than June 1, 2001 regarding the total number of vessels currently designated for scrapping, and the schedule and costs for scrapping these vessels.

SEC. 8137. Section 8106 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (titles I through VIII of the matter under subsection 101(b) of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–111, 10 U.S.C. 113 note) shall continue in effect to apply to disbursements that are made by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 8138. PRIVACY OF INDIVIDUAL MEDICAL RECORDS. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be used to transfer, release, disclose, or otherwise make available to any individual or entity outside the Department of Defense for any non-national security or non-law enforcement purposes an individual's medical records without the consent of the individual.

SEC. 8139. Of the amount available under title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'', $1,000,000 shall be available only for continuation of the Middle East Regional Security Issues program.

SEC. 8140. Of the funds available in title II under the heading ''OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE'', $20,000,000 may be available for information security initiatives: Provided, That, of such amount, $5,000,000 is available for the Institute for Defense Computer Security and Information Protection of the Department of Defense, and $15,000,000 is available for the Information Security Scholarship Program of the Department of Defense.

SEC. 8141. In addition to the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act, $5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2001, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That the Secretary

of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $5,000,000 to the American Red Cross for Armed Forces Emergency Services.

SEC. 8142. Of the amounts appropriated under title II under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $2,000,000 may be made available, subject to the enactment of authorizing legislation, for the Bosque Redondo Memorial in accordance with the provisions of title II of the bill S. 964 of the 106th Congress, as passed the Senate on November 19, 1999.

SEC. 8143. Of the funds provided within title I of this Act, such funds as may be necessary shall be available for a special subsistence allowance for members eligible to receive food stamp assistance, as authorized by law.

SEC. 8144. Section 8093 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79; 113 Stat. 1253) is amended by striking subsection (d), relating to a prohibition on the use of Department of Defense funds to procure a nuclear-capable shipyard crane from a foreign source.

SEC. 8145. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) from amounts made available for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force in this Act and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79), an aggregate amount of $99,700,000 (less any proportional general reduction required by law and any reduction required for the Small Business Innovative Research program) shall be available only for the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program; and

(2) the Secretary of the Air Force shall not be required to obligate funds for potential termination liability in connection with the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program.

SEC. 8146. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than $233,637,000 of the funds provided in this Act shall be available only for the Airborne Laser program.

SEC. 8147. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 106 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) Service as a member of the Alaska Territorial Guard during World War II of any individual who was honorably discharged therefrom under section 8147 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, shall be considered active duty for purposes of all laws administered by the Secretary.''.

(b) DISCHARGE.—(1) The Secretary of Defense shall issue to each individual who served as a member of the Alaska Territorial Guard during World War II a discharge from such service under honorable conditions if the Secretary determines that the nature and duration of the service of the individual so warrants.

(2) A discharge under paragraph (1) shall designate the date of discharge. The date of discharge shall be the date, as determined by the Secretary, of the termination of service of the individual concerned as described in that paragraph.

(c) PROHIBITION ON RETROACTIVE BENEFITS.—No benefits shall be paid to any individual for any period before the date of the enactment of this Act by reason of the enactment of this section.

SEC. 8148. UNITED STATES-CHINA SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION. Subject to authorization, there are hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended, to the United States-China Security Review Commission for fiscal year 2001 to carry out its functions.

SEC. 8149. Section 1621 of Public Law 92–204 (43 U.S.C. 1621), the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(m) LICENSES HELD BY ALASKA NATIVE REGIONAL CORPORATIONS.—An Alaska Native regional corporation organized pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, or an affiliate thereof, that holds a Federal Communications Commission license in the personal communications service as of the date of enactment of this section and has either paid for such license in full or has complied with the payment schedules for such license shall be permitted to transfer or assign without penalty such license to any transferee or assignee. No economic penalties shall apply to any transfer or assignment authorized under this section. Any amounts owed to the United States for the initial grant of such licenses shall become immediately due and payable upon the consummation of any such transfer or assignment. Any application for such a transfer or assignment shall be deemed granted if not denied by the Commission within 90 days of the date on which it was initially filed. Any provision of law or regulation to the contrary is hereby amended.''.

SEC. 8150. For purposes of implementing section 206(b) of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the limits provided in section 302(a)(3)(A) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply with respect to fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 8151. (a) DESIGNATION.—The consolidated operations center planned for construction at Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville, Alabama, to house the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command and for other purposes, shall be known and designated as the ''Wernher von Braun Complex''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the complex referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Wernher von Braun Complex''.

SEC. 8152. Of the funds provided in this Act under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' for the Pacific Disaster Center, $300,000 shall be made available for a grant, to be awarded not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, to the Circum-Pacific Council for the Crowding the Rim Summit Initiative.

SEC. 8153. Upon enactment of this Act, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(1) of Public Law 106–113) is amended under the heading ''Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account'' in the first paragraph by striking ''Provided, That of the total provided, $6,000,000 shall be available only for the cost of guaranteed loans under the New Markets Venture Capital program and shall become available for obligation only upon authorization of such program by the enactment of subsequent legislation in fiscal year 2000:''.

SEC. 8154. In addition to amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $1,650,000 is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense, only for a competitively awarded grant to a medical research institution for research among persons who served on active duty in the Southwest Asia theater of operations during the Persian Gulf War on (1) the possible health effect of exposure to low levels of hazardous chemicals, including chemical warfare agents and other substances, and (2) the individual susceptibility of humans to such exposure under environmentally controlled conditions.

SEC. 8155. In addition to the amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Defense shall make available a grant of $2,000,000 to the Oakland Military Institute, Oakland, California.

SEC. 8156. In addition to the amounts provided elsewhere in this Act, the amount of $10,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'' and shall be available to the Secretary of the Army, notwithstanding any other provision of law, only to be provided as a grant to the City of San Bernardino, California, contingent on the resolution of the case City of San Bernardino v. United States, pending as of July 1, 2000, in the United States District Court for the Central District of California (C.D. Cal. Case No. CV 96–8867).

SEC. 8157. The Secretary of Defense may transfer, at no cost, the title/ownership of the alloying material being stored at the Brownfield site in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania to the Bethlehem Development Corporation: Provided, That the net proceeds from the disposition of the materials are only for redevelopment of the Brownfield site.

SEC. 8158. In addition to amounts provided in this Act, $2,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ''Defense Health Program'', to remain available for obligation until expended: Provided, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, these funds shall be available only for a grant to the Fisher House Foundation, Inc., only for the construction and furnishing of additional Fisher Houses to meet the needs of military family members when confronted with the illness or hospitalization of an eligible military beneficiary.

SEC. 8159. The Office of Economic Adjustment may amend a grant awarded in 1998 to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for Industrial Modernization of Philadelphia Shipyard for the purpose of undertaking community economic adjustment activities to provide for the acquisition of equipment that would further the overall purpose of the grant: Provided, That such amendment shall not increase the grant period or the total amount of the grant award and shall be deemed, for all purposes, to be within the scope of the original grant.

SEC. 8160. The appropriation under the heading ''Defense Reinvestment for Economic Growth'' in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–50) is amended by striking ''that date'' and inserting ''December 1, 2004'': Provided, That the amendment, made by this section shall be effective as of July 2, 1993.

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 8161. In addition to the amounts appropriated elsewhere in this Act, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense: Provided, That not later than October 15, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall transfer these funds to the Department of Energy appropriation account ''Fossil Energy Research and Development'', only for a proposed conceptual design study to examine the feasibility of a zero emissions, steam injection process with possible applications for increased power generation efficiency, enhanced oil recovery and carbon sequestration.

SEC. 8162. Section 104 of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2000 (in title I, chapter 1, of division B of Public Law 106–246) is amended to read as follows: after ''Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army'', insert the following: '', to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002,''.

SEC. 8163. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $71,367,000, to reduce cost growth in consulting and advisory services and other contract growth, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $20,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $10,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $367,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $41,000,000.

SEC. 8164. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $92,700,000, to reduce excess funded carryover, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $40,500,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $52,200,000.

SEC. 8165. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, the total amount appropriated in this Act is hereby reduced by $159,076,000, to reduce growth in headquarters and administrative activities, to be distributed as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $56,700,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $12,376,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $90,000,000.

SEC. 8166. Of the amounts provided in title II of this Act, the following account is hereby reduced by the specified amount:

''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'', $1,100,000,000.

TITLE IX

ADDITIONAL FISCAL YEAR 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide additional emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the ''Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund'', $1,100,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the Secretary of Defense may transfer the funds provided herein only to appropriations for military personnel; operation and maintenance accounts; procurement; research, development, test and evaluation; the Defense Health Program; and to working capital funds: Provided further, That the funds transferred shall be merged with and shall be available for the same purposes and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which transferred: Provided further, That the transfer authority provided in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Defense: Provided further, That upon a determination that all or part of the funds transferred from this appropriation are not necessary for the purposes provided herein, such amounts may be transferred back to this appropriation: Provided further, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: Provided further, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined by such Act, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 9001. (a) In addition to amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense elsewhere in this Act, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79), and the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–246), there is hereby appropriated to the Department of Defense $679,000,000, as follows:

(1) For military personnel accounts, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, $50,000,000, only for ''Military Personnel, Navy''.

(2) For operation and maintenance accounts, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, $529,000,000, as follows:

(i) For depot-level maintenance and repair, $234,000,000, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $50,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $162,000,000 (of which $20,000,000 is for aviation depot maintenance and $142,000,000 for ship depot maintenance);

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $22,000,000.

(ii) For readiness spares kits, $45,000,000, only for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force''.

(iii) For real property maintenance, $250,000,000, as follows:

''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $70,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $70,000,000;

''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $40,000,000; and

''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $70,000,000.

(3) For the Defense Health Program, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2001, $100,000,000.

(b) EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—The entire amount made available in this section—

(1) is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; and

(2) shall be available only if the President transmits to the Congress an official budget request for $679,000,000, which includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

SEC. 9002. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated by this title, or made available by the transfer of funds in this title, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414).

This Act may be cited as the ''Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001''.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JERRY LEWIS,
BILL YOUNG,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVE HOBSON,
HENRY BONILLA,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr.,
RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
JAY DICKEY,
RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
MARTIN OLAV SABO,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
JAMES P. MORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
JUDD GREGG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
ERNEST HOLLINGS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
TOM HARKIN,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4576), making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The conference agreement on the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, incorporates some of the provisions of both the House and Senate versions of the bill. The language and allocations set forth in House Report 106–644 and Senate Report 106–298 should be complied with unless specifically addressed in the accompanying bill and statement of the managers to the contrary.

Senate Amendment: The Senate deleted the entire House bill after the enacting clause and inserted the Senate bill. The conference agreement includes a revised bill.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

The conferees agree that for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–177) as amended by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Reaffirmation Act of 1987 (Public Law 100–119) and by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–508), the term program, project, and activity for appropriations contained in this Act shall be defined as the most specific level of budget items identified in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2001, the accompanying House and Senate Committee reports, the conference report and accompanying joint explanatory statement of the managers of the Committee of Conference, the related classified annexes and reports, and the P–1 and R–1 budget justification documents as subsequently modified by Congressional action. The following exception to the above definition shall apply:

For the Military Personnel and the Operation and Maintenance accounts, the term ''program, project, and activity'' is defined as the appropriations accounts contained in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act. At the time the President submits his budget for fiscal year 2002, the conferees direct the Department of Defense to transmit to the congressional defense committees budget justification documents to be known as the ''M–1'' and ''O–1'' which shall identify, at the budget activity, activity group, and subactivity group level, the amounts requested by the President to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance in any budget request, or amended budget request, for fiscal year 2002.

CONGRESSIONAL SPECIAL INTEREST ITEMS

The conferees direct that projects for which funds are provided as indicated in the tables or paragraphs of the Conference Report in any appropriation account are special interest items for the purpose of preparation of the DD Form 1414. The conferees also direct that the funding adjustments outlined in the tables shall be provided only for the specific purposes outlined in the table.

TITLE I -- MILITARY PERSONNEL

The conferees agree to the following amounts for the Military Personnel accounts:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Active Personnel:				
Army	22,198,457	22,242,457	22,173,929	22,175,357
Navy	17,742,897	17,799,297	17,877,215	17,772,297
Marine Corps.....	6,822,300	6,818,300	6,831,373	6,833,100
Air Force	18,282,834	18,238,234	18,110,764	18,174,284
Reserve Personnel:				
Army	2,433,880	2,463,320	2,458,961	2,473,001
Navy	1,528,385	1,566,095	1,539,490	1,576,174
Marine Corps	436,386	440,886	446,586	448,886
Air Force	981,710	980,610	963,752	971,024
National Guard Personnel:				
Army.....	3,747,636	3,719,336	3,781,236	3,782,536
Air Force	1,627,181	1,635,681	1,634,181	1,641,081
Total, Military Personnel	75,801,666	75,904,216	75,817,487	75,847,740

ITEMS ADDRESSED IN SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS

The recently passed Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–246), included the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 for the Department of Defense. This Supplemental addressed shortfalls in military personnel, recruiting, advertising, and retention by providing a total of $134,400,000 in the Military Personnel accounts, and $373,000,000 in the Operation and Maintenance accounts. In this Act, the conferees have agreed to include a total of $50,000,000 for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', also designated as emergency supplemental appropriations in Title IX of this Act.

PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION SAVINGS

The conferees recommended a total reduction of $243,800,000 to the Active Military Personnel accounts due to lower than budgeted fiscal year 2000 end strengths, and differences in the actual grade mix of officers and enlisted recommended in the budget request. The General Accounting Office estimates that the active components will have approximately 3,500 fewer personnel on board to begin fiscal year 2001, and as a result, the fiscal year 2001 pay and allowances requirements for personnel are incorrect and the budgets overstated.

Force Structure Changes

The conferees recommend a total of $160,000,000 in the Military Personnel and Operation and Maintenance accounts for force structure that was not included in the budget request, as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	MILPERS	O&M	PROC.	TOTAL
Navy USS HOUSTON Submarine.....	3,500	---	---	3,500
Navy Recruiter Manning	15,000	---	---	15,000
Air Force B-52 aircraft.....	3,200	36,900	25,100	65,200
Army Reserve Full-Time Support.....	10,000	20,500	---	30,500
Marine Corps Reserve Active Reserve	1,900	---	---	1,900
Air Force Reserve AGR's RED HORSE.....	400	1,800	---	2,200
Air Force Reserve Recruiters.....	1,700	---	---	1,700
Army National Guard Full-Time Support ..	17,500	20,500	---	38,000
Air National Guard Full-Time Support.....	2,000	---	---	2,000
Totals	55,200	79,700	25,100	160,000

Active End Strength
(Fiscal Year 2001)

	Budget	Conference	Conference vs. Budget
Army	480,000	480,000	---
Navy	372,000	372,642	+642
Marine Corps	172,600	172,600	---
Air Force	357,000	357,000	---
Total, Active Personnel.....	1,381,600	1,382,242	+642

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY				
100 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 150 BASIC PAY	3,762,693	3,762,693	3,762,693	3,762,693
200 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,113,757	1,113,757	1,113,757	1,113,757
350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	659,623	659,623	659,623	659,623
400 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	149,691	149,691	149,691	149,691
450 INCENTIVE PAYS	80,787	80,787	80,787	80,787
500 SPECIAL PAYS	200,661	200,661	200,661	200,661
550 ALLOWANCES	66,874	66,874	66,874	66,874
600 SEPARATION PAY	66,100	66,100	66,100	66,100
650 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	286,086	286,086	286,086	286,086
700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	6,386,272	6,386,272	6,386,272	6,386,272
750 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL 800 BASIC PAY	8,107,923	8,107,923	8,107,923	8,107,923
850 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	2,399,945	2,399,945	2,399,945	2,399,945
1000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,314,050	1,314,050	1,314,050	1,314,050
1050 INCENTIVE PAYS	68,203	68,203	68,203	68,203
1100 SPECIAL PAYS	368,377	439,377	436,377	401,377
1150 ALLOWANCES	404,783	404,783	404,783	404,783

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1200 SEPARATION PAY	264,275	264,275	264,275	264,275
1250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	613,669	613,669	613,669	613,669
1300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	13,541,225	13,612,225	13,609,225	13,574,225
1350 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS 1400 ACADEMY CADETS	41,697	41,697	41,697	41,697
1500 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL 1550 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	800,746	800,746	800,746	800,746
1600 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	395,151	395,151	395,151	395,151
1650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	1,195,897	1,195,897	1,195,897	1,195,897
1700 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL 1750 ACCESSION TRAVEL	133,294	133,294	133,294	133,294
1800 TRAINING TRAVEL	39,345	39,345	39,345	39,345
1850 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	145,814	145,814	145,814	145,814
1900 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	545,458	545,458	545,458	545,458
1950 SEPARATION TRAVEL	164,494	164,494	164,494	164,494
2000 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	1,517	1,517	1,517	1,517
2050 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	33,033	33,033	33,033	33,033
2100 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	28,469	28,469	28,469	28,469
2160 EXCESS PCS REQUIREMENTS	---	---	-22,000	---
2200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	1,091,424	1,091,424	1,069,424	1,091,424
2250 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS 2300 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	946	946	946	946
2350 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	216	216	216	216
2400 DEATH GRATUITIES	2,856	2,856	2,856	2,856
2450 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	86,391	84,291	84,663	84,291
2500 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	7,042	7,042	7,042	7,042
2550 EDUCATION BENEFITS	20,700	20,700	20,700	20,700
2600 ADOPTION EXPENSES	252	252	252	252
2650 OTHER	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
2700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	123,203	121,103	121,475	121,103
2750 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-181,261	-181,261	-181,261	-181,261
2770 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-24,900	-68,800	-68,800
2805 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	12,800	---	12,800
2815 BAH OUT-OF-POCKET HOUSING COSTS	---	10,200	---	---
2820 DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	---	2,000	---	2,000
2825 UNOBLIGATED/UNEXPENDED FUND BALANCES	---	-25,000	---	---
2840 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY	22,198,457	22,242,457	22,173,929	22,175,357

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel	
1100 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	20,000
1100 Special Pays/Loan Repayment Program	6,000
1100 Special Pays/Special Duty Assignment Pay	7,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs:	
2450 Unemployment Benefits	–2,100
Undistributed:	
2770 Personnel Underexecution	-68,800
2805 Basic Allowance for Housing	12,800
2820 Dislocation Allowance	2,000

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
2850 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY				
2900 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER 2950 BASIC PAY	2,607,730	2,607,730	2,607,730	2,607,730
3000 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	771,888	771,888	771,888	771,888
3150 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	579,923	579,923	579,923	579,923
3200 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	102,700	102,700	102,700	102,700
3250 INCENTIVE PAYS	151,054	151,054	151,054	151,054
3300 SPECIAL PAYS	225,670	225,670	232,670	225,670
3350 ALLOWANCES	68,361	68,361	68,361	68,361
3400 SEPARATION PAY	50,921	50,921	50,921	50,921
3450 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	195,639	195,639	195,639	195,639
3500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	4,753,886	4,753,886	4,760,886	4,753,886
3550 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL 3600 BASIC PAY	6,491,397	6,491,397	6,491,397	6,491,397
3650 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,919,086	1,919,086	1,919,086	1,919,086
3800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,494,544	1,494,544	1,515,544	1,494,544
3850 INCENTIVE PAYS	91,992	91,992	91,992	91,992
3900 SPECIAL PAYS	617,996	641,496	777,996	643,996
3950 ALLOWANCES	415,302	415,302	415,302	415,302
4000 SEPARATION PAY	129,091	129,091	129,091	129,091
4050 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	493,333	493,333	493,333	493,333
4100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	11,652,741	11,676,241	11,833,741	11,678,741

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
4150 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MIDSHIPMEN				
4200 MIDSHIPMEN	38,990	38,990	38,990	38,990
4300 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL				
4350 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	527,447	527,447	527,447	527,447
4400 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	294,417	294,417	294,417	294,417
4450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	821,864	821,864	821,864	821,864
4500 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL				
4550 ACCESSION TRAVEL	55,107	55,107	55,107	55,107
4600 TRAINING TRAVEL	44,108	44,108	44,108	44,108
4650 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	149,713	149,713	149,713	149,713
4700 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	209,121	209,121	209,121	209,121
4750 SEPARATION TRAVEL	120,679	120,679	120,679	120,679
4800 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	16,409	16,409	16,409	16,409
4850 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	14,401	14,401	14,401	14,401
4900 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	6,118	6,118	6,118	6,118
4950 OTHER	4,780	4,780	4,780	4,780
4955 EXCESS PCS REQUIREMENTS	---	---	-12,500	---
5000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	620,436	620,436	607,936	620,436
5050 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS				
5100 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	853	853	853	853
5150 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	200	200	200	200
5200 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
5250 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	59,115	57,715	57,933	57,715
5300 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	2,919	2,919	2,919	2,919
5350 EDUCATION BENEFITS	6,823	6,823	6,823	6,823
5400 ADOPTION EXPENSES	272	272	272	272
5470 OTHER	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
5500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	73,482	72,082	72,300	72,082
5550 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-218,502	-218,502	-218,502	-218,502
5580 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	---	-40,000	-20,000
5610 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	4,300	---	4,300
5625 USS HOUSTON MANNING	---	3,500	---	3,500
5630 ADDITIONAL RECRUITER MANNING	---	15,000	---	15,000
5631 BAH OUT-OF-POCKET HOUSING COSTS	---	9,500	---	---
5632 DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	---	2,000	---	2,000
5640 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY	17,742,897	17,799,297	17,877,215	17,772,297

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel		
3900	Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses....	20,000
3900	Special Pays/Special Duty Assignment Pay	6,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs		
5250	Unemployment Benefits.....	–1,400
Undistributed:		
5580	Personnel Underexecution	-20,000
5610	Basic Allowance for Housing	4,300
5625	USS HOUSTON Manning.....	3,500
5630	Additional Recruiter Manning	15,000
5632	Dislocation Allowance	2,000

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
5650 MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
5700 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER				
5750 BASIC PAY	858,648	858,648	858,648	858,648
5800 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	254,157	254,157	254,157	254,157
5950 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	155,678	155,678	155,678	155,678
6000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	34,653	34,653	34,653	34,653
6050 INCENTIVE PAYS	41,292	41,292	41,292	41,292
6100 SPECIAL PAYS	1,561	1,561	1,561	1,561
6150 ALLOWANCES	23,743	23,743	23,743	23,743
6200 SEPARATION PAY	12,793	12,793	12,793	12,793
6250 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	65,978	65,978	65,978	65,978
6300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,448,503	1,448,503	1,448,503	1,448,503
6350 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL				
6400 BASIC PAY	2,879,975	2,879,975	2,879,975	2,879,975
6450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	850,513	850,513	850,513	850,513
6600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	428,605	428,605	428,605	428,605
6650 INCENTIVE PAYS	8,356	8,356	8,356	8,356
6700 SPECIAL PAYS	92,617	100,617	122,217	118,217
6750 ALLOWANCES	177,333	177,333	177,333	177,333
6800 SEPARATION PAY	57,341	57,341	57,341	57,341
6850 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	219,995	219,995	219,995	219,995
6900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	4,714,735	4,722,735	4,744,335	4,740,335

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conference
6950 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL					
7000 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	259,333	259,333	259,333	259,333	
7050 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	161,385	161,385	161,385	161,385	
7100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	420,718	420,718	420,718	420,718	
7150 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL					
7200 ACCESSION TRAVEL	32,319	32,319	32,319	32,319	
7250 TRAINING TRAVEL	6,806	6,806	6,806	6,806	
7300 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	65,212	65,212	65,212	65,212	
7350 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	73,675	73,675	73,675	73,675	
7400 SEPARATION TRAVEL	46,950	46,950	46,950	46,950	
7450 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	1,031	1,031	1,031	1,031	
7500 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	4,473	4,473	4,473	4,473	
7550 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	5,941	5,941	5,941	5,941	
7600 OTHER	1,765	1,765	1,765	1,765	
7610 EXCESS PCS REQUIREMENTS	---	---	-5,000	---	
7650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	238,172	238,172	233,172	238,172	
7700 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS					
7750 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	905	905	905	905	
7800 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	15	15	15	15	
7850 DEATH GRATUITIES	942	942	942	942	
7900 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	26,328	25,628	25,801	25,628	
7950 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400	
8000 EDUCATION BENEFITS	1,631	1,631	1,631	1,631	
8050 ADOPTION EXPENSES	47	47	47	47	
8120 OTHER	500	500	500	500	
8150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	31,768	31,068	31,241	31,068	
8200 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-31,596	-31,596	-31,596	-31,596	
8230 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-8,100	-15,000	---	
8255 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	1,500	---	1,500	
8260 MARINE CORPS EXECUTION REPRICING	---	-8,000	---	-16,100	
8265 BAH OUT-OF-POCKET HOUSING COSTS	---	2,800	---	---	
8270 DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	---	500	---	500	
8290 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS	6,822,300	6,818,300	6,831,373	6,833,100	

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel	
6700 Special Pays/Enlistment Bonuses	2,000
6700 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	13,000
6700 Special Pays/Marine Corps College Fund	6,600
6700 Special Pays/Special Duty Assignment Pay	4,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs	
7900 Unemployment Benefits	-700
Undistributed:	
8255 Basic Allowance for Housing	1,500
8260 Marine Corps Execution Repricing	-16,100
8270 Dislocation Allowance	500

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
8300 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
8350 ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICER				
8400 BASIC PAY	3,473,866	3,473,866	3,473,866	3,473,866
8450 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,028,264	1,028,264	1,028,264	1,028,264
8600 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	637,900	637,900	637,900	637,900
8650 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	135,485	135,485	135,485	135,485
8700 INCENTIVE PAYS	304,250	304,250	295,500	295,500
8750 SPECIAL PAYS	196,975	196,975	196,975	196,975
8800 ALLOWANCES	65,445	65,445	65,445	65,445
8850 SEPARATION PAY	112,077	112,077	112,077	112,077
8900 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	262,956	262,956	262,956	262,956
8950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	6,217,218	6,217,218	6,208,468	6,208,468
9000 ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL				
9050 BASIC PAY	6,228,883	6,228,883	6,228,883	6,228,883
9100 RETIRED PAY ACCRUAL	1,843,749	1,843,749	1,843,749	1,843,749
9250 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	1,197,616	1,197,616	1,197,616	1,197,616
9300 INCENTIVE PAYS	36,737	36,737	36,737	36,737
9350 SPECIAL PAYS	274,776	311,276	321,276	313,776
9400 ALLOWANCES	347,371	347,371	347,371	347,371
9450 SEPARATION PAY	97,901	97,901	97,901	97,901
9500 SOCIAL SECURITY TAX	476,510	476,510	476,510	476,510
9550 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	10,503,543	10,540,043	10,550,043	10,542,543

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9600 ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS				
9650 ACADEMY CADETS	38,493	38,493	38,493	38,493
9750 ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL				
9800 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR SUBSISTENCE	691,392	691,392	691,392	691,392
9850 SUBSISTENCE-IN-KIND	110,450	110,450	110,450	110,450
9900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	801,842	801,842	801,842	801,842
9950 ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL				
10000 ACCESSION TRAVEL	59,407	59,407	59,407	59,407
10050 TRAINING TRAVEL	58,707	58,707	58,707	58,707
10100 OPERATIONAL TRAVEL	142,829	142,829	142,829	142,829
10150 ROTATIONAL TRAVEL	440,651	440,651	440,651	440,651
10200 SEPARATION TRAVEL	103,090	103,090	103,090	103,090
10250 TRAVEL OF ORGANIZED UNITS	5,963	5,963	5,963	5,963
10300 NON-TEMPORARY STORAGE	21,363	21,363	21,363	21,363
10350 TEMPORARY LODGING EXPENSE	36,712	36,712	36,712	36,712
10400 OTHER	2,727	2,727	2,727	2,727
10405 EXCESS PCS REQUIREMENTS	---	---	-17,500	---
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 5	871,449	871,449	853,949	871,449
10500 ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS				
10550 APPREHENSION OF MILITARY DESERTERS	100	100	100	100
10600 INTEREST ON UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS	595	595	595	595
10650 DEATH GRATUITIES	1,506	1,506	1,506	1,506
10700 UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS	26,010	25,410	25,490	25,410
10750 SURVIVOR BENEFITS	3,475	3,475	3,475	3,475
10800 EDUCATION BENEFITS	4,076	4,076	4,076	4,076
10850 ADOPTION EXPENSES	800	800	800	800
10920 OTHER	3,642	3,642	3,642	3,642
10950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 6	40,204	39,604	39,684	39,604
11000 LESS REIMBURSABLES	-189,915	-189,915	-189,915	-189,915
11020 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-59,600	-195,000	-155,000
11030 B-52 FORCE STRUCTURE	---	---	3,200	3,200
11080 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING	---	12,100	---	12,100
11115 UNOBLIGATED/UNEXPENDED FUND BALANCES	---	-42,000	---	---
11120 BAH OUT-OF-POCKET HOUSING COSTS	---	7,500	---	---
11125 DISLOCATION ALLOWANCE	---	1,500	---	1,500
11140 TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE	18,282,834	18,238,234	18,110,764	18,174,284

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Pay and Allowances of Officer	
8700 Incentive Pays/Excess Aviation Continuation Pay....	–8,750
Budget Activity 2: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel	
9350 Special Pays/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses.....	29,000
9350 Special Pays/Special Duty Assignment Pay.....	4,000
9350 Special Pays/Loan Repayment Program	6,000
Budget Activity 6: Other Military Personnel Costs	
10700 Unemployment Benefits	-600
Undistributed:	
11020 Personnel Underexecution	-155,000
11030 B-52 Force Structure	3,200
11080 Basic Allowance for Housing	12,100
11125 Dislocation Allowance	1,500

National Guard and Reserve Forces

The conferees agree to provide $10,892,702,000 in Reserve Personnel appropriations, $11,398,892,000 in Operation and Maintenance appropriations, and $100,000,000 in the National Guard and Reserve Equipment appropriation. These funds support a Selected Reserve end strength of 866,338 as shown below.

Selected Reserve End Strength
(Fiscal Year 2001)

	Budget	Conference	Conference vs. Budget
Selected Reserve:			
Army Reserve.....	205,000	205,300	+300
Navy Reserve	88,900	88,900	---
Marine Corps Reserve.....	39,500	39,558	+58
Air Force Reserve	74,300	74,470	+170
Army National Guard.....	350,000	350,088	+88
Air National Guard.....	108,000	108,022	+22
Total	865,700	866,338	+638
AGR/TARS:			
Army Reserve	12,806	13,106	+300
Navy Reserve	14,649	14,649	---
Marine Corps Reserve.....	2,203	2,261	+58
Air Force Reserve	1,278	1,336	+58
Army National Guard.....	22,448	22,974	+526
Air National Guard.....	11,148	11,170	+22
Total	64,532	65,496	+964
Technicians:			
Army Reserve	6,444	7,094	+650
Air Force Reserve	9,733	9,733	---
Army National Guard	23,957	24,728	+771
Air National Guard	22,547	22,547	---
Total	62,681	64,102	+1,421

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
11150 RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY				
11200 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING 11250 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	964,427	964,427	984,008	981,008
11300 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	36,479	36,479	36,479	36,479
11350 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	145,204	145,204	143,204	143,204
11400 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	12,156	12,156	12,156	12,156
11500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,158,266	1,158,266	1,175,847	1,172,847
11550 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT 11600 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	13,604	13,604	13,604	13,604
11650 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	106,286	106,286	106,286	106,286
11700 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	90,982	90,982	90,982	90,982
11750 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	912,447	924,847	909,947	909,947
11800 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	40,773	40,773	50,773	50,773
11850 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	65,624	65,624	65,624	65,624
11900 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.....	24,896	24,896	24,896	24,896
11950 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	21,002	21,002	21,002	21,002
12000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	1,275,614	1,288,014	1,283,114	1,283,114
12020 FULL TIME SUPPORT/AGR'S.....	---	10,000	---	10,000
12045 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	1,300	---	1,300
12055 COLLEGE FIRST PROGRAM.....	---	5,000	---	5,000
12060 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	---	740	---	740
12090 TOTAL RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	2,433,880	2,463,320	2,458,961	2,473,001

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training	
11250 Pay Group A Training/Annual Training	8,000
11250 Pay Group A Training/Additional Training Periods/RMPs	2,000
11250 Pay Group A Training/IDT for Military Funeral Honors	2,700
11250 Pay Group A Training/Inactive Duty Training	4,000
11250 Pay Group A Training/Excess Annual Training, Travel	-119
11350 Pay Group F Training/Initial Active Duty for Training	-2,000
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support	
11750 Administration and Support/Excess PCS Requirements	-2,500
11800 Education Benefits/MGIB Shortfall	3,000
11800 Education Benefits/MGIB Kicker	7,000
Undistributed:	
12020 Full Time Support/AGRs	10,000
12045 JROTC Program	1,300
12055 College First Program	5,000
12060 Basic Allowance for Housing	740

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12100 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY				
12150 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
12200 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	635,712	635,712	647,634	642,057
12350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	635,712	635,712	647,634	642,057
12400 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
12450 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	3,590	3,590	3,590	3,590
12500 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	6,599	6,599	8,599	9,599
12550 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	31,027	31,027	31,027	31,027
12600 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	790,101	790,101	786,651	789,101
12650 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	5,538	5,538	7,272	7,272
12700 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	30,855	30,855	30,855	30,855
12750 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.....	24,147	24,147	23,046	24,147
12800 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	816	816	816	816
12820 TOTAL BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	892,673	892,673	891,856	896,407
12880 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	600	---	600
12895 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	---	310	---	310
12900 CINC ACTIVE DUTY FOR TRAINING.....	---	13,400	---	13,400
12910 ANNUAL TRAINING.....	---	23,400	---	23,400
12940 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY.....	1,528,385	1,566,095	1,539,490	1,576,174

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training		
12200	Pay Group A Training/Additional Training Periods/RMPs.....	4,000
12200	Pay Group A Training/ IDT for Military Funeral Honors.....	1,000
12200	Pay Group A Training/Unjustified Subsistence	-155
12200	Pay Group A Training/Inactive Duty Training	1,500
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support		
12500	School Training/Active Duty Training	3,000
12600	Administration and Support/Excess PCS Requirements.....	-2,000
12600	Administration and Support/Active Duty for Special Work.....	1,000
12650	Education Benefits/MGIB Kicker	1,734
Undistributed:		
12880	JROTC Program	600
12895	Basic Allowance for Housing	310
12900	CINC Active Duty for Training	13,400
12910	Annual Training	23,400

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12950 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS				
13000 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
13050 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	162,444	162,444	166,444	166,444
13100 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	18,056	18,056	18,056	18,056
13150 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	63,940	63,940	63,940	63,940
13200 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	257	257	257	257
13300 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	244,697	244,697	248,697	248,697
13350 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
13400 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	2,124	2,124	2,124	2,124
13450 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	9,823	9,823	9,823	9,823
13500 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	23,590	23,590	24,590	23,590
13550 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	123,440	123,440	127,640	125,740
13600 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	16,364	16,364	17,364	17,364
13650 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
13700 OTHER PROGRAMS.....	11,992	11,992	11,992	11,992
13750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	191,689	191,689	197,889	194,989
13780 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	300	---	300
13795 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION.....	---	-700	---	---
13800 ACTIVE DUTY FOR SPECIAL WORK.....	---	3,000	---	3,000
13805 ACTIVE RESERVE PERSONNEL REASSESSMENT.....	---	1,900	---	1,900
13840 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS.....	436,386	440,886	446,586	448,886

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training
13050 Pay Group A Training/Additional Training Periods/RMPs..... 1,000
13050 Pay Group A Training/IDT Training for Military Funeral Honors..1,000
13050 Pay Group A Training/Annual Training 2,000
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support
13550 Administration and Support/Enlistment Bonuses..... ..1,000
13550 Administration and Support/Selective Reenlistment Bonuses..... 1,000
13550 Administration and Support/Affiliation Bonuses 300
13600 Education Benefits/MGIB Kicker 1,000
Undistributed:
13780 JROTC Program 300
13800 Active Duty for Special Work 3,000
13805 Active Reserve Personnel Reassessment 1,900

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
13850 RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
13900 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
13950 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	469,020	469,020	449,471	449,471
14000 PAY GROUP B TRAINING (BACKFILL FOR ACTIVE DUTY).....	86,281	86,281	86,281	86,281
14050 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	11,683	11,683	11,683	11,683
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	566,984	566,984	547,435	547,435
14200 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
14250 MOBILIZATION TRAINING.....	2,921	2,921	2,921	2,921
14300 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	71,671	71,671	71,671	71,671
14350 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	150,670	150,670	150,670	150,670
14400 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	116,583	116,583	118,090	114,340
14450 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	6,751	6,751	12,251	12,251
14500 ROTC - SENIOR, JUNIOR, SCHOLARSHIP.....	41,248	41,248	41,248	41,248
14550 HEALTH PROFESSION SCHOLARSHIP.....	24,882	24,882	24,882	24,882
14600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	414,726	414,726	421,733	417,983
14610 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION.....	---	-8,100	---	---
14626 JROTC PROGRAM.....	---	1,200	---	1,200
14640 AGR PILOT BONUS.....	---	3,700	---	3,750
14645 RED HORSE UNIT.....	---	400	---	400
14650 ADDITIONAL RECRUITER MANNING.....	---	1,700	---	1,700
14655 MISPRICED CY01 PAY RAISE.....	---	---	-1,444	-1,444
14660 UNJUSTIFIED PROGRAM GROWTH.....	---	---	-3,972	---
14690 TOTAL, RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	981,710	980,610	963,752	971,024

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Unit and Individual Training	
13950 Pay Group A Training/Budget Re-estimation	-1,671
13950 Pay Group A Training/IDT Training for Military Funeral Honors	1,380
13950 Pay Group A Training/Active Duty Training, Travel	-19,258
Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support	
14400 Administration and Support/Budget Re-estimation	-1,139
14400 Administration and Support/Excess PCS Requirements	–1,104
14450 Education Benefits/MGIB Kicker	5,500
Undistributed:	
14626 JROTC Program	1,200
14640 AGR Pilot Program	3,750
14645 RED HORSE Unit	400
14650 Additional Recruiter Manning	1,700
14655 Mispriced CY01 Pay Raise	-1,444

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
14700 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY				
14750 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
14800 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	1,693,915	1,693,915	1,693,915	1,693,915
14850 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	215,641	215,641	215,641	215,641
14900 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	13,411	13,411	13,411	13,411
15000 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	1,922,967	1,922,967	1,922,967	1,922,967
15050 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15100 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	150,995	150,995	165,995	165,995
15150 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	63,907	63,907	63,907	63,907
15200 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	1,556,056	1,568,056	1,556,056	1,556,056
15250 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	53,711	53,711	53,711	53,711
15350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	1,824,669	1,836,669	1,839,669	1,839,669
15360 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION.....	---	-36,100	---	---
15390 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT (AGR).....	---	23,500	17,500	17,500
15420 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	---	1,300	---	1,300
15430 UNOBLIGATED/UNEXPENDED FUND BALANCES.....	---	-29,000	---	---
15440 EMERGENCY SPILL RESPONSE PROGRAM.....	---	---	1,100	1,100
15445 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY.....	3,747,636	3,719,336	3,781,236	3,782,536

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 2: Other Training and Support	
15100 School Training/Advanced Training Shortfall	15,000
Undistributed:	
15390 Additional Full-Time Support (AGR)	17,500
15420 Basic Allowance for Housing	1,300
15440 Emergency Spill Response Program	1,100

Fixed Wing Aviation Requirements

The Chief of the National Guard Bureau is Directed to conduct a study of the future fixed wing aviation requirements of the Army National Guard to deploy and sustain requirements for the assured success of planned missions such as Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and National Missile Defense (NMD), and report back to the Committees on Appropriations by December 1, 2000.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
15450 NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE				
15500 ACTIVITY 1: UNIT AND INDIVIDUAL TRAINING				
15550 PAY GROUP A TRAINING (15 DAYS & DRILLS 24/48).....	687,174	687,174	687,174	687,174
15600 PAY GROUP F TRAINING (RECRUITS).....	32,814	32,814	32,814	32,814
15650 PAY GROUP P TRAINING (PIPELINE RECRUITS).....	1,949	1,949	1,949	1,949
15750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1.....	721,937	721,937	721,937	721,937
15800 ACTIVITY 2: OTHER TRAINING AND SUPPORT				
15850 SCHOOL TRAINING.....	104,409	104,409	104,409	104,409
15900 SPECIAL TRAINING.....	64,746	64,746	64,746	64,746
15950 ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT.....	722,726	722,726	722,726	722,726
16000 EDUCATION BENEFITS.....	13,363	13,363	13,363	13,363
16100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2.....	905,244	905,244	905,244	905,244
16120 PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION.....	---	-900	---	---
16135 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT (AGR).....	---	---	2,000	2,000
16155 BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING.....	---	700	---	700
16160 AGR PILOT BONUS.....	---	8,700	---	8,700
16170 AVIATION CONTINUATION PAY.....	---	---	5,000	2,500
16200 TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE.....	1,627,181	1,635,681	1,634,181	1,641,081

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Undistributed:		
16135	Additional Full-Time Support (AGR)	2,000
16155	Basic Allowance for Housing	700
16160	AGR Pilot Bonus	8,700
16170	Aviation Continuation Pay	2,500

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

A summary of the conference agreement on the items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conferenc
50000	RECAPITULATION				
50050	O & M, ARMY	19,073,731	19,386,843	19,049,881	19,144,431
50100	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000
50150	O & M, NAVY	23,250,154	23,426,830	23,398,254	23,419,360
50200	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000
50250	O & M, MARINE CORPS	2,705,658	2,813,091	2,729,758	2,778,758
50300	O & M, AIR FORCE	22,296,977	22,316,797	22,268,977	22,383,521
50350	TRANSFER - STOCKPILE	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000
50400	O & M, DEFENSEWIDE	11,920,069	11,803,743	11,991,688	11,844,480
50500	O & M, ARMY RESERVE	1,521,418	1,596,418	1,529,418	1,562,118
50550	O & M, NAVY RESERVE	960,946	992,646	968,946	978,946
50600	O & M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	133,959	145,959	141,159	145,959
50650	O & M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,885,859	1,921,659	1,893,859	1,903,659
50700	O & M, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	3,182,335	3,263,235	3,330,535	3,333,835
50750	O & M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,446,375	3,480,375	3,481,775	3,474,375

(In thousands of dollars)

		Budget	House	Senate	Conference
50790	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND.....	4,100,577	4,100,577	4,100,577	3,938,777
50800	UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES...	8,574	8,574	8,574	8,574
50850	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY.....	389,932	389,932	389,932	389,932
50900	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY.....	294,038	294,038	294,038	294,038
50950	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE.....	376,300	376,300	376,300	376,300
51000	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE.....	23,412	23,412	21,412	21,412
51050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES	186,499	196,499	231,499	231,499
51200	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID.....	64,900	56,900	55,900	55,900
51300	FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION.....	458,400	433,400	458,400	443,400
51350	PENTAGON RENOVATION TRANSFER FUND.....	---	---	---	---
51450	QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE.....	---	480,000	---	160,500
51600	GRAND TOTAL, O & M.....	96,280,113	97,507,228	96,720,882	96,889,774
51650	TRANSFERS.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
51700	TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE, O & M.....	96,430,113	97,657,228	96,870,882	97,039,774

ADDITIONAL READINESS FUNDING TO ADDRESS SERVICE SHORTFALLS

The conferees note that, in addition to the funding recommended in title II of this Act, the conference agreement includes additional fiscal year 2000 emergency supplemental appropriations in title IX, reflecting critical readiness shortfalls identified by the Chiefs of the Military Departments and addressed by the House during its consideration of H.R. 1398 (Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for fiscal year 2000). These emergency appropriations include $529,000,000 in the services' Operation and Maintenance accounts, including $234,000,000 for depot maintenance, $250,000,000 for real property maintenance, and $45,000,000 for readiness spares kits.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

The conferees direct the Secretary of Defense to provide the Appropriations Committees and the General Accounting Office reports identifying contingency related expenses no later than 30 days after the end of each month for which contingency costs are incurred.

BIOMETRICS INFORMATION ASSURANCE

The Conferees include in this Title of the bill $7,000,000 for Army, $3,000,000 for Navy, and $3,000,000 for Air Force, and include $12,000,000 in Title III of the bill for Army, all to support the efforts of Army as Executive Agent to lead, consolidate, and coordinate all biometrics information assurance programs of the Department of Defense (DoD), pursuant to the June 12, 2000 United States Army Report on the Biometrics Project (Report) prepared at the request of the Committees on Appropriations, and direct that the near-term and long-term implementation plan defined in the Report be implemented.

Recognizing the concerns expressed in the Report and elsewhere regarding social and legal issues associated with the uses of biometrics in the Government and private sectors, the Conferees support a comprehensive, in-depth legal and social assessment of the issues associated with the current and near-term uses of biometrics in the United States, to include plans for long-term monitoring of human biometrics uses, which are expected to increase substantially, and further recommend that this assessment be initiated as soon as practicable, pursuant to the Report.

To reduce lease costs and to support operating capability of the Biometrics Fusion Center by Fiscal Year (FY) 2004, the Conference recommended that the funds appropriated for this program in FY 2000 be made available immediately to develop specifications and requirements, not later than June 30, 2001, for the acquisition, via lease, of space suitable for the Biometrics Fusion Center Final Operating Capability in acordance with the Report.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY				
150 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
200 LAND FORCES				
250 DIVISIONS	1,174,856	1,177,856	1,179,856	1,177,856
300 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	321,297	321,297	321,297	321,297
350 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	350,844	350,844	350,844	350,844
400 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	503,390	503,390	503,390	503,390
450 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	980,512	980,512	980,512	980,512
500 LAND FORCES READINESS				
550 FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,144,565	1,151,465	1,144,565	1,138,565
600 LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	531,614	531,614	527,914	535,414
650 LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	694,662	749,064	697,162	699,162
700 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
750 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (OPERATING FORCES)	2,698,913	2,702,813	2,698,913	2,702,813
800 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OPERATING FORCES)	916,378	916,378	933,378	933,878
850 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	131,042	131,042	127,042	131,042
900 UNIFIED COMMANDS	82,388	82,388	87,388	111,388
950 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	50,620	50,620	50,620	50,620
1045 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	9,581,081	9,649,283	9,602,881	9,636,781

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
1050 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
1100 MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
1200 STRATEGIC MOBILIZATION	309,219	309,219	309,219	309,219
1250 ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	130,471	130,471	130,471	130,471
1300 INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	66,557	46,457	57,557	78,057
1325 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (MOBILITY OPERATIONS)	20,666	20,666	20,666	20,666
1350 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	526,913	506,813	517,913	538,413
1400 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
1450 ACCESSION TRAINING				
1500 OFFICER ACQUISITION	73,963	73,963	73,963	73,963
1550 RECRUIT TRAINING	15,728	15,728	15,728	15,728
1600 ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	14,618	14,618	14,618	14,618
1650 SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	134,581	134,581	135,831	135,831
1700 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (ACCESSION TRAINING)	75,468	75,468	75,468	75,468
1750 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACCESSION TRAINING)	49,668	49,668	49,668	49,668
1800 BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING				
1850 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	242,799	257,799	244,299	254,299
1900 FLIGHT TRAINING	323,414	323,414	323,414	323,414
1950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	100,260	112,260	97,760	104,360
2000 TRAINING SUPPORT	417,639	430,639	419,139	425,439
2050 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (BASIC SKILL/ADV TRAINING)	845,136	845,136	845,136	845,136
2100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (BASIC SKILL/ADV TRAINING)	264,642	264,642	264,642	264,642
2150 RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING				
2200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	385,251	400,251	382,251	382,251
2250 EXAMINING	77,700	77,700	77,700	77,700
2300 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,629	87,629	87,629	87,629

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
2350 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,207	79,207	74,207	74,207
2400 JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS	77,491	81,991	84,091	81,991
2450 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (RECRUIT/OTHER TRAINING)	188,375	188,375	188,375	188,375
2500 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	3,453,569	3,513,069	3,453,919	3,474,719
2550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
2600 SECURITY PROGRAMS				
2650 SECURITY PROGRAMS	472,588	472,588	472,588	472,588
2700 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
2750 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	488,831	488,831	488,831	488,831
2800 CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	365,993	370,993	360,993	364,993
2850 LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	356,748	383,748	366,748	383,748
2900 AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	339,518	339,518	339,518	339,518
2950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
3000 ADMINISTRATION	327,113	327,113	331,113	334,113
3050 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	466,906	466,906	468,906	468,906
3100 MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	164,992	164,992	163,992	163,992
3150 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	154,893	154,893	154,893	154,893
3200 OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	739,315	739,315	741,315	741,315
3250 ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	112,851	72,851	112,851	72,851
3300 REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	69,439	69,439	69,439	69,439
3350 BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	1,076,077	1,076,077	1,076,077	1,076,077
3400 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT)	177,821	177,821	182,321	182,321
3550 SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS				
3600 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	194,381	181,981	194,381	181,981
3650 MISC SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	54,702	48,402	52,702	48,402

3700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	5,562,168	5,535,468	5,576,668	5,543,968
3710 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	7,000	1,000	-4,000
3720 GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
3740 MEMORIAL EVENTS	---	700	---	700
3750 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	273,300	---	---
3760 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	---	-20,000	---
3780 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-38,700	---	---
3825 DFAS PROGRAM GROWTH	---	-19,590	---	---
3830 CHICAGO MILITARY ACADEMY	---	5,000	---	---
3835 REPAIRS AT FT. BAKER	---	6,000	---	5,000
3840 CLARA BARTON CENTER	---	1,500	---	---
3845 DEFENSE JOINT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	---	-14,000	---	-14,000
3850 WMD-DISTANCE LEARNING NETWORK	---	4,000	---	4,000
3855 WMD-COUNTER-TERRORISM TRAINING/TESTING MEMORIAL TUNNEL	---	7,000	5,000	5,000
3915 EXCESS CARRYOVER -- DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	---	---	-40,500	---
3920 WMD-CIVIL SUPPORT TEAMS	---	---	5,000	5,850
3940 UNOBLIGATED BALANCE, PENTAGON RENOVATION	---	---	-2,000	-2,000
4100 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY	19,073,731	19,386,843	19,049,881	19,144,431
4150 TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
4200 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(19,123,731)	(19,436,843)	(19,099,881)	(19,194,431)

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
250 M-Gator	3,000
550 JCS Exercises	-11,000
550 Integrated Training Area Management	2,000
550 Modern Burner Unit	3,000
600 Strike force funding	-15,000
600 GCCS-USFK	11,300
600 HEMTT vehicle recapitalization	7,500
650 Depot Maintenance Apprenticeship Program	3,000
650 Maintenance Automatic Identification Technology	1,000
650 LOGTECH	500
750 NTC Airhead	2,000
750 Security Improvements-NTC Heliport	1,900
800 Fort Wainwright Utilidors	10,000
800 Fort Greely runway repairs	6,000
800 USARAK Power Plant Refurbishment	1,500
900 Hunter UAV	3,000
900 USARPAC C4I and Information Assurance	26,000
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:	
1300 Rock Island UPC subsidy	11,500
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
1650 Air Battle Captain	1,250
1850 Institutional Training-Specialized Skill Training	5,000
1850 Military Police School/MCTFT Joint Training	2,000
1850 Information Assurance: IT Training and Education	3,000
1850 Joint Assessment Neurological Examination Equipment	1,500
1950 DLI-Classroom and Office Furnishings	1,800
1950 Defense Language Institute	2,000
1950 Monterey Regional Educational Initiative	1,800
1950 DLI-Office Furnishings for DOIM Computer Center	1,000
1950 Professional Development Education, NDU	-2,500
2000 Institutional Training-Training Support	5,000
2000 Distance Learning-CCCE	1,300
2000 Armor Officers Distance Learning (Ft. Knox)	1,500
2200 Recruiting contracts and studies	-3,000
2350 Civilian Education and Training	-5,000
2400 JROTC	4,500
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
2800 Pulse Technology	4,000
2800 Central Supply Activities	-5,000
2850 System Technical Support	10,000
2850 Supercomputing Work	6,000
2850 Logistics and Technology Project	1,000
2850 JCALS	10,000
3000 Biometrics Support	7,000
3050 Information Assurance-USFK IT security	2,000
3100 Manpower Management, travel	-1,000

3200	Army conservation and ecosystem management	2,000
3250	Claims Underexecution	-40,000
3400	Rock Island Bridge Repairs	2,500
3400	Fort Des Moines	2,000
3600	NATO Administrative Growth	-12,400
3650	Administrative Cost Growth in Europe	-6,300
Undistributed:		
3710	Classified Programs Undistributed	-4,000
3740	Memorial Events	700
3835	Repairs at Fort Baker	5,000
3845	Defense Joint Accounting System	-14,000
3850	WMD-Distance Learning Network	4,000
3855	WMD-Counter-Terrorism Training and Testing/Memorial Tunnel	5,000
3920	WMD Civil Support Teams	4,000
3920	WMD Civil Support Teams--Equipment	1,850
3940	Unobligated balance, Pentagon Renovation	-2,000

INTEGRATED TRAINING AREA MANAGEMENT

The conferees understand that commanders are consistently reporting reduced ITAM funding as a training readiness issue in the Monthly Readiness Report. Therefore, the conferees recommend an increase of $5,100,000 for ITAM and direct the Army to realign additional resources in order to fully fund the ITAM program.

TACTICAL MISSILE MAINTENANCE

Of the amount provided for Operation and Maintenance, Army, specifically depot maintenance, the conferees direct that $48,300,000 be applied to Army Tactical Missile Depot Maintenance requirements, to include ground support equipment, at its organic public depots.

REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE

The conferees observe that the Army has reallocated $1,100,000,000 of its operational training funds during fiscal years 1997 through 1999, and failed to meet tank mile training goals by an average of 20 percent. The Army cites that training resources were moved to other operation and maintenance programs such as real property maintenance. The conferees have provided significant real property maintenance and Quality of Life Enhancement resources to the Army for fiscal year 2001, and expects the service to execute the training plan and budget proposed in the budget request. The conferees direct the Army to allocate real property maintenance resources, by major command, at levels not less than those provided in Senate Report 106–298.

UNDERUTILIZED PLANT CAPACITY

The conferees are aware that the Office of the Secretary of Defense has directed the Army to study the scale and capacity of the arsenals and ammunition plants, in an effort to mitigate the need for further cash subsidies. The Army shall provide this report to the Appropriations Committees no later than September 15, 2000.

INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS

The conferees do not agree to reductions as proposed in the House and Senate versions of the bill to the Industrial Preparedness subactivity group in Operation and Maintenance, Army.

AIR BATTLE CAPTAIN

The conferees direct to the Secretary of the Army to submit to the Appropriations Committees a detailed recruitment plan, specifically addressing the Air Battle Captain program, within sixty days of enactment of the conference report.

ENHANCED SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM

The conferees understand that the Army has decided to terminate the Enhanced Skills Training Program (ESTP) for students at Historically Black colleges and Universities (HBCU) and to replace it with a distance learning program. Because of the historic role that HBCU's have played in integrating the Army, the conferees direct the Army to maintain through fiscal year 2001 the ESTP as configured during fiscal year 2000. To better understand the benefits of ESTP, the conferees directs the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2000, on its long term plans for its partnership with HBCU's in preparing students for the Army.

OPEN BURN/OPEN DISPOSAL PRACTICES

The conferees are aware of public concern regarding possible health risks to civilian populations associated with the open burning/open detonation (OB/OD) of munitions and equipment at Army depots at various locations in the U.S. Most of these risks are believed to be associated with airborne gases, particles and other contaminants carried downwind of the burn/detonation sites. The Army is directed to study potential alternative closed disposal technologies that do not release into the atmosphere and to report to Congress no later than September 30, 2001 on the possibility of phasing out OB/OD in favor of closed disposal methods. The report should include a review of technologies currently in existence and under development and assess the cost and feasibility of constructing facilities employing those technologies.

MEDIUM GENERAL PURPOSE TENTS

The conferees direct that $14,000,000 of the funds provided for Operation and Maintenance, Army be made available only for the purpose of meeting prospective requirements for modular general purpose tents (MGPT) associated with wartime and other mobilizations as described in the report accompanying the House-passed Department of Defense Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The conferees also note that the Department has refused to fully obligate previously appropriated funds for the program, citing a lack of firm direction from the Congress. The conferees therefore believe it necessary to clarify their strong support for the MGPT program, and direct the Secretary of the Army to expend the full amount of Operation and Maintenance, Army funds designated for MGPT in the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense Conference Report without further delay.

TACONY WAREHOUSE SITE

The conferees direct that of the funds provided in Operation and Maintenance, Army, $5,000,000 shall be available only to demolish the Army's Tacony Warehouse depot site owned by Fort Dix in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
4250 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY				
4300 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
4350 AIR OPERATIONS				
4400 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	2,636,230	2,636,230	2,636,230	2,636,230
4450 FLEET AIR TRAINING	798,956	798,956	798,956	798,956
4500 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	59,407	59,407	59,407	59,407
4550 AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	102,182	102,182	102,182	102,182
4600 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	648,745	668,745	653,745	653,745
4650 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,044	27,044	22,044	24,544
4800 SHIP OPERATIONS				
4850 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	2,237,075	2,237,075	2,237,075	2,237,075
4900 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	539,919	539,919	539,919	539,919
4950 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	393,478	393,478	393,478	395,478
5000 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,113,052	2,255,052	2,145,052	2,145,052
5050 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,050,703	1,070,703	1,086,703	1,102,703
5200 COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT				
5250 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	371,080	371,080	371,080	371,080
5300 ELECTRONIC WARFARE	16,452	16,452	16,452	16,452
5350 SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	167,779	167,779	167,779	167,779
5400 WARFARE TACTICS	141,835	140,835	161,835	160,835
5450 OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	257,981	257,981	269,981	269,981
5500 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	548,600	549,950	548,600	554,600
5550 EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	163,062	168,062	163,062	168,062
5600 DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	791	791	791	791
5750 WEAPONS SUPPORT				
5800 CRUISE MISSILE	139,779	139,779	139,779	139,779

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
5850 FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	816,722	816,522	816,722	816,522
5900 IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	48,635	48,635	48,635	48,635
5950 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	381,806	395,806	403,806	403,806
6100 WORKING CAPITAL FUND SUPPORT 6150 NWCF SUPPORT	19,100	19,100	19,100	19,100
6200 BASE SUPPORT 6210 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	866,050	866,050	866,050	866,050
6220 BASE SUPPORT	2,151,215	2,160,015	2,151,215	2,158,015
6230 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	16,692,678	16,907,628	16,819,678	16,856,778
6250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
6300 READY RESERVE AND PREPOSITIONING FORCES 6350 SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	428,418	428,418	428,418	428,418
6400 ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS 6450 AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	2,939	2,939	2,939	2,939
6500 SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	193,464	250,164	209,464	232,764
6550 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS 6600 FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	23,707	23,707	23,707	23,707
6650 INDUSTRIAL READINESS	1,112	1,112	1,112	1,112
6700 COAST GUARD SUPPORT	19,294	19,294	19,294	19,294
6750 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	668,934	725,634	684,934	708,234
6800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
6850 ACCESSION TRAINING 6900 OFFICER ACQUISITION	90,121	90,121	90,121	90,121
6950 RECRUIT TRAINING	6,594	6,594	6,594	6,594
7000 RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,918	77,918	77,918	77,918

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
7150 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
7200 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	276,861	279,861	281,161	284,161
7250 FLIGHT TRAINING	342,553	342,553	342,553	342,553
7300 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	107,625	115,370	110,625	113,625
7350 TRAINING SUPPORT	186,225	195,225	186,225	195,225
7500 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
7550 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	180,737	180,737	180,737	180,737
7600 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	86,613	86,613	86,613	86,613
7650 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	56,234	56,234	55,234	55,234
7700 JUNIOR ROTC	31,372	33,072	34,472	34,072
7820 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	198,071	198,071	198,071	198,071
7830 BASE SUPPORT	324,715	324,715	324,715	324,715
7850 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	1,965,639	1,987,084	1,975,039	1,989,639
7900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
7950 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
8000 ADMINISTRATION	618,145	618,145	621,145	623,445
8050 EXTERNAL RELATIONS	19,987	19,987	19,987	20,987
8100 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	114,660	114,660	114,660	114,660
8150 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSON MANAGEMENT	97,812	97,812	97,812	97,812
8200 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	187,270	187,270	187,270	190,270
8250 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	308,225	308,225	308,225	308,225
8450 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
8500 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	186,105	186,105	186,105	186,105
8550 PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	355,482	347,164	352,482	348,482
8600 ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	721,560	709,211	721,560	717,560

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
8650 AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	303,087	304,473	303,087	307,587
8700 HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	61,092	59,692	61,092	61,092
8750 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	47,240	47,240	47,240	47,240
8800 SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	54,260	54,260	54,260	54,260
8950 SECURITY PROGRAMS 9000 SECURITY PROGRAMS	622,854	622,854	622,854	622,854
9150 SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS 9200 INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	8,508	8,508	8,508	8,508
9220 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	109,485	109,485	109,485	109,485
9230 BASE SUPPORT	157,131	157,131	157,131	157,131
9250 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	3,972,903	3,952,222	3,972,903	3,975,703
9280 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	-15,144	5,700	-11,144
9290 GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEF STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
9320 NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM	---	5,000	---	3,000
9360 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-12,376	---	---
9380 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-14,061	-10,000	---
9405 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDEREXECUTION	---	-49,600	---	-49,600
9410 IMPROVED SHIPBOARD MATTRESS	---	13,000	---	13,000
9415 DEFENSE JOINT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	---	-7,000	---	-7,000
9420 COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM GROWTH	---	-15,557	---	-10,000
9460 MTAPP	---	---	2,000	2,000
9475 UNOBLIGATED BALANCE, PENTAGON RENOVATION	---	---	-2,000	-2,000
9476 TURNER JOY MEMORIAL REPAIRS	---	---	---	750
9750 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY	23,250,154	23,426,830	23,398,254	23,419,360
9800 TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
9850 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(23,300,154)	(23,476,830)	(23,448,254)	(23,469,360)

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
4600 C-12 Spares program	5,000
4650 Object Oriented Simulations/Reengineering Pilot Program	2,500
4950 Fire Protective Coatings	2,000
5000 LHA Midlife	32,000
5050 Berthing & Messing Barge	15,000
5050 Ship Depot Operations Support Pearl Harbor Shipyard	24,000
5050 Shipyard Apprentice Program	12,000
5050 Fire Fighting Foam Applicator	1,000
5400 JCS Exercises	-1,000
5400 Warfare Tactics PMRF Facilities	20,000
5450 Meteorology and oceanography	7,000
5450 UNOLS	5,000
5500 Man Overboard Indicator	2,500
5500 Center of Excellence for Disaster Management & Humanitarian Assistance	5,000
5500 CINCUSNAVEUR Administrative Growth	-1,500
5550 Reverse Osmosis Desalinators	1,000
5550 Surface Ship Calibration Support	4,000
5850 Arms Control	-200
5950 CWIS Overhauls	10,000
5950 Mk 45 Mod 1 Maintenance	12,000
6220 Partnership for Rapid Innovation Pilot Project at Navy Region Northwest	8,000
6220 Portal Crane Maintenance, Rota	3,500
6220 NATO Administrative Cost Growth	-4,700
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:	
6500 Nuclear Submarine Inactivations (PSNS)	23,300
6500 Ship Disposal Project	16,000
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
7200 Information Assurance: IT Training and Education	3,000
7200 Mark 53 (NULKA) training and support	4,300
7300 Navy Postgraduate School	1,000
7300 NPS-Center for Civil Military Relations	1,000
7300 Joint Multi-Dimensional education & Analysis System (Naval War College)	2,000
7300 NUWC MBA program	2,000
7350 CNET	5,000
7350 Distance Learning--CNET	4,000
7650 Civilian Education and Training	-1,000
7700 JROTC	1,700
7700 Naval Sea Cadet Program	1,000
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
8000 Biometrics Support	3,000
8000 Advanced Technology Information Support (ATIS)	2,300
8050 Public Service Initiative	1,000
8200 Public Benefits Center	3,000
8550 Acquisition Management	-7,000
8600 Acquisition Management	-10,000
8600 Information Technology Center	6,000

8650 Acquisition Workforce	-8,500
8650 Configuration Management Information System	13,000
Undistributed:	
9280 Classified Programs Undistributed	-11,144
9320 Navy Environmental Leadership Program	3,000
9405 Civilian Personnel Underexecution	-49,600
9410 Improved Shipboard Mattresses	13,000
9415 Defense Joint Accounting System	-7,000
9420 Communications Program Growth	-10,000
9460 MTAPP	2,000
9475 Unobligated balance, Pentagon Renovation	-2,000
9476 Turner Joy Memorial Repairs	750

ENHANCED SAFETY IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES

Public Law 106–79 directed the Department to initiate programs that improved safety practices at DOD facilities. The conferees again urge the Department to undertake measures to improve the safety of work conditions at DOD industrial facilities. No later than December 1, 2000, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report regarding the feasibility of establishing pilot programs at maintenance depots and public shipyards to improve worker safety. The report shall include proposals, to include any requisite legislative language, for employing gain sharing incentives for the procurement of professional safety services.

FALLON NAS GREENBELT

The conferees understand that the navy has conducted studies to determine the feasibility of restoring current and previously irrigated lands around the perimeter (''Greenbelt'') of Fallon Naval Air Station, Nevada, to its natural ecological condition. Further, the conferees understand that the Commander, NAS Fallon, has consulted with the Army Corps of Engineers concerning their expertise in similar efforts. The conferees direct, as the Secretary of the Navy strives to eliminate the need for irrigation to the ''Greenbelt'', consistent with aircrew safety and the direction provided in Public Law 101–618, that the Navy continue to cooperate with the Army Corps of Engineers to study the most expedient methods to achieve this non-agricultural, non-irrigated state in the ''Greenbelt'' lands. The conferees direct that of the funds available to the Department of the Navy under the heading Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $100,000 shall be available to expedite the study described above.

CENTER OF EXCELLENCE FOR DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

The conferees recommend $5,000,000 for the Center for Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance. Within these funds, $960,000 is to fund the Casualty Care Research Center. The Committee expects the Centers to work collaboratively to provide disaster response services in domestic, international, military and civilian settings.

RESTORATION OF USS TURNER JOY

The conferees direct the Navy to cooperate with the Bremerton Naval Memorial and Historic Ships Association in the repair of the USS Turner Joy. Of the funds available for Operation and Maintenance, Navy, $750,000 shall be available for the maintenance and repair of the USS Turner Joy.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
9900 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS				
9950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
10000 EXPEDITIONARY FORCES				
10050 OPERATIONAL FORCES	420,702	462,702	443,402	463,402
10100 FIELD LOGISTICS	235,561	250,561	235,561	244,561
10150 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	97,194	119,194	97,194	97,194
10200 BASE SUPPORT	760,299	761,799	760,299	761,799
10250 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	394,789	394,789	394,789	394,789
10300 USMC PREPOSITIONING				
10350 MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	82,390	82,390	82,390	82,390
10400 NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	3,891	3,891	3,891	3,891
10450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,994,826	2,075,326	2,017,526	2,048,026
10500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
10550 ACCESSION TRAINING				
10600 RECRUIT TRAINING	10,655	10,655	10,655	10,655
10650 OFFICER ACQUISITION	300	300	300	300
10700 BASE SUPPORT	55,649	55,649	55,649	55,649
10750 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	19,782	19,782	19,782	19,782
10800 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
10850 SPECIALIZED SKILLS TRAINING	32,975	35,975	32,975	35,975
10900 FLIGHT TRAINING	166	166	166	166
10950 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	8,704	8,704	8,704	8,704
11000 TRAINING SUPPORT	84,417	84,417	84,417	84,417
11050 BASE SUPPORT	50,948	50,948	50,948	50,948
11100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	28,762	28,762	28,762	28,762

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
11150 RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION				
11200 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	100,001	108,101	100,001	100,001
11250 OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	17,961	17,961	17,961	17,961
11300 JUNIOR ROTC	11,917	12,617	12,817	12,817
11350 BASE SUPPORT	8,006	8,006	8,006	8,006
11400 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,633	2,633	2,633	2,633
11450 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	432,876	444,676	433,776	436,776
11500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
11550 SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT				
11650 SPECIAL SUPPORT	204,293	204,293	204,293	204,293
11700 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	31,414	29,414	31,414	29,414
11750 ADMINISTRATION	25,811	25,811	25,811	25,811
11800 BASE SUPPORT	14,157	14,157	14,157	14,157
11850 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	2,281	2,281	2,281	2,281
11900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	277,956	275,956	277,956	275,956
11990 MPS REPLENISHMENT/REPLACEMENT STOCKS	---	15,000	---	15,000
12015 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-367	---	---
12020 CIVILIAN PERSONNEL SEPARATION	---	2,500	---	2,500
12050 REINTERMENT OF REMAINS	---	---	500	500
12300 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	2,705,658	2,813,091	2,729,758	2,778,758

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
10050 Initial Issue Gear	15,000
10050 ULCANS	10,000
10050 Lightweight Maintenance Enclosures	8,000
10050 Modular Command Post System	2,000
10050 Joint Service NBC Defense Equipment Surveillance	3,700
10050 ECWCS	4,000
10100 Equipment Maintenance	5,000
10100 Corrosion Control	4,000
10200 Urban Warfare Training-Former George AFB Lease	1,500
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
10850 Information Assurance: IT Training and Education	3,000
11300 JROTC	900
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
11700 Servicewide Transportation Underexecution	-2,000
Undistributed:	
11990 MPS replenishment/replacement stocks	15,000
12020 Civilian Personnel Separation	2,500
12050 Reinterment of Remains	500

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
12450 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE				
12500 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
12550 AIR OPERATIONS 12600 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,363,665	2,363,665	2,400,565	2,400,565
12650 PRIMARY COMBAT WEAPONS	306,379	306,879	306,379	306,879
12700 COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	205,101	205,101	205,101	205,101
12750 AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING	774,341	774,341	774,341	774,341
12775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,341,224	1,356,224	1,341,224	1,341,224
12800 COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	1,093,924	1,097,924	1,091,924	1,095,924
12850 BASE SUPPORT	1,849,247	1,849,247	1,849,247	1,849,247
12900 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	739,807	739,807	742,607	743,107
12950 COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS 13000 GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	680,464	688,964	680,464	688,964
13050 NAVIGATION/WEATHER SUPPORT	154,153	154,153	158,153	158,153
13100 OTHER COMBAT OPS SUPPORT PROGRAMS	280,971	288,971	286,071	290,971
13150 JCS EXERCISES	37,052	24,852	37,052	24,852
13200 MANAGEMENT/OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	124,998	124,998	124,998	124,998
13250 TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	259,317	259,317	259,317	259,317

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
13300 SPACE OPERATIONS				
13350 LAUNCH FACILITIES	234,395	234,395	234,395	234,395
13400 LAUNCH VEHICLES	116,766	116,766	116,766	116,766
13450 SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	248,564	258,564	238,564	258,564
13500 SATELLITE SYSTEMS	53,473	53,473	53,473	53,473
13550 OTHER SPACE OPERATIONS	114,729	114,729	114,729	114,729
13600 BASE SUPPORT	377,605	377,605	377,605	377,605
13650 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	134,276	134,276	134,276	134,276
13700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	11,490,451	11,524,251	11,527,251	11,553,451
13750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
13800 MOBILITY OPERATIONS				
13850 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,653,084	1,653,084	1,656,584	1,656,584
13900 AIRLIFT OPERATIONS C31	37,961	37,961	37,961	37,961
13950 MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	146,133	146,133	146,133	146,133
13975 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	305,244	319,344	305,244	305,244
14000 PAYMENTS TO TRANSPORTATION BUSINESS AREA	429,775	429,775	429,775	429,775
14050 BASE SUPPORT	466,832	466,832	466,832	466,832
14100 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	120,515	120,515	120,515	120,515
14150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 2	3,159,544	3,173,644	3,163,044	3,163,044
14200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
14250 ACCESSION TRAINING				
14300 OFFICER ACQUISITION	68,142	68,142	68,142	68,142
14350 RECRUIT TRAINING	4,302	4,302	4,302	4,302
14400 RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	61,522	61,522	61,522	61,522
14450 BASE SUPPORT (ACADEMIES ONLY)	68,220	68,220	61,220	61,220
14500 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (ACADEMIES ONLY)	64,655	64,655	64,655	64,655
14550 BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING				
14600 SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	256,003	261,003	256,003	260,003
14650 FLIGHT TRAINING	618,293	618,293	618,293	618,293
14700 PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	109,263	111,763	109,263	111,263
14750 TRAINING SUPPORT	75,599	75,599	75,599	75,599
14775 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,626	11,626	11,626	11,626
14800 BASE SUPPORT (OTHER TRAINING)	471,268	471,268	469,268	469,268
14850 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (OTHER TRAINING)	127,117	127,117	127,117	127,117
14900 RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION				
14950 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	113,524	121,724	113,524	113,524
15000 EXAMINING	3,483	3,483	3,483	3,483
15050 OFF DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	87,032	87,032	87,032	87,032
15100 CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	69,633	69,633	68,633	68,633
15150 JUNIOR ROTC	31,819	33,619	34,219	33,619
15200 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	2,241,501	2,259,001	2,233,901	2,239,301

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
15250 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
15300 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS				
15350 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	985,411	980,911	985,411	981,111
15400 TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	396,144	396,144	396,144	396,144
15450 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	222,395	222,395	222,395	222,395
15475 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	55,398	55,398	55,398	55,398
15500 BASE SUPPORT	1,131,172	1,131,172	1,131,172	1,131,172
15550 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	341,091	341,091	352,091	352,091
15600 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
15650 ADMINISTRATION	153,206	153,206	156,206	156,206
15700 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	322,654	322,654	322,654	322,654
15750 PERSONNEL PROGRAMS	146,783	146,783	146,783	146,783
15800 RESCUE AND RECOVERY SERVICES	59,073	59,073	59,073	59,073
15900 ARMS CONTROL	41,094	34,194	39,094	34,194
15950 OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	590,249	594,249	593,249	601,249
16000 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	35,109	31,109	33,109	31,109
16050 CIVIL AIR PATROL CORPORATION	13,917	13,917	19,417	19,417
16100 BASE SUPPORT	237,050	237,550	237,050	237,550
16150 MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	25,239	25,239	25,239	25,239
16200 SECURITY PROGRAMS				
16250 SECURITY PROGRAMS	685,834	685,834	685,834	685,834
16300 SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS				
16350 INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	13,662	12,562	13,662	12,562
16400 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	5,455,481	5,443,481	5,473,981	5,470,181
16450 CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS UNDISTRIBUTED	---	35,574	1,500	10,044
16460 GENERAL REDUCTION, NATIONAL DEF STOCKPILE FUND	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000	-50,000
16500 READINESS SPARES KITS	---	45,000	---	---
16580 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS	---	-75,000	---	---
16600 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	-4,633	-37,000	---
16620 AIR FORCE MTAP	---	---	4,000	---
16655 DFAS PROGRAM GROWTH	---	-27,521	---	---
16660 DEFENSE JOINT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	---	-7,000	---	-7,000
16705 EXCESS CARRYOVER- DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	---	---	-52,200	---
16715 UNOBLIGATED BALANCE, PENTAGON RENOVATION	---	---	-2,000	-2,000
16720 TRAVEL	---	---	-5,000	-5,000
16730 ELMENDORF AFB TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE	---	---	10,000	10,000
16740 COLLEGE/OFFICER CANDIDATE INITIATIVE	---	---	1,500	1,500
16910 TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE	22,296,977	22,316,797	22,268,977	22,383,521
16920 TRANSFER	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)
16940 TOTAL FUNDING AVAILABLE	(22,346,977)	(22,366,797)	(22,318,977)	(22,433,521)

ADJUSTMENTS TO BUDGET ACTIVITIES

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
12600 B-52 Attrition Reserve	36,900
12650 Reverse Osmosis Desalinators	500
12800 Air Force Battlelabs	4,000
12800 Communications, other contracts	-2,000
12900 Keesler AFB, weatherproofing	2,800
12900 Ambient Temperature Cure Glass-MacDill AFB	500
13000 Tethered Aerostat Radar System	8,500
13050 University Partnering for Operational Support	4,000
13100 TACCSF Theater Air Command and Control Simulation Facility	8,000
13100 Power Scene	2,000
13150 JCS Exercises	-12,200
13450 Eastern Missile Range Launch Facility Enhancements	10,000
Budget Activity 2: Mobilization:	
13850 PACAF Airlift Support	3,500
Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:	
14450 Facility Investment Strategy	-7,000
14600 Information Assurance: IT Training and Education	3,000
14600 IT Workforce Re-Skilling--Aeronautical Systems Center	1,000
14700 Joint Multi-Dimensional Education & Analysis System (Air War College)	2,000
14800 Base Support and Other Training Underexecution	-2,000
15100 Civilian Education and Training	-1,000
15150 JROTC	1,800
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:	
15350 Acquisition Management	-8,800
15350 REMIS	2,500
15350 Engine Reliability & Maintainability Program	2,000
15550 RPM Eielson Utilidors	10,000
15550 Hickam AFB Alternative Fuel Vehicle Program	1,000
15650 Biometrics Support	3,000
15900 Arms Control	-6,900
15950 Manufacturing Technical Assistance Pilot Program	4,000
15950 Iodine 131 Experimentation	5,000
15950 Iodine Medical Monitoring	2,000
16000 Personnel Support Programs Underexecution	-4,000
16050 CAP	5,500
16100 William Lehman Aviation Center	500
16350 NATO & International Program Growth	-1,100
Undistributed:	
16450 Classified Programs Undistributed	10,044
16660 Defense Joint Accounting System	-7,000
16715 Unobligated Balance, Pentagon Renovation	-2,000
16720 Travel	-5,000
16730 Elmendorf AFB Transportation Infrastructure	10,000
16740 College/Officer Candidate Initiative	1,500

NEW ENERGY SAVING TECHNOLOGY

The conferees are aware of the unique energy savings and anticorrosion properties of Ambient Temperature Cure (ATC) Glass coatings for air-conditioning systems. The conference agreement includes $500,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force funding for the 6th Civil Engineering Squadron located at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, for an energy demonstration of ATC glass coating technology as a follow-on to its initial testing of this technology on air conditioning systems. Accordingly, the conferees direct the Air Force to conduct a before and after test and evaluation of energy savings of ATC glass coated air conditioning-systems, at MacDill Air Force Base, over a three-month period. The evaluation shall measure and document energy consumption and provide comment regarding effectiveness on existing air-conditioning units of varying ages and levels of corrosion. The Secretary of the Air Force shall provide the results of this testing to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not later than April 1, 2001.

CONTAMINANT AIR PROCESSING SYSTEM

The conferees commend the Secretary of the Air Force for standardizing mission-critical equipment that allows Air Force personnel to be effectively processed after contact with biological, chemical and nuclear agents. The conferees encourage the Secretary to use existing funds to continue implementation of standardized contaminant air processing systems (CAPS) throughout Air Force installations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
16950 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE				
17000 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
17050 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	396,489	396,489	396,489	396,489
17100 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	1,263,572	1,263,572	1,263,572	1,263,572
17150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,660,061	1,660,061	1,660,061	1,660,061
17200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: MOBILIZATION				
17250 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	45,677	48,677	45,677	45,677
17350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING				
17450 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	10,999	10,999	10,999	10,999
17460 DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	100,331	100,331	100,331	102,331
17470 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	15,354	15,354	15,354	15,354
17480 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	78,299	78,299	73,299	73,299
17490 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	7,445	7,445	7,445	7,445
17510 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	1,089	1,089	1,089	1,089
17600 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	49,158	49,158	57,158	51,158
17650 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3	262,675	262,675	265,675	261,675
17700 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
17750 AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	94,525	94,525	94,525	94,525
17775 CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	88,431	93,131	112,500	103,000
17800 CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	4,207,597	4,205,275	4,187,097	4,243,293
17900 DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	348,658	346,658	346,658	346,658
17950 DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	1,416	1,416	1,416	2,416
18000 DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	184,856	186,856	179,856	181,856
18050 DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	755,197	758,197	755,197	758,197
18150 DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	12,596	12,596	12,596	12,596

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
18200 DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	1,143,496	1,178,496	1,154,496	1,145,696
18300 DEFENSE POW/MISSING PERSONS OFFICE	14,827	14,827	14,827	14,827
18310 DEFENSE SECURITY ASSISTANCE AGENCY	67,598	67,598	57,598	57,598
18320 DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	126,929	126,929	126,929	126,929
18475 DEF THREAT REDUCTION & TREATY COMPLIANCE AGENCY	215,624	215,624	213,624	213,624
18500 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE DEPENDENTS EDUCATION	1,434,204	1,438,804	1,443,754	1,446,354
18600 JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	157,883	157,361	157,883	160,361
18650 OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	22,495	27,495	49,495	56,995
18700 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	417,126	449,430	427,626	454,030
18800 SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	43,864	43,864	43,864	43,864
18820 WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	299,334	289,334	299,334	289,334
18860 SPECIAL PROGRAMS	315,000	115,000	315,000	115,000
18950 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	9,951,656	9,823,416	9,994,275	9,867,153
19000 LEGACY	---	---	15,000	12,000
19020 IMPACT AID	---	35,000	20,000	30,000
19070 MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION	---	-12,586	---	-12,586
19090 CONTRACT AND ADVISORY SERVICES	---	---	-10,000	-4,000
19160 DEFENSE JOINT ACCOUNTING SYSTEM	---	-13,500	---	-13,500
19230 UNOBLIGATED BALANCE, PENTAGON RENOVATION	---	---	-2,000	-2,000
19235 JEFFERSON PROJECT	---	---	3,000	---
19350 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	11,920,069	11,803,743	11,991,688	11,844,480

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget Activity 3: Training and Recruiting:

17460	DAU - IT Organizational Composition Research	2,000
17480	DHRA - DLAMP	-5,000
17600	SOCOM - NAVSCIATTS Collateral Equip	2,000

Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities:

17775	Civil Military - Innovative Readiness Training	10,000
17775	Civil Military - Starbase Youth Program	4,069
17775	Civil Military - Youth Development and Leadership Program	500
17800	Classified and Intelligence	35,696
17900	DCAA - Civilian Personnel Underexecution	-2,000
17950	DFAS - MOCAS	1,000
18000	DHRA	-5,000
18000	DHRA - Joint Recruiting and Advertising Program	2,000
18050	DISA - Information Assurance: IT Training and	

	Education.....	3,000
18200	DLA - Equipment Purchases and other Command Initiatives.....	-4,000
18200	DLA - Generalized Emulation of Microcircuits..	2,200
18200	DLA - Aging Aircraft Automated Document Conversion Program.....	4,000
18310	DSAA - DSCA, PfP, SEDM.....	-10,000
18475	DTRA	-2,000
18500	DoDEA - Family Advocacy Program.....	2,000
18500	DoDEA - Galena IDEA.....	4,000
18500	DoDEA - Math Teacher Leadership.....	550
18500	DoDEA - Special Education Support.....	5,000
18500	DoDEA - Math Program Skill Set Kits.....	600
18600	JCS - Headquarters Personnel Reduction...	-522
18600	JCS - JMEANS - NDU (Moved from O&M, Army).....	3,000
18650	OEA - Adak Reuse Support.....	7,000
18650	OEA - Fitzsimmons Army Hospital.....	10,000
18650	OEA - Charleston Naval Shipyard, Buildings 3 and 4.....	10,000

18650	OEA - MCAS El Toro.....	1,500
18650	OEA - Fort Greely.....	1,000
18650	OEA - Pico Rivera.....	2,000
18650	OEA - NAS Cecil Fields.....	3,000
18700	OSD - Studies and Analysis (excluding the Office of Net Assessment)	-5,000
18700	OSD - DESCIM.....	-5,000
18700	OSD - Environmental Security Cooperation	-1,000
18700	OSD - Pacific Command Regional Initiative.....	20,000
18700	OSD - Clara Barton Center.....	1,500
18700	OSD - Command Information Superiority Architectures (CISA) Program.....	5,000
18700	OSD - Headquarters Personnel Reduction	-4,446
18700	OSD - Energy Savings Performance Contracts...	4,000
18700	OSD - National Flag Foundation.....	1,000
18700	OSD - MASINT Feasibility Study.....	10,000
18700	OSD - FIRES Data Capture Program (Moved from R&D, DW)	4,000
18700	OSD - CTMA : Depot Level Activities.....	6,000
18700	OSD - CTMA : Wearable Computers.....	850

18820	WHS - Low Priority Programs.....	-10,000
18860	Special Programs.....	-200,000
19000	Undistributed - Legacy.....	12,000
19020	Undistributed - Impact Aid.....	30,000
19070	Undistributed - Defense Agencies	
	Headquarters Personnel Reduction.....	-12,586
19090	Undistributed - CAAS.....	-4,000
19160	Undistributed - Defense Joint Accounting	
	System.....	-13,500
19230	Undistributed - Unobligated balance,	
	Pentagon Renovation.....	-2,000

CIVIL/MILITARY PROGRAMS

The conferees recommend a total of $103,000,000 for the Department's civil/military programs for fiscal year 2001 as shown below. The conferees direct the Department to report to the Committees on Appropriations on the status of the obligation of these funds not later than April 15, 2001.

[In thousands of dollars]

National Guard Youth Challenge Program	$62,500
Innovative Readiness Training Program	30,000
Starbase Program	10,000
Youth Development and Leadership Program	500
Total	103,000

FAMILY ADVOCACY

The conferees recommend $2,000,000 for the Department of Defense Dependents Education account, only for enhancements to Family Advocacy programs for at-risk youth.

IMPACT AID PROGRAM

The conferees recommend a total of $30,000,000 only for the continuation of the impact aid program currently being executed by the Department of Defense for schools heavily impacted by military dependents.

NORTHERN EDGE

The Conferees direct the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the CJCS exercise fund to the service operation and maintenance accounts to cover the incremental cost of this exercise.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
19500 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE				
19510 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
19520 LAND FORCES				
19530 DIVISION FORCES	9,921	9,921	9,921	9,921
19540 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	22,544	22,544	22,544	22,544
19550 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	218,697	218,697	218,697	218,697
19560 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	103,347	103,347	103,347	103,347
19600 MISSION OPERATIONS				
19610 LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	325,809	325,809	325,809	325,809
19630 LAND FORCES READINESS				
19640 FORCES READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	129,020	129,720	129,020	129,720
19650 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	35,501	35,501	35,501	35,501
19660 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	46,767	46,767	46,767	46,767
19670 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
19680 BASE SUPPORT	345,771	345,771	345,771	345,771
19690 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	114,704	114,704	114,704	114,704
19720 ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	1,340	1,340	1,340	1,340
19900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,353,421	1,354,121	1,353,421	1,354,121

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
19950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
19960 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
19980 ADMINISTRATION	34,708	34,708	34,708	34,708
19990 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	22,482	22,482	22,482	22,482
20000 PERSONNEL/FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION	41,594	41,594	41,594	41,594
20010 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	69,213	81,213	69,213	69,213
20075 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	167,997	179,997	167,997	167,997
20110 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	30,000	---	15,000
20120 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	---	8,000	---
20140 CINC ODT TRAINING	---	2,800	---	---
20145 EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM	---	9,000	---	4,500
20150 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT TECHNICIANS	---	20,500	---	20,500
20700 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	1,521,418	1,596,418	1,529,418	1,562,118

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces

19640 Forces Readiness Operations Support/Integrated Training Area Management 700

Undistributed:

20110 Real Property Maintenance 15,000

20145 Extended Cold Weather Clothing System 4,500

20150 Additional Full Time Support Technicians 20,500

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
20850 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE				
20900 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
20950 RESERVE AIR OPERATIONS 21000 MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	355,803	355,803	355,803	355,803
21100 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	17,381	17,381	17,381	17,381
21150 AIR OPERATION AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,384	3,384	3,384	3,384
21200 AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	101,391	101,391	101,391	101,391
21250 AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPS SUPPORT	338	338	338	338
21400 RESERVE SHIP OPERATIONS 21450 MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	48,182	48,182	48,182	48,182
21500 SHIP OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AND TRAINING	621	621	621	621
21550 INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	11,207	11,207	11,207	11,207
21600 SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	68,721	78,721	68,721	78,721
21650 SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,375	1,375	1,375	1,375
21700 RESERVE COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT 21800 COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	34,850	34,850	34,850	34,850
21950 RESERVE WEAPONS SUPPORT 22000 WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,436	5,436	5,436	5,436
22030 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	63,728	63,728	63,728	63,728
22040 BASE SUPPORT	142,681	142,681	142,681	142,681
22090 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	855,098	865,098	855,098	865,098
22100 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
22150 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES 22200 ADMINISTRATION	7,004	7,004	7,004	7,004
22250 CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	1,847	1,847	1,847	1,847
22300 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	27,713	34,413	27,713	27,713
22350 SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	63,070	63,070	63,070	63,070

(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
22400 COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	5,566	5,566	5,566	5,566
22450 GENERAL DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM	648	648	648	648
22500 LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT				
22600 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	105,848	112,548	105,848	105,848
22670 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	15,000	---	5,000
22680 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	---	---	5,000	---
22700 FLYING HOUR PROGRAM SHORTFALL	---	---	3,000	3,000
23150 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	960,946	992,646	968,946	978,946

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces	
21600 Ship Depot Maintenance	10,000
Undistributed:	
22670 Real Property Maintenance	5,000
22700 Flying Hour Program Shortfall	3,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
23300 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
23350 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
23400 MISSION FORCES				
23450 TRAINING	17,938	17,938	17,938	17,938
23470 INITIAL ISSUE	---	---	5,200	5,200
23500 OPERATING FORCES	46,561	48,361	46,561	48,361
23550 BASE SUPPORT	17,024	17,024	17,024	17,024
23600 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	8,330	10,330	8,330	10,330
23650 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	9,014	14,014	9,014	12,014
23660 MAINTENANCE OF AGING EQUIPMENT	---	---	2,000	---
23700 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	98,867	107,667	106,067	110,867
23750 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
23800 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
23850 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	7,907	9,907	7,907	7,907
23900 SPECIAL SUPPORT	11,317	11,317	11,317	11,317
23950 SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	484	484	484	484
24000 ADMINISTRATION	7,628	7,628	7,628	7,628
24050 BASE SUPPORT	7,756	7,756	7,756	7,756
24100 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	35,092	37,092	35,092	35,092
24200 INCREASED USE OF GUARD AND RESERVE	---	1,200	---	---
24600 TOTAL, O&M, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	133,959	145,959	141,159	145,959

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces		
23470	Initial Issue	5,200
23500	Operating Forces/Single Storage Site for NBC Equipment	1,800
23600	Real Property Maintenance	2,000
23650	Depot Maintenance	3,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
24750 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE				
24800 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
24850 AIR OPERATIONS 24900 PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,199,990	1,199,990	1,199,990	1,199,990
24950 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	49,309	49,309	49,309	49,309
24970 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	281,177	296,177	285,177	288,177
25000 BASE SUPPORT	224,138	224,138	224,138	224,138
25050 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	45,661	45,661	45,661	45,661
25150 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	1,800,275	1,815,275	1,804,275	1,807,275
25200 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
25250 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES 25300 ADMINISTRATION	47,817	47,817	47,817	47,817
25350 MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	20,094	20,094	20,094	20,094
25400 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	10,562	14,562	10,562	10,562
25450 OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	6,457	6,457	6,457	6,457
25500 AUDIOVISUAL	654	654	654	654
25520 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	85,584	89,584	85,584	85,584
25600 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	10,000	---	4,000
25640 RED HORSE UNIT	---	1,800	---	1,800
25645 TECHNICIAN PILOT RETENTION ALLOWANCE	---	5,000	---	3,000
25650 FLYING HOUR PROGRAM SHORTFALL	---	---	4,000	2,000
25950 TOTAL, O&M, AIR FORCE RESERVE	1,885,859	1,921,659	1,893,859	1,903,659

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces		
24970	Depot Maintenance	7,000
Undistributed:		
25600	Real Property Maintenance	4,000
25640	RED HORSE Unit	1,800
25645	Technician Pilot Retention Allowance	3,000
25650	Flying Hour Program Shortfall	2,000

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
26100 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
26120 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
26140 LAND FORCES				
26180 DIVISIONS	420,846	420,846	420,846	420,846
26200 CORPS COMBAT FORCES	743,303	743,303	743,303	743,303
26220 CORPS SUPPORT FORCES	192,504	192,504	192,504	192,504
26240 ECHELON ABOVE CORPS FORCES	184,399	184,399	184,399	184,399
26260 LAND FORCES OPERATION SUPPORT	98,444	98,444	98,444	98,444
26280 LAND FORCES READINESS				
26320 LAND FORCES SYSTEM READINESS	72,247	72,247	72,247	72,247
26340 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	190,172	190,172	190,172	190,172
26360 LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT				
26400 BASE OPERATIONS	460,632	463,032	460,632	463,032
26420 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	202,431	202,431	202,431	202,431
26440 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	422,376	422,376	422,376	422,376
26580 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	2,987,354	2,989,754	2,987,354	2,989,754

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
26600 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
26620 ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
26660 STAFF MANAGEMENT	73,993	73,993	73,993	73,993
26680 INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	20,115	25,115	20,115	27,315
26720 PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	33,627	33,627	33,627	33,627
26740 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	67,246	79,246	67,246	67,246
26760 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	194,981	211,981	194,981	202,181
26810 ADDITIONAL FULL-TIME SUPPORT (TECHNICIAN)	---	30,500	20,500	20,500
26840 SCHOOL HOUSE SUPPORT	---	---	7,000	5,000
26870 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	---	15,000	32,000	22,000
26890 EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM	---	12,000	12,000	12,000
26900 ANGEL GATE ACADEMY	---	---	---	4,200
26945 NATIONAL EMERGENCY AND DISASTER INFORMATION CENTER	---	1,000	---	1,000
26950 R-2000 ENGINE FLUSH SYSTEMS	---	3,000	---	3,000
26970 EMERGENCY SPILL RESPONSE	---	---	1,000	1,000
26975 DISTRIBUTED LEARNING PROJECT	---	---	65,700	65,700
26980 WMD IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	---	---	10,000	7,500
27350 TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NAT. GUARD	3,182,335	3,263,235	3,330,535	3,333,835

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:		
26400	Base Operations/Integrated Training Area Management	2,400
Budget Activity 4: Administration and Servicewide Activities		
26680	Information Management/NGB Nationwide Dedicated Fiber Optic Network	5,000
26680	Information Management/Information Operations Program	2,200
Undistributed:		
26810	Additional Full-Time Support (Technicians)	20,500
26840	School House Support	5,000
26870	Real Property Maintenance	22,000
26890	Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	12,000
26900	Angel Gate Academy	4,200
26945	National Emergency and Disaster Information Center	1,000
26950	R-2000 Engine Flush Systems	3,000
26970	Emergency Spill Response	1,000
26975	Distributed Learning Project	65,700
26980	WMD Implementation Plan	7,500

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
27500 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
27550 BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES				
27600 AIR OPERATIONS				
27650 AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	2,216,504	2,216,504	2,216,504	2,216,504
27700 MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	368,761	368,761	368,761	368,761
27750 BASE SUPPORT	291,414	291,414	291,414	291,414
27800 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE	104,385	109,385	104,385	109,385
27850 DEPOT MAINTENANCE	452,932	469,432	452,932	460,932
27900 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1	3,433,996	3,455,496	3,433,996	3,446,996
27950 BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
28000 SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES				
28050 ADMINISTRATION	2,668	2,668	2,668	2,668
28100 RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,711	14,711	9,711	9,711
28110 TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4	12,379	17,379	12,379	12,379
28210 C-130 OPERATIONS	---	1,500	5,000	5,000
28230 RECRUITING SUPPORT	---	---	6,000	---
28240 NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM	---	1,000	---	1,000
28250 PROJECT ALERT	---	---	3,500	3,500
28255 EXTENDED COLD WEATHER CLOTHING SYSTEM	---	3,000	---	2,000
28260 LASER LEVELING	---	2,000	---	2,000
28270 REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	---	---	8,000	---
28290 DEPOT MAINTENANCE BACKLOG	---	---	11,400	---
28300 ALASKALERT	---	---	1,500	1,500
28550 TOTAL, O&M, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	3,446,375	3,480,375	3,481,775	3,474,375

Adjustments to Budget Activities

Adjustments to the budget activities are as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Budget Activity 1: Operating Forces:	
27800 Real Property Maintenance	5,000
27850 Depot Maintenance	8,000
Undistributed:	
28210 C-130 Operations	5,000
28240 National Guard State Partnership Program	1,000
28250 Project Alert	3,500
28255 Extended Cold Weather Clothing System	2,000
28260 Laser Leveling	2,000
28300 Alaskalert	1,500

C–130 OPERATIONS

The conferees recommend a total of $5,000,000 for personnel and operation and maintenance costs to support Air National Guard C–130 operational support aircraft and those stand-alone aircraft currently utilized by selected States.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND

The conferees agree to provide $3,938,777,000 for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund. This amount provides for continuing operations in and around Bosnia, Kosovo and Southwest Asia adjusted for unanticipated changes in the number of troops supporting these operations.

The conferees included a general provision which reduces the available funding for overseas contingency operations. The conferees recognize that current levels of deployed forces committed to peacekeeping operations may be reduced during fiscal year 2001. To ensure that current operations are uninterrupted if force levels and commitments are unchanged, the conference agreement provides sufficient emergency funding for overseas contingencies.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The conference agreement provides $8,574,000 for the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY

The conference agreement provides $389,932,000 for Environmental Restoration, Army.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY

The conference agreement provides $294,038,000 for Environmental Restoration, Navy.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement provides $376,300,000 for Environmental Restoration, Air Force.

FORMER SOVIET UNION THREAT REDUCTION

The conference agreement provides $443,400,000 for the Former Soviet Union Threat Reduction program.

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	BUDGET	HOUSE	SENATE	CONFERENCE
Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination - Russia	152,800	162,800	152,800	152,800
Weapons Storage Security - Russia	89,700	89,700	89,700	89,700
Weapons Transportation Security - Russia	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Fissile Material Storage Facility - Russia	57,400	57,400	57,400	57,400
Fissile Material Processing and Packaging - Russia	9,300	9,300	9,300	9,300
Elimination of Weapons Grade Plutonium - Russia	32,100	32,100	32,100	32,100
Strategic Nuclear Arms Elimination - Ukraine	29,100	34,100	29,100	29,100
BW Proliferation Prevention	12,000	12,000	12,000	12,000
Chemical Weapons Destruction - Russia	35,000	—	35,000	—
Defense and Military Contacts	14,000	9,000	14,000	9,000
Other Program Support	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Russian Nuclear Submarine Dismantlement and Disposal	—	—	[25,000]	25,000

QUALITY OF LIFE ENHANCEMENTS, DEFENSE

The conference agreement provides $160,500,000 for Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense. The conference agreement, which distributes funding as indicated below, includes funding both to reduce the substantial backlog of real property maintenance, and to provide for certain requirements associated with local educational authorities.

[In thousands of dollars]

Quality of Life Enhancements, Defense: Program Increases:

Army	$100,000,000
Navy	20,000,000
Marine Corps	10,000,000
Air Force	20,000,000
Defense-Wide	10,500,000

TITLE III – PROCUREMENT

The conference agreement is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUMMARY				
ARMY:				
AIRCRAFT	1,323,262	1,547,082	1,532,862	1,571,812
MISSILES	1,295,728	1,240,347	1,329,781	1,320,681
WEAPONS, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES	1,874,638	2,634,786	2,166,574	2,472,524
AMMUNITION	1,131,323	1,227,386	1,212,149	1,220,516
OTHER	3,795,870	4,254,564	4,060,728	4,497,009
TOTAL, ARMY	9,420,821	10,904,165	10,302,094	11,082,542
NAVY:				
AIRCRAFT	7,963,858	8,179,564	8,426,499	8,477,138
WEAPONS	1,434,250	1,372,112	1,571,650	1,461,600
AMMUNITION	429,649	491,749	471,749	498,349
SHIPS	12,296,919	12,266,919	11,612,090	11,614,633
OTHER	3,334,611	3,433,063	3,400,180	3,557,380
MARINE CORPS	1,171,935	1,229,605	1,196,368	1,233,268
TOTAL, NAVY	26,631,222	26,973,012	26,678,536	26,842,368
AIR FORCE:				
AIRCRAFT	9,539,602	10,064,032	7,289,934	7,583,345
AMMUNITION	638,808	638,808	654,808	647,808
MISSILES	3,031,346	2,893,529	2,920,815	2,863,778
OTHER	7,699,127	7,778,997	7,605,027	7,763,747
TOTAL, AIR FORCE	20,908,883	21,375,366	18,470,584	18,858,678
DEFENSE-WIDE	2,275,308	2,303,136	2,294,908	2,346,258
NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	150,000	100,000
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES	---	3,000	---	3,000
TOTAL PROCUREMENT	59,236,234	61,558,679	57,896,122	59,232,846

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement provides $21,412,000 for Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED DEFENSE SITES

The conference agreement provides $231,499,000 for Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

The conference agreement provides $55,900,000 for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

In 1999, the Department of Defense signed a multi-year contract for the E–2C program. The E–2C multi-year contract assumed a total E–2C purchase which included both Department of the Navy and international aircraft deliveries in future years. The negotiated price for the Navy aircraft reflected the assumption that the international sales would be successfully completed in the future years. This process raises serious concerns that the Department of Defense might negotiate future multi-year contracts with sales prices that presume Congressional approval of potential international sales in future years. Such a practice is unacceptable and would violate the intent and spirit of the Foreign Military Sales notification and approval process.

The conferees direct that any future multi-year contracts shall reflect pricing which assumes only the U.S. military procurement quantities. The Department of Defense is expressly prohibited from negotiating any multi-year contracts which include quantities and pricing that reflect foreign military sales yet to be approved by the Congress.

INFORMATION ASSURANCE

The House recommended a net increase of $150,000,000 over the President's budget for selected information assurance and computer network security programs. The conferees endorse the high priority given this effort by the House and recommended a net increase of over $150,000,000 for specific information assurance initiatives, to include:

$35,000,000 to purchase hardware and software applications to monitor computer networks for suspicious activity;

$19,000,000 for new digital secure phones to replace the outdated STU–III;

$18,600,000 to accelerate the DOD's Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) program;

$16,400,000 for information security awareness, education and training;

$15,000,000 for the Information Security Scholarship Program;

$10,000,000 to ensure security capabilities are built into new cell phones, rather than retrofitting them later at a significantly higher cost;

$10,000,000 for information operations vulnerability analysis;

$5,000,000 to examine the use of information operations against certain critical target sets;

$5,000,000 for the Institute for Defense Computer Security and Information Protection;

$3,000,000 for additional basic (6.1) research into information assurance; and

$26,000,000 for USARPAC C4I and Information Assurance.

The conferees expect the Department to execute these funds in a coordinated manner, and where possible, to make use of existing institutions and training programs to ensure the maximum benefit from these resources. The conferees understand that even these investments will be of limited value if the software used by the Department has been designed with intentional weaknesses to permit future unauthorized access. The conferees expect the Department to carefully consider the origin of all software used in developing or upgrading information technology or national security systems.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADES

The conferees believe that additional cost savings could be realized if DOD tenant agencies would include their telecommunications infrastructure upgrades with those of the parent installation and thus achieve the benefits of economies of scale. The conferees therefore direct DOD agencies that are located on Army, Navy and Air Force installations to coordinate their infrastructure upgrades with those of the installation where they reside.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
AIRCRAFT				
FIXED WING				
UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	---	---	---	7,600
ROTARY				
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	64,651	183,371	120,451	189,601
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP) (AP-CY)	22,127	22,127	22,127	22,127
TH-67 TRAINING HELICOPTER	---	18,000	---	24,000
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT	86,778	223,498	142,578	243,328
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
GUARDRAIL MODS (TIARA)	22,626	22,626	22,626	22,626
ARL MODS	6,553	6,553	6,553	6,553
AH1F MODS	423	423	423	423
AH-64 MODS	18,516	52,616	87,516	36,016
CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	117,083	117,083	117,083	117,083
CH-47 ICH	57,630	57,630	57,630	57,630
CH-47 ICH (AP-CY)	26,200	26,200	26,200	26,200
UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	11,903	11,903	11,903	11,903
OH-58 MODS	462	462	462	462
AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS	752	752	752	752
LONGBOW	709,454	709,454	709,454	726,954
LONGBOW (AP-CY)	35,000	35,000	35,000	35,000
UH-1 MODS	4,297	4,297	4,297	4,297
UH-60 MODS	3,021	15,021	17,521	23,521
KIOWA WARRIOR	41,816	41,816	78,216	41,916
AIRBORNE AVIONICS	60,042	63,042	60,042	61,542

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ASE MODS (SIRFC)	4,487	4,487	4,487	4,487
GATM	10,073	10,073	10,073	10,073
SPARE PARTS (AIR)	15,167	15,167	15,167	15,167
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT	1,145,505	1,194,605	1,265,405	1,202,605
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS				
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	---	14,000	---	10,000
OTHER SUPPORT				
AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	---	14,000	13,900	10,000
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	11,926	11,926	11,926	11,926
AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	3,490	3,490	13,490	10,390
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	74,144	74,144	74,144	74,144
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,419	1,419	1,419	1,419
AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS	---	10,000	10,000	8,000
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	90,979	128,979	124,879	125,879
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,323,262	1,547,082	1,532,862	1,571,812

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
UTILITY F/W (MR) AIRCRAFT	0	0	0	7,600
UC-35 aircraft		0	0	7,600
(Note: House added funds in AP, N)				
UH-60 BLACKHAWK (MYP)	64,651	183,371	120,451	189,601
Army Reserve: 8 UH-60L aircraft		78,520	0	78,520
National Guard: 2 UH-60Q aircraft		40,200	0	26,800
National Guard: 4 UH-60L aircraft		0	55,800	39,260
UH-60L active (2)				-19,630
TH-67 TRAINING HELICOPTER	0	18,000	0	24,000
Procure training helicopters	0	18,000	0	24,000
(Note: Senate added funds under the heading Kiowa Warrior)				
AH-64 MODS	18,516	52,616	87,516	36,016
Vibration Management Enhancement Program		7,000	0	5,000
Oil debris detection and burn off system		5,000	5,000	5,000
Longbow internal auxiliary fuel tank		10,000	0	0
Strap pack		4,300	0	0
Funny harness		3,400	0	0
Aerial rocket control system		4,400	0	0
Recapitalization and safety modifications		0	64,000	7,500
(NOTE: $17,500,000 transferred to Longbow)				
LONGBOW	709,454	709,454	709,454	726,954
Recapitalization and safety modifications				17,500
(Note: House and Senate added funds under AH-64 mods)				
UH-60 MODS	3,021	15,021	17,521	23,521
National Guard: Firehawk		3,000	0	3,000
Extended range fuel system		9,000	0	3,000
1/207th search and rescue mods		0	14,500	14,500
KIOWA WARRIOR	41,816	41,816	78,216	41,918
TH-67 Training helicopters		0	35,000	0
(Note: Funds appropriated under the heading TH-67 helicopter)				
Crew station mission equipment trainer		0	2,600	1,300
Contract savings		0	-1,200	-1,200
AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	0	14,000	0	10,000
ASET IV		4,000	0	4,000
AN/AVR-2A Laser detection		10,000	0	6,000
AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	3,490	3,490	13,490	10,390
Laser eye protection		0	4,000	2,400
HGU/P aircrew integrated helmet systems for Army National Guard		0	6,000	4,500

FORWARD LOOKING INFRARED DEVICES

The Horizontal Technology Integration second generation forward looking infrared (FLIR) is being fielded on the M1A2 Abrams tank system enhancement program, M2A3 Bradley Fighting Vehicle, and the long range advanced scout surveillance system. It met the original Apache helicopter FLIR requirements for the proposed upgrade to the AH–64 Apache target acquisition designation sight/pilot night vision system, which the Army subsequently changed. The conferees are concerned that the change in requirements may not result in a significant increase in performance that would outweigh the advantages of commonality between air and land systems in areas such as unit cost, improved logistics support, and life cycle cost savings. The conferees direct the Army to perform a cost-benefit analysis, using the original and revised aviation FLIR requirements, which compares the Horizontal Technology Integration second generation FLIR and the proposed aviation FLIR upgrade. The conferees further direct that none of the funds in this Act may be obligated for an Apache FLIR upgrade that is not common with the FLIR for ground systems unless the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees which justifies a requirement for a unique FLIR for airborne applications and demonstrates that it is affordable compared to a common system.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
OTHER MISSILES				
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM				
AVENGER SYSTEM SUMMARY	29,801	29,801	29,801	29,801
AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM				
HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY (MYP)	285,363	285,363	285,363	285,363
ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYSTEM				
JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY (MYP)	372,248	372,248	332,248	321,248
MLRS ROCKET	9,413	9,413	9,413	9,413
MLRS LAUNCHER SYSTEMS	188,689	188,689	188,689	188,689
ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	15,044	102,044	92,444	98,044
ATACMS BLKII SYSTEM SUMMARY	230,334	80,000	215,334	215,334
MULTI PURPOSE INDV MUN (AP-CY)	3,547	---	---	---
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	1,134,439	1,067,558	1,153,292	1,147,892
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
MODIFICATIONS				
PATRIOT MODS	22,929	22,929	22,929	22,929
STINGER MODS	21,838	33,338	37,038	33,338
AVENGER MODS	6,828	6,828	6,828	6,828
ITAS/TOW MODS (MYP)	64,562	64,562	64,562	64,562
MLRS MODS	16,499	16,499	16,499	16,499
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF MISSILES	132,656	144,156	147,856	144,156
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	20,785	20,785	20,785	20,785
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	2,394	2,394	2,394	2,394

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MISSILES)	969	969	969	969
MISSILE DEMILITARIZATION	1,341	1,341	1,341	1,341
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	3,144	3,144	3,144	3,144
TOTAL, SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	7,848	7,848	7,848	7,848
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	1,295,728	1,240,347	1,329,781	1,320,681

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS) - SYS SUM	15,044	102,044	92,444	98,044
Procure ATACMS Block I (100 missiles)		77,000	77,400	77,000
Block IV Unitary Warhead		10,000	0	6,000

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY				
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
ABRAMS TRNG DEV MOD	5,331	5,331	5,331	5,331
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	359,389	440,689	368,389	431,689
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT (AP-CY)	20,006	20,006	20,006	20,006
BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES	12,098	12,098	12,098	12,098
HAB TRAINING DEVICES	---	---	1,200	1,200
BRADLEY FVS TRAINING DEVICES (MOD)	14,038	14,038	14,038	14,038
ABRAMS TANK TRAINING DEVICES	10,504	10,504	10,504	10,504
MEDIUM ARMORED VEHICLE FAMILY: MAVF	537,077	600,077	637,077	637,007
MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
CARRIER, MOD	45,111	45,111	45,111	55,111
FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	31,898	31,898	31,898	31,898
BFVS SERIES (MOD)	37,142	37,142	65,142	59,142
HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	8,060	8,060	70,060	8,060
FAASV PIP TO FLEET	5	5	5	5
IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88 MOD)	68,385	76,685	68,385	74,385
HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	---	---	77,000	77,000
ARMORED VEH LAUNCH BRIDGE (AVLB) (MOD)	1,692	1,692	---	---
AVLB SLEP	15,252	---	---	---
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	36,098	36,098	43,098	56,998
M1A1D RETROFIT	891	891	891	891
SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	36,149	36,149	36,149	58,649
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	338,422	338,422	338,422	293,922
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM (AP-CY)	174,445	174,445	174,445	174,445

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TCV-WTCV)	135	135	10,135	7,135
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	9,250	9,250	9,250	9,250
ARMY TRANSFORMATION: MEDIUM ARMORED VEHICLE (2nd BDE)	---	600,000	---	300,000
TOTAL, TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES	1,761,378	2,498,726	2,038,634	2,338,764
WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES ARMOR MACHINE GUN, 7.62MM M240 SERIES	12,449	12,449	12,449	12,449
MACHINE GUN, 5.56MM (SAW)	---	18,300	12,180	17,000
GRENADE LAUNCHER, AUTO, 40MM, MK19-3	11,835	14,335	14,335	14,335
M16 RIFLE	4,793	4,793	4,793	4,793
XM107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE	3,085	3,085	3,085	3,085
5.56 CARBINE M4	5,190	7,190	5,190	6,190
MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH MARK-19 MODIFICATIONS	1,813	1,813	1,813	1,813
M4 CARBINE MODS	2,504	2,504	2,504	2,504
SQUAD AUTOMATIC WEAPON (MOD)	9,956	9,956	9,956	9,956
MEDIUM MACHINE GUNS (MODS)	495	495	495	495
HOWITZER, TOWED, 155MM, M198 (MODS)	3,507	3,507	3,507	3,507
M119 MODIFICATIONS	4,705	4,705	4,705	4,705
M16 RIFLE MODS	9,592	9,592	9,592	9,592
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)	787	787	787	787
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (WOCV-WTCV)	1,182	1,182	1,182	1,182
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	5,152	5,152	5,152	5,152
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	3,604	3,604	3,604	3,604
SMALL ARMS (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	3,506	3,506	3,506	3,506
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES	84,155	106,955	98,835	104,655
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)	29,105	29,105	29,105	29,105
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	1,874,638	2,634,786	2,166,574	2,472,524

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
BRADLEY BASE SUSTAINMENT	359,389	440,689	368,389	431,689
National Guard: Bradley A0 to ODS		81,300		65,300
National Guard: Bradley A2 to ODS			9,000	7,000
CARRIER, MOD	45,111	45,111	45,111	55,111
M113 upgrades			(10,000)	10,000
BFVS SERIES (MOD)	37,142	37,142	65,142	59,142
Reactive armor tiles for Bradley fighting vehicles		0	25,000	20,000
Bradley sustainment: DSESTS		0	3,000	2,000
HEAVY ASSAULT BRIDGE (HAB) SYS (MOD)	0	0	77,000	77,000
Procure HAB		0	77,000	77,000
(Note: The conferees direct the funds appropriated in fiscal year 2000 for Wolverine be used for that purpose)				
M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	36,098	36,098	43,098	56,998
Abrams Test Sets			4,000	3,000
Electronic obsolescence			3,000	2,000
Transfer of system technical support funding				15,900
SYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PGM: SEP M1A2	36,149	36,149	36,149	58,649
Transfer of system technical support funding				22,500
ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	338,422	338,422	338,422	293,922
Transfer system technical support funding				-44,500

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY				
AMMUNITION				
SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION				
CTG 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	97,758	97,758	97,758	97,758
CTG 5.56MM ARMOR PIERCING M995	1,337	1,337	1,337	1,337
CTG 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	8,990	8,990	8,990	8,990
CTG 9MM, ALL TYPES	2,487	2,487	2,487	2,487
CTG .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	10,646	20,646	13,646	16,646
CTG CAL .50 API MK211 MOD 0	1,987	3,987	1,987	2,987
CTG 20MM, ALL TYPES	2,004	2,004	2,004	2,004
CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	57,780	66,380	57,780	66,380
CTG 30MM, ALL TYPES	9,517	14,517	14,517	14,517
CTG 40MM, ALL TYPES	60,788	60,788	64,788	62,788
NONLETHAL WEAPONS CAPABILITY SET	8,397	10,397	8,397	10,397
MORTAR AMMUNITION				
60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	28,673	36,643	31,173	33,673
CTG MORTAR 81MM PRAC 1/10 RANGE M880	930	930	930	930
CTG MORTAR 120MM HE M934 W/MO FUZE	45,031	45,031	49,031	48,031
CTG MORTAR 120MM ILLUM XM930 W/MTSQ FZ	---	5,600	5,000	5,000
CTG 120MM WP SMOKE M929A1	24,969	24,969	24,969	24,969
TANK AMMUNITION				
CTG TANK 120MM TP-T M831/M831A1	48,477	48,477	48,477	48,477
CTG TANK 120MM TPCSDS-T M865	101,512	101,512	101,512	101,512
ARTILLERY AMMUNITION				
CTG ARTY 75MM BLANK M337A1	1,807	1,807	1,807	1,807
CTG ARTY 105MM DPICM XM915	---	---	10,000	7,000

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CTG ARTY 105MM M927	---	---	5,000	3,000
CTG ARTY 105MM ILLUM M314 SERIES	130	130	130	130
PROJ ARTY 155MM SMOKE WP M825	14,682	14,682	14,682	14,682
PROJ ARTY 155MM SADARM M898	14,907	---	14,907	---
REMOTE AREA DENIAL ARTILLERY MUNITION (RADAM)	47,674	47,674	15,000	27,674
PROJ ARTY 155MM HE M107	35,178	45,178	40,178	40,178
MODULAR ARTILLERY CHARGE SYSTEM (MACS)	27,432	37,432	42,432	39,932
ARTILLERY FUZES				
ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES	67,005	67,005	67,005	67,005
MINES				
MINE, TRAINING, ALL TYPES	3,892	3,892	3,892	3,892
MINE AT M87 (VOLCANO)	---	20,000	15,000	15,000
WIDE AREA MUNITIONS	7,284	12,284	23,284	19,284
ROCKETS				
BUNKER DEFEATING MUNITION (BDM)	---	10,000	---	6,000
ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	152,767	158,567	152,767	156,767
OTHER AMMUNITION				
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	16,603	17,603	17,603	17,603
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	20,260	24,760	23,260	23,260
SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	13,067	13,067	13,067	13,067
SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	3,053	3,053	3,053	3,053
MISCELLANEOUS				
AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	6,750	6,750	6,750	6,750
CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	4,298	4,298	4,298	4,298
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	10,145	10,145	10,145	10,145
AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	9,476	9,476	9,476	9,476
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	5,118	5,118	5,118	5,118
CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	5,764	5,764	5,764	5,764
TOTAL, AMMUNITION	978,575	1,071,138	1,039,401	1,049,768
AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT				
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT				
PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	47,748	51,248	47,748	50,748
LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	3,215	3,215	3,215	3,215
MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES	12,267	12,267	12,267	12,267
CONVENTIONAL AMMO DEMILITARIZATION	84,799	84,799	84,799	84,799
ARMS INITIATIVE	4,719	4,719	24,719	19,719
TOTAL, AMMUNITION PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	152,748	156,248	172,748	170,748
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY	1,131,323	1,227,386	1,212,149	1,220,516

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	47,748	51,248	47,748	50,748
Riverbank Army Ammunition Plant		3,500	0	3,000

(Note: Only to activate the Riverbank AAP grenade line to ensure competition and to meet 40mm submunition requirements)

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES				
TACTICAL VEHICLES				
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	---	---	5,000	5,000
SEMITRAILER FB BB/CONT TRANS 22 1/2 T	12,135	5,035	12,135	5,035
SEMITRAILER LB 40T M870A1 (CCE)	1,912	1,912	1,912	1,912
SEMITRAILER, TANK, 5000G	30,213	30,213	30,213	30,213
SEMITRAILER, TANK, 7500G, BULKHAUL	20,010	20,010	20,010	20,010
SEMITRAILER VAN CGO SUPPLY 12T 4WHL M129A2C	6,147	6,147	6,147	6,147
HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	110,746	125,046	135,746	138,046
TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)	5,208	5,208	5,208	5,208
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	438,256	475,556	475,556	475,556
FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,830	16,030	14,830	16,030
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	166,119	191,119	169,119	184,619
ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)	13,453	13,453	16,453	14,953
TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	42,989	44,589	42,989	43,989
HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV P	17,233	17,233	17,233	17,233
LINE HAUL ESP	27,054	27,054	27,054	27,054
MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	28,910	36,910	38,910	42,410
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (TAC VEH)	1,853	2,853	1,853	2,853
NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES				
HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	2,263	2,263	---	1,163
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	834	834	700	700
GENERAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	989	989	989	989
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	1,021	1,021	1,021	6,671

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TOTAL, TACTICAL AND SUPPORT VEHICLES	942,175	1,023,475	1,023,078	1,045,791
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
COMM - JOINT COMMUNICATIONS COMBAT IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM	13,096	18,096	13,096	16,096
JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	5,553	5,553	5,553	5,553
COMM - SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	72,034	72,034	72,034	72,034
SHF TERM	38,307	14,307	14,007	28,000
SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)	3,475	13,475	3,475	13,475
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	21,439	21,439	21,439	21,439
SMART-T (SPACE)	48,594	32,094	32,594	32,094
SCAMP (SPACE)	4,261	4,261	4,261	4,261
GLOBAL BRDCST SVC - GBS	9,286	---	4,286	4,286
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	1,489	1,489	1,489	1,489
COMM - C3 SYSTEM ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)	10,355	10,355	10,355	10,355
COMM - COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	32,675	66,875	65,275	70,175
SINCGARS FAMILY	18,340	51,840	38,340	51,840
JOINT TACTICAL AREA COMMAND SYSTEMS	972	972	972	972
ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	113,951	122,951	190,951	173,951
COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING	3,348	3,348	3,348	3,348
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	4,374	19,374	4,374	19,374
MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	2,459	2,459	2,459	2,459
COMM - INTELLIGENCE COMM CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	1,744	1,744	1,744	1,744

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
INFORMATION SECURITY				
TSEC - ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	11,051	11,051	11,051	11,051
INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	54,374	75,374	71,374	80,374
COMM - LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS				
TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION	2,025	2,025	2,025	2,025
BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	3,945	3,945	3,945	3,945
ARMY DISN ROUTER	4,339	4,339	4,339	4,339
ELECTROMAG COMP PROG (EMCP)	431	431	431	431
WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)	2,865	2,865	2,865	2,865
COMM - BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	57,779	57,779	86,879	86,879
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	18,836	18,836	18,836	18,836
LOCAL AREA NETWORK (LAN)	65,975	65,975	65,975	65,975
PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM	65,412	17,262	20,412	32,212
ELECT EQUIP - NAT FOR INT PROG (NFIP)				
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE PROG (FCI)	869	869	869	869
GENERAL DEFENSE INTELL PROG (GDIP)	19,604	19,604	19,604	19,604
ELECT EQUIP - TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYS (ASAS) (TIARA)	66,671	66,671	66,671	66,671
JTT/CIBS-M (TIARA)	26,753	26,753	26,753	26,753
PROPHET GROUND (TIARA)	9,571	12,571	9,571	10,571
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (TUAV)	37,789	37,789	37,789	37,789
JOINT STARS (ARMY) (TIARA)	66,415	66,415	66,415	66,415
DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS) (TIARA)	20,030	20,030	20,030	20,030
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIE	12,853	8,353	12,853	12,853

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMON IMAGERY GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEM (CIGSS)	2,833	2,833	2,833	2,833
TROJAN (TIARA)	4,264	4,264	4,264	4,264
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (TIARA)	224	224	224	224
CI HUMINT AUTOMATED TOOL SET (CHATS) (TIARA)	1,939	1,939	1,939	1,939
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.OM (TIARA)	484	484	484	484
ELECT EQUIP - ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
SHORTSTOP	---	20,000	---	12,000
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	2,311	2,311	2,311	2,311
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
FAAD GBS	24,188	27,188	24,188	26,188
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	34,146	59,546	79,146	66,146
LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	46,156	46,156	46,156	46,156
LTWT VIDEO RECON SYSTEM (LWVRS)	1,199	1,199	1,199	1,199
NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT	35,348	35,348	35,348	35,348
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION / AIMING LIGHT	8,040	8,040	13,040	11,040
ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	14,405	14,405	14,405	14,405
MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SURV)	18,530	18,530	23,530	23,530
DIGITIZATION APPLIQUE	60,802	60,802	60,802	60,802
LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER (LLD	7,093	7,093	7,093	7,093
COMPUTER BALLISTICS: MORTAR M-30	1,652	1,652	1,652	1,652
MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	7,341	7,341	7,341	7,341
INTEGRATED MET SYS SENSORS (IMETS) - TIARA	7,018	7,018	7,018	7,018
ELECT EQUIP - TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	17,260	17,260	25,260	22,260
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACT DATA SYS (AFATDS)	54,452	54,452	54,452	54,452

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
FIRE SUPPORT ADA CONVERSION	972	972	972	972
CMBT SVC SUPT CONTROL SYS (CSSCS)	27,411	27,411	27,411	27,411
FAAD C2	17,868	17,868	29,868	29,868
AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS (AMD	4,859	4,859	4,859	4,859
FORWARD ENTRY DEVICE (FED)	17,153	17,153	17,153	17,153
STRIKER-COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	19,084	19,084	27,084	24,084
LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	1,010	1,010	1,010	1,010
LOGTECH	7,505	7,505	7,505	7,505
TC AIMS II	10,376	10,376	10,376	10,376
GUN LAYING AND POS SYS (GLPS)	8,410	8,410	8,410	8,410
ISYSCON EQUIPMENT	26,558	26,558	26,558	26,558
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	22,935	31,025	22,935	31,025
STAMIS TACTICAL COMPUTERS (STACOMP)	40,015	40,015	40,015	40,015
STANDARD INTEGRATED CMD POST SYSTEM	35,971	47,471	41,171	47,471
ELECT EQUIP - AUTOMATION				
ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	35,960	35,960	35,960	35,960
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	172,051	181,051	183,051	189,051
RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	91,495	99,495	91,495	99,495
ELECT EQUIP - AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)				
AFRTS	1,519	1,519	1,519	1,519
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)	3,217	3,217	3,217	3,217
ELECT EQUIP - SUPPORT				
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	374	374	374	374
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT	1,847,767	1,961,021	2,032,367	2,118,450
OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
GEN SMK MECH:MTRZD DUAL PURP M56	11,369	15,369	11,369	14,369
GENERATOR, SMOKE, MECH M58	5,585	5,585	5,585	5,585
BRIDGING EQUIPMENT				
HEAVY DRY SUPT BRIDGE SYSTEM	19,224	19,224	19,224	19,224
RIBBON BRIDGE	15,669	29,169	15,669	30,169
FLOAT BRIDGE PROPULSION	1,942	1,942	1,942	1,942
ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT				
KIT, STANDARD TELEOPERATING	688	10,688	688	6,688
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	5,206	5,206	5,206	5,206
LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	993	993	993	1,993
BN COUNTERMINE SIP	7,442	7,442	7,442	7,442
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL UNITS (ECU)	6,348	6,348	6,348	6,348
LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES	12,580	17,080	12,580	16,580
SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	3,984	3,984	3,984	3,984
LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)	1,999	1,999	6,599	5,599
FORCE PROVIDER	22,263	22,263	22,263	22,263
FIELD FEEDING AND REFRIGERATION	11,976	11,976	11,976	11,976
AIR DROP PROGRAM	3,971	3,971	3,971	3,971
CAMOUFLAGE: ULCANS	---	---	10,000	7,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CSS-EQ)	1,909	1,909	1,909	1,909
PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT				
FAMILY OF TANK ASSEMBLIES, FABRIC, COLLAPSIBL	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489
DISTRIBUTION SYS, PET & WATER	---	3,000	---	2,000

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	7,120	7,120	7,120	7,120
DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	13,516	13,516	13,516	13,516
HOSELINE OUTFIT FUEL HANDLING	5,878	5,878	5,878	5,878
INLAND PETROLEUM DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	5,618	5,618	5,618	5,618
WATER EQUIPMENT				
WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS	40,727	40,727	40,727	40,727
MEDICAL EQUIPMENT				
COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	31,567	37,767	37,567	38,567
MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT				
SHOP EQ CONTACT MAINTENANCE TRK MTD (MYP)	9,650	9,650	9,650	9,650
WELDING SHOP, TRAILER MTD	6,042	6,042	6,042	6,042
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MAINT EQ)	5,078	5,078	5,078	5,078
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				
MISSION MODULES - ENGINEERING	1,489	1,489	1,489	1,489
ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	4,671	11,671	9,671	11,671
LOADERS	1,444	1,444	1,444	1,444
HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	8,282	10,582	8,282	9,782
DEPLOYABLE UNIVERSAL COMBAT EARTH MOVERS	14,146	24,346	21,146	24,346
CRANES	6,089	6,089	6,089	6,089
CRUSHING/SCREENING PLANT, 150 TPH	89	89	89	89
CONST EQUIP SLEP	1,986	16,986	1,986	16,986
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (CONST EQUIP)	2,635	6,635	2,635	6,635
RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
SMALL TUG	---	9,000	---	9,000
FLOATING CRANES	---	15,000	---	15,000

(In thousans of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
LOGISTICS SUPPORT VESSEL (ESP)	6,638	6,638	6,638	6,638
CAUSEWAY SYSTEMS	17,227	17,227	17,227	17,227
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (FLOAT/RAIL)	6,722	6,722	6,722	6,722
GENERATORS				
GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	85,886	90,886	85,886	88,886
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER, 53,000 LBS	40,031	40,031	40,031	40,031
ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	24,407	24,407	24,407	24,407
ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER CRANE	2,056	2,056	2,056	2,056
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (MHE)	1,231	3,731	1,231	3,231
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
CTC INSTRUMENTATION SUPPORT	81,845	93,945	94,445	99,045
TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	91,937	104,937	103,937	116,937
CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	81,160	---	20,315	42,000
AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (AVCA	14,744	14,744	14,744	14,744
FIRE SUPPORT COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	1,457	1,457	1,457	1,457
TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	18,828	18,828	18,828	18,828
INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	65,381	65,381	68,381	68,381
TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	18,738	18,738	18,738	18,738
ARMY DIAGNOSTICS IMPROVEMENT PGM (ADIP)	17,300	17,300	17,300	17,300
RECONFIGURABLE SIMULATORS	2,330	2,330	2,330	2,330
PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	18,856	18,856	18,856	18,856
BASE LEVEL COM'L EQUIPMENT	7,399	7,399	7,399	7,399
MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3)	28,008	31,008	28,008	31,008
PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	2,367	8,367	2,367	5,367
SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	24,344	24,344	24,344	24,344
MA8975	2,332	2,332	2,332	2,332
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	962,888	1,027,028	962,243	1,089,728
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
INITIAL SPARES - C&E	42,401	42,401	42,401	42,401
INITIAL SPARES - OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	639	639	639	639
TOTAL, SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS	43,040	43,040	43,040	43,040
ARMY TRANSFORMATION: OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP (2nd BDE)	---	200,000	---	200,000
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	3,795,870	4,254,564	4,060,728	4,497,009

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	0	0	5,000	5,000
Heavy expanded mobility ammunition trailer		0	4,000	4,000
M105A3 trailers			1,000	1,000
HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)	110,746	125,046	135,746	138,046
Transformation: Additional HMMWV's		9,300	0	9,300
Army Reserve: Additional HMMWV's		5,000	0	3,000
Uparmored HMMWV's		0	25,000	15,000
FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	438,256	475,556	475,556	475,556
National Guard: Additional FMTV's		35,000	0	35,000
Army Reserves: Additional FMTV'S (5 ton)		2,300	0	2,300
Additional vehicles			37,300	0
FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	168,119	191,119	169,119	184,619
M3 CROP		10,000	3,000	8,500
Movement Tracking System		15,000	0	10,000
MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	28,910	36,910	38,910	42,410
A8020 fuel injection test stand		8,000	0	6,000
Aluminum mesh liner		0	10,000	7,500
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES	1,021	1,021	1,021	6,671
WMD-Civil Support Teams equipment				5,650
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)	32,875	66,875	65,275	70,175
Army Transformation: EPLRS		24,200	0	24,200
National Guard: EPLRS		10,000	0	8,000
Additional EPLRS		0	27,300	0
Software upgrades			5,300	5,300
SINCGARS FAMILY	18,340	51,840	38,340	51,840
Army Transformation: SINCGARS		10,000	0	10,000
National Guard: SINCGARS		20,000	20,000	20,000
Transformation: FHMUX		3,500	0	3,500
ACUS MOD PROGRAM (WIN T/T)	113,951	122,951	190,951	173,951
TS-21 Blackjack (AN/UXC-10)		9,000	14,000	9,000
HMDA, single shelter switches and maintenance shelters		0	63,000	51,000
INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	54,374	75,374	71,374	80,374
Information Assurance: Network Intrusion Detection Device		8,000	0	7,000
Information Assurance: Secure Terminal Equipment		13,000	5,000	7,000
Biometrics information assurance		0	12,000	12,000
INFORMATION SYSTEMS	57,779	57,779	86,879	86,879
NG Distance learning		0	29,100	29,100

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
ROLLER, VIBRATORY, SELF-PROPELLED (CCE)	4,671	11,671	9,671	11,671
Army Reserves: additional systems		4,000	0	4,000
Additional systems		3,000	5,000	3,000
CTC INSTRUMENTATION SUPPORT	81,845	93,945	94,445	99,045
MOUT		3,600	3,600	3,600
Targetry electronics for the Multi-purpose Range Complex-Heavy		3,500	0	2,000
DFIRST for National Guard Installation #21A95		5,000	0	3,600
Deployable force-on-force instrumentation		0	7,000	6,000
Deployable range training system		0	2,000	2,000
TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	91,937	104,937	103,937	116,937
Engagement skills trainers for the National Guard		8,000	0	5,000
Laser Markmanship Training System		5,000	0	4,000
Army Firefighter trainer		0	5,000	4,000
MILES 2000 equipment		0	7,000	7,000
Abrams Full-Crew Interactive Skills Trainer (#3312)			(5,000)	4,000
Guardfist				1,000
NIGHT VISION DEVICES	34,146	59,546	79,146	68,146
Miniature Eyesafe Laser Infrared Observation Set		5,000	0	3,000
AN/PVS-7 goggles		12,000	0	8,000
25mm image intensification tubes		8,400	0	6,000
Night vision devices			45,000	15,000
AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	172,051	181,051	183,051	189,051
NG Distance Learning Courseware		4,000	0	4,000
Ammunition AIT		5,000	0	3,000
Joint computer-aided acquisition and logistics support (JCALS)		0	6,000	6,000
Maintenance AIT			5,000	4,000
RIBBON BRIDGE	15,669	13,500	15,669	30,169
Ribbon bridges for the Army Reserves		13,500	0	13,500
National Guard: Multi-role bridge companies				1,000
LESS THAN $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	993	993	993	1,993
Launched grapnel hooks				1,000
COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	31,567	37,767	37,567	38,567
Portable Low-Power Blood Cooling and Storage Devices		2,200	0	2,000
Rapid Intravenous Infusion Pump		4,000	6,000	5,000
ARMY TRANSFORMATION: OTHER SUPPORT EQUIP	0	200,000	0	200,000
Procures support equipment for the 2nd Brigade		200,000	0	200,000

(Note: None of the funds may be obligated without prior notification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.)

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
AV-8B (V/STOL)HARRIER (MYP)	226,646	226,646	302,196	262,196
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	2,818,553	2,818,553	2,775,953	2,775,953
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP) (AP-CY)	101,068	101,068	101,068	101,068
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	1,128,592	1,128,592	1,128,592	1,128,592
V-22 (MEDIUM LIFT) (AP-CY)	79,858	79,858	79,858	79,858
AH-1W (HELICOPTER) SEA COBRA	2,452	2,452	2,452	2,452
SH-60R	162,327	152,327	249,027	211,357
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	252,790	252,790	192,232	247,790
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP) (AP-CY)	68,082	68,082	68,082	68,082
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT	4,840,368	4,830,368	4,899,460	4,877,348
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
CH-60S (MYP)	165,071	165,077	227,846	206,921
CH-60S (MYP) (AP-CY)	80,411	80,411	80,411	80,411
UC-35	---	15,200	---	7,600
C-40A	---	---	110,000	55,000
VP-3 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT	50,276	50,276	---	50,276
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT	295,758	310,964	418,257	400,208
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	268,579	268,579	317,779	301,379
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK (AP-CY)	5,142	5,142	5,142	5,142
JPATS	74,372	74,372	81,372	81,372
TOTAL, TRAINER AIRCRAFT	348,093	348,093	404,293	387,893
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
KC-130J	154,818	231,118	229,418	229,418

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
EA-6 SERIES	203,102	203,102	186,302	189,302
AV-8 SERIES	40,639	40,639	81,139	120,639
F-14 SERIES	30,481	30,481	31,481	31,481
ADVERSARY	6,947	6,947	6,947	6,947
F-18 SERIES	212,614	200,214	249,814	264,214
H-46 SERIES	16,556	21,556	16,556	19,556
AH-1W SERIES	9,758	13,758	13,758	13,758
H-53 SERIES	19,919	22,519	25,119	24,719
SH-60 SERIES	21,088	39,088	23,888	37,188
H-1 SERIES	2,642	16,642	21,392	15,642
H-3 SERIES	61	61	61	61
EP-3 SERIES	25,833	80,833	30,833	66,533
P-3 SERIES	60,710	78,710	108,310	99,760
S-3 SERIES	79,050	64,050	79,050	69,050
E-2 SERIES	18,485	57,485	18,485	42,485
TRAINER A/C SERIES	19,422	19,422	19,422	19,422
C-2A	2,596	2,596	2,596	2,596
C-130 SERIES	7,921	7,921	7,921	7,921
FEWSG	605	605	605	605
CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	7,936	7,936	7,936	7,936
E-6 SERIES	60,687	60,687	60,687	60,687
EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	7,632	7,632	7,632	7,632
SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	4,134	4,134	4,134	4,134
T-45 SERIES	9,057	9,057	9,057	9,057
POWER PLANT CHANGES	17,062	17,062	17,062	17,062
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	41,889	41,889	41,889	41,889
COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	71,620	71,620	71,620	71,620
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT	998,446	1,126,646	1,143,696	1,251,896
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	941,553	947,553	941,553	941,553
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES				
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	312,411	312,411	315,411	315,411
AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	8,642	8,642	8,642	8,642
WAR CONSUMABLES	13,015	13,015	15,015	14,015
OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	37,088	37,088	37,088	37,088
SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	12,158	12,158	12,158	12,158
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,508	1,508	1,508	1,508
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES	384,822	384,822	389,822	388,822
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	7,963,858	8,179,564	8,426,499	8,477,138

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
AV-8B (V/STOL) HARRIER (MYP)	226,646	226,646	302,196	262,196
Two (2) Additional AV-8B Modifications			92,000	52,000
Non-recurring Cost			-12,011	-12,011
Production Engineering Support Cost Growth			-4,439	-4,439
F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET (MYP)	2,818,553	2,818,553	2,775,953	2,775,953
Production Engineering Support Cost Growth			-13,000	-13,000
Premature IDECM RFCM Production Quantities			-29,600	-29,600
SH-60R	162,327	152,327	249,027	211,357
Non-recurring cost growth		-5,000		-5,000
Avionics support equipment deferment		-5,000		-5,000
Two (2) Additional SH-60R Modifications			78,600	52,400
AQS-22 Airborne Low Frequency Sonar (ALFS)			6,000	4,930
Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS)			2,100	1,700
E-2C (EARLY WARNING) HAWKEYE (MYP)	252,790	252,790	192,232	247,790
Delete One (1) Aircraft based on FMS			-50,558	
GFE Electronics Cost Growth			-10,000	-5,000
CH-60S (MYP)	165,071	165,071	227,846	206,921
Two (2) Additional CH-60 Helicopters			62,775	41,850
UC-35		15,200		7,600
One additional aircraft		15,200		7,600
C-40A			110,000	55,000
One additional aircraft			110,000	55,000
VP-3 REPLACEMENT AIRCRAFT	50,276	50,276		50,276
T-45TS (TRAINER) GOSHAWK	268,579	268,579	317,779	301,379
Two (2) Additional Aircraft			49,200	32,800
JPATS	74,372	74,372	81,372	81,372
Three (3) Additional Aircraft			7,000	7,000
KC-130J	154,818	231,118	229,418	229,418
Additional aircraft		76,300	74,600	74,600
EA-6 SERIES	203,102	203,102	186,302	189,302
Premature ICAP III Training System			-16,800	-16,800
EA-6B Block 89A Ready Room Mission Rehearsal System				3,000
AV-8 SERIES	40,639	40,639	81,139	120,639
Litening Targeting Pods			40,500	80,000
F-14 SERIES	30,481	30,481	31,481	31,481
RWR Antenna Replacement and System Enhancement			1,000	1,000
F-18 SERIES	212,614	200,214	249,814	264,214
Tactical Aircraft Moving Map Capability (TAMMAC)		5,000		3,000
ATFLIR		9,600		7,000
ATARS Procurement (OPEVAL results)		-27,000		0
ECP-583 Avionics Upgrade for Marine Corps			46,000	46,000
Premature ATFLIR Modifications and Installation Equipment			-8,800	-4,400
H-46 SERIES	16,556	21,556	16,556	19,556
Engine Reliability improvement program risk reduction		5,000		3,000
AH-1W SERIES	9,758	13,758	13,758	13,758
AH-1 Night targeting system		4,000	4,000	4,000
H-53 SERIES	19,919	22,519	25,119	24,719

Marine Corps Reserve: CH-53 Night Vision B-kits		2,600		1,800
Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS)			5,000	3,000
SH-60 SERIES	21,088	39,088	23,888	37,188
AN/AQS-13F		8,000		6,000
Specific Emitter Identification (procurement/installation)		10,000		8,000
Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic System (IMDS)			2,800	2,100
H-1 SERIES	2,642	16,642	21,392	15,642
AN/AAQ-22 Upgrade		8,000	10,000	7,000
H-1 Upgrade- reclaim/restore seven (7) airframes		6,000	8,750	6,000
EP-3 SERIES	25,833	80,833	30,833	66,533
Modification of P-3 to EP-3 configuration		55,000		61,000
SSIP/JMOD			5,000	5,000
Sensor System Improvement Program				-25,300
(Note: The fiscal year 2001 request for this program was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106-246) accordingly, the funds are no longer necessary and have been reduced.)				
P-3 SERIES	60,710	78,710	108,310	99,760
Digital Recorder Reproducers (DRRs)		4,000		2,000
SLAM-ER Weapon Integration		6,000		4,000
Digital Instantaneous Frequency Management Upgrade		6,000		6,000
Lightweight Environmentally Sealed Parachute Assembly		2,000		1,500
Four (4) ASUW Improvement Program (AIP) Kits			44,100	22,050
CNS/ATM			3,500	3,500
S-3 SERIES	79,050	64,050	79,050	69,050
Accelerated retirement of S-3 fleet in 2008		-15,000		-10,000
E-2 SERIES	18,485	57,485	18,485	42,485
Hawkeye 2000 Upgrade		39,000		24,000
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	941,553	947,553	941,553	941,553
Spares for P-3 to EP-3 modification		6,000		0
COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	312,411	312,411	315,411	315,411
Direct Support Squadron Readiness Training			3,000	3,000
WAR CONSUMABLES	13,015	13,015	15,015	14,015
High Pressure Pure Air Generator			2,000	1,000

COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE AIRCRAFT

The conferees note that the Air Force has decided to consider several different aircraft for its combat search and rescue mission, including such existing products as the EH–101 helicopter. The conferees understand that the Navy may be considering alternative to either extend the life of or replace the existing MH–53E helicopters used in the Vertical Onboard Delivery and the dedicated Airborne Mine countermeasures missions. The conferees believe that any such analysis should follow a similar competitive process as used by the Air Force, to ensure that the Navy takes advantage of all existing operational designs to obtain the best rotorcrafts available for those missions.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
BALLISTIC MISSILES				
TRIDENT II	433,932	433,932	433,932	433,932
TRIDENT II (AP-CY)	28,801	28,801	9,501	9,501
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	1,232	1,232	1,232	1,232
TOTAL, BALLISTIC MISSILES	463,965	463,965	444,665	444,665
OTHER MISSILES				
STRATEGIC MISSILES				
ESSM	40,001	40,001	40,001	40,001
TACTICAL MISSILES				
AMRAAM	38,943	38,943	38,943	38,943
JSOW	171,624	149,523	206,624	185,574
SLAM-ER	27,859	27,859	27,859	27,859
STANDARD MISSILE	170,365	170,365	170,365	170,365
RAM	23,067	23,067	23,067	23,067
HELLFIRE	---	---	25,000	20,000
AERIAL TARGETS	58,891	58,891	58,891	58,891
DRONES AND DECOYS	---	10,000	20,000	15,000
OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	14,902	14,902	14,902	14,902
MODIFICATION OF MISSILES				
SIDEWINDER MODS	27,532	27,532	27,532	27,532
STANDARD MISSILES MODS	50,690	50,690	50,690	50,690
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	21,269	21,269	29,469	29,469
FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	170,537	95,500	170,537	95,537

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,723	2,723	2,723	2,723
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	818,403	731,265	906,603	800,553
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT				
TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP.				
ASW TARGETS	3,180	3,180	3,180	3,180
MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP				
MK-46 TORPEDO MODS	7,141	7,141	7,141	7,141
MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	38,926	44,926	40,926	43,926
QUICKSTRIKE MINE	1,960	1,960	1,960	1,960
SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	23,740	23,740	23,740	23,740
ASW RANGE SUPPORT	14,955	18,955	14,955	18,955
DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION				
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	1,842	1,842	1,842	1,842
TOTAL, TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIPMENT	91,744	101,744	93,744	100,744
OTHER WEAPONS				
GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	909	909	2,409	2,409
MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS				
CIWS MODS	964	5,964	30,964	25,964
GUN MOUNT MODS	4,779	14,779	34,779	29,779
MODS LESS THAN $2 MILLION	---	---	5,000	4,000
TOTAL, OTHER WEAPONS	6,652	21,652	73,152	62,152
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	53,486	53,486	53,486	53,486
TOTAL, WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	1,434,250	1,372,112	1,571,650	1,461,600

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
TRIDENT II (AP-CY)	28,801	28,801	9,501	9,501
JSOW	171,624	149,523	206,624	185,574
JSOW-A		20,139		35,070
JSOW-B		-42,240		-21,120
HELLFIRE II			25,000	20,000
DRONES AND DECOYS		10,000	20,000	15,000
Improved Tactical Air Launched Decoy (ITALD)		10,000	20,000	15,000
WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	21,269	21,269	29,469	29,469
ABL Facility Restoration			8,200	8,200
FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	170,537	95,537	170,537	95,537
Defer EELV launch services until leadtime away from need per GAO recommendation		-75,000		-75,000
MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	38,926	44,926	40,926	43,926
Increased Procurement		6,000	2,000	5,000
ASW RANGE SUPPORT	14,955	18,955	14,955	18,955
Northwest Undersea Test Range Upgrade		4,000		4,000
SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	909	909	2,409	2,409
MK 43 machine gun conversion			1,500	1,500
CIWS MODS	964	5,964	30,964	25,964
Phalanx CIWS Block IB Upgrade kits		5,000		25,000
CIWS			30,000	0
GUN MOUNT MODS	4,779	14,779	34,779	29,779
MK-45 Gun System Mod 4 Upgrade kits		10,000	30,000	25,000
MODS UNDER $2 MILLION			5,000	4,000
SMAW Common Practice Round			5,000	4,000

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS				
PROC AMMO, NAVY				
NAVY AMMUNITION				
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	63,157	73,157	63,157	68,157
JDAM	24,390	24,390	24,390	24,390
2.75 INCH ROCKETS	---	---	9,600	5,600
AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	11,508	11,508	11,508	11,508
MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	5,230	5,230	11,730	8,230
PRACTICE BOMBS	50,600	60,600	65,600	63,100
CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	26,461	26,461	26,461	26,461
AIRCRAFT ESCAPE ROCKETS	10,635	10,635	10,635	10,635
AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	39,293	45,793	44,293	45,793
JATOS	4,995	4,995	4,995	4,995
5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	14,948	14,948	14,948	14,948
EXTENDED RANGE GUIDED MUNITIONS (ERGM)	5,723	5,723	5,723	5,723
76MM GUN AMMUNITION	8,733	8,733	8,733	8,733
OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	5,176	5,176	5,176	5,176
SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	8,745	8,745	8,745	8,745
PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	6,378	6,378	6,378	6,378
MINE NEUTRALIZATION DEVICES	7,317	7,317	7,317	7,317
AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,343	1,343	1,343	1,343
CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, NAVY	295,932	322,432	332,032	328,532

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROC AMMO, MC				
MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	23,456	26,456	23,456	25,456
7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	2,039	3,039	2,039	3,039
LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	40,945	44,945	44,945	44,945
.50 CALIBER	7,637	8,637	8,637	8,637
40 MM, ALL TYPES	2,034	2,034	3,034	3,034
60 MM, ALL TYPES	688	688	688	688
81 MM, ALL TYPES	4,981	4,981	4,981	4,981
120 MM, ALL TYPES	7,633	7,633	7,633	7,633
CTG 25 MM, ALL TYPES	3,931	3,931	3,931	3,931
9 MM ALL TYPES	2,657	2,657	2,657	2,657
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	8,358	12,358	8,358	10,858
STINGER SLEP	3,925	3,925	3,925	3,925
ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	1,592	6,192	1,592	11,192
ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	322	18,322	322	15,322
DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	9,638	9,638	9,638	9,638
FUZE, ALL TYPES	249	249	249	249
NON LETHALS	4,480	4,480	4,480	4,480
AMMO MODERNIZATION	6,900	6,900	6,900	6,900
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	952	952	952	952
CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	1,300	1,300	1,300	1,300
TOTAL, PROC AMMO, MC	133,717	169,317	139,717	169,817
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MARINE CORPS	429,649	491,749	471,749	498,349

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	63,157	73,157	63,157	68,157
Laser Guided Bombs		10,000		5,000
2.75 INCH ROCKETS			9,600	5,600
Hydra Rockets			9,600	5,600
MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	5,230	5,230	11,730	8,230
PGU-28/M793			6,500	3,000
PRACTICE BOMBS	50,600	60,600	65,600	63,100
Laser Guided Training Rounds		10,000	15,000	12,500
AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	39,293	45,793	44,293	45,793
MJU-52/B IR expendable countermeasures		6,500	5,000	6,500
5.56 MM, ALL TYPES	23,456	26,456	23,456	25,456
Increased quantity		3,000		2,000
7.62 MM, ALL TYPES	2,039	3,039	2,039	3,039
Increased quantity		1,000		1,000
LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	40,945	44,945	44,945	44,945
Anti-personnel obstacle breaching system		4,000	4,000	4,000
.50 CALIBER	7,637	8,637	8,637	8,637
Increased quantity		1,000	1,000	1,000
40 MM ALL TYPES	2,034	2,034	3,034	3,034
M430 HEDP			1,000	1,000
GRENADES, ALL TYPES	8,358	12,358	8,358	10,858
M67 fragmentation hand grenade		4,000		2,500
ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	1,592	6,192	1,592	11,192
SMAW Common round		4,600		4,600
83 mm HEDP			[5,000]	5,000
ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	322	18,322	322	15,322
M795 HE ammunition		18,000		15,000

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY				
OTHER WARSHIPS				
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	4,053,653	4,053,653	4,053,653	4,053,653
CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP-CY)	21,869	21,869	21,869	21,869
NEW SSN	1,203,012	1,198,012	1,203,012	1,198,012
NEW SSN (AP-CY)	508,222	508,222	508,222	508,222
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	703,441	698,441	703,441	698,441
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS	210,414	210,414	210,414	210,414
SUBMARINE REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP-CY)	72,277	72,277	72,277	72,277
DDG-51 (MYP)	2,713,559	2,703,559	2,713,559	2,703,559
DDG-51 (MYP) (AP-CY)	356,843	356,843	500,000	456,843
TOTAL, OTHER WARSHIPS	9,868,290	9,848,290	10,011,447	9,948,290
AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS				
LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (AP-CY)	---	---	460,000	460,000
LPD-17	1,489,286	1,479,286	---	---
LDP-17 PROGRAM COST GROWTH	---	---	285,000	---
LPD-17 (AP-CY)	20,700	20,700	200,000	560,700
TOTAL, AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS	1,509,986	1,499,986	945,000	1,020,700
AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM				
ADC(X)	338,951	348,951	338,951	338,951
OUTFITTING	301,077	291,077	301,077	291,077
LCAC SLEP	15,615	15,615	15,615	15,615
COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	263,000	263,000	---	---
TOTAL, AUXILIARIES, CRAFT, AND PRIOR-YEAR PROGRAM	918,643	918,643	655,643	645,643
TOTAL, SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	12,296,919	12,266,919	11,612,090	11,614,633

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
NEW SSN	1,203,012	1,198,012	1,203,012	1,198,012
Other Cost Growth		-5,000		-5,000
CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	703,441	698,441	703,441	698,441
C4ISR Upgrade, Engineering Services cost growth		-5,000		-5,000
DDG-51 (MYP)	2,713,559	2,703,559	2,713,559	2,703,559
Basic Construction cost growth		-10,000		-10,000
DDG-51 (MYP) (AP-CY)	356,843	356,843	500,000	456,843
Advance Procurement			143,157	100,000
LHD-1 AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT SHIP (MYP)			460,000	460,000
LHD-8			460,000	460,000
LPD-17	1,489,286	1,479,286	Ø	Ø
Escalation		-10,000		Ø
Defer 2 Ships			-1,489,286	-1,489,286
LPD-17 Cost Growth			285,000	Ø
LPD-17 (AP-CY)	20,700	20,700	200,000	560,700
Advance Procurement			179,300	540,000
ADC(X)	338,951	348,951	338,951	338,951
Second shipyard support engineering		10,000		Ø
OUTFITTING	301,077	291,077	301,077	291,077
LPD schedule delays		-10,000		-10,000
COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	263,000	263,000	Ø	Ø

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT				
LM-2500 GAS TURBINE	6,995	6,995	6,995	6,995
ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	6,257	6,257	6,257	6,257
PROPELLERS				
SUBMARINE PROPELLERS	3,757	3,757	3,757	3,757
NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT				
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	33,425	45,425	48,425	50,425
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT				
UNDERWAY REPLENISHMENT EQUIPMENT	9,120	9,120	9,120	9,120
PERISCOPES				
SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	18,998	18,998	18,998	18,998
OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT				
FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,837	16,837	16,837	16,837
COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	10,486	10,486	10,486	10,486
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	47,805	47,805	47,805	47,805
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	11,419	11,419	11,419	11,419
SUBMARINE BATTERIES	12,387	12,387	12,387	12,387
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	6,206	21,206	6,206	18,206
DSSP EQUIPMENT	5,356	5,356	5,356	5,356
LCAC	3,559	---	3,559	3,559
MINESWEEPING EQUIPMENT	16,589	16,589	16,589	16,589
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	58,851	60,851	63,351	64,851
SURFACE IMA	2,010	2,010	2,010	2,010
SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,852	4,852	4,852	4,852

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT				
REACTOR COMPONENTS	203,365	203,365	203,365	203,365
OCEAN ENGINEERING				
DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	5,649	5,649	5,649	5,649
SMALL BOATS				
STANDARD BOATS	2,696	2,696	2,696	2,696
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	3,302	3,302	3,302	3,302
PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT				
OPERATING FORCES IPE	2,689	2,689	2,689	19,689
OTHER SHIP SUPPORT				
NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	80,870	80,870	80,870	80,870
TOTAL, SHIPS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	573,480	598,921	592,980	625,480
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
SHIP RADARS				
RADAR SUPPORT	---	25,000	8,000	25,000
SHIP SONARS				
AN/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	14,291	14,291	14,291	14,291
SSN ACOUSTICS	106,647	114,647	106,647	112,647
UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	847	2,847	847	2,847
SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	---	5,000	---	5,000
SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	10,726	10,726	10,726	10,726
ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	10,697	10,697	10,697	10,697
FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	29,869	29,869	29,869	29,869

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SURTASS	5,516	5,516	5,516	5,516
ASW OPERATIONS CENTER	6,213	6,213	6,213	6,213
ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT				
INFORMATION WARFARE SYSTEMS	3,901	3,901	3,901	3,901
RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT				
SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	61,524	50,024	61,524	61,024
SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT				
SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	17,316	17,316	17,316	17,316
OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	---	10,000	---	7,000
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	15,853	33,853	15,853	33,853
GCCS-M EQUIPMENT AFLOAT	37,427	37,427	37,427	37,427
NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	46,692	46,692	46,692	46,692
ATDLS	19,153	19,153	19,153	19,153
MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	8,989	8,989	13,989	12,989
SHALLOW WATER MCM	16,863	16,363	16,863	16,363
NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	9,607	9,607	9,607	9,607
ARMED FORCES RADIO AND TV	9,046	9,046	9,046	9,046
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	15,356	15,356	15,356	15,356
TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
OTHER SPAWAR TRAINING EQUIPMENT	1,341	1,341	1,341	1,341
OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	21,390	28,390	21,390	29,390
AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
MATCALS	4,294	4,294	4,294	4,294
SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,945	7,945	11,945	7,945

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	18,510	18,510	18,510	18,510
NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	30,549	30,549	30,549	30,549
AIR STATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,705	6,705	6,705	6,705
MICROWAVE LANDING SYSTEM	5,124	5,124	5,124	5,124
FACSFAC	4,315	4,315	4,315	4,315
ID SYSTEMS	14,280	14,280	14,280	14,280
SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS	---	4,000	---	1,500
TAC A/C MISSION PLANNING SYS (TAMPS)	11,980	11,980	11,980	11,980
OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
TADIX-B	32	6,032	32	6,032
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	2,735	2,735	2,735	2,735
COMMON IMAGERY GROUND SURFACE SYSTEMS	47,022	47,022	47,022	47,022
RADIAC	8,308	8,308	8,308	8,308
GPETE	7,356	7,356	7,356	7,356
INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,421	4,421	4,421	4,421
EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	5,378	8,378	5,378	8,378
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,889	11,889	4,889	11,889
SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS				
SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	---	---	---	3,000
SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	185,143	185,143	185,143	185,143
COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	30,909	30,909	30,909	30,909
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS				
SHORE LF/VLF COMMUNICATIONS	31,433	31,433	31,433	31,433
SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	77,957	77,957	77,957	77,957
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS				

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	252,695	206,606	227,695	227,695
SHORE COMMUNICATIONS				
JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	2,460	2,460	2,460	2,460
NSIPS	1,785	1,785	1,785	1,785
JEDMICS	---	12,000	4,000	12,000
NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	176,132	176,132	161,732	166,132
CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT				
INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	46,563	66,563	49,563	58,563
CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT				
SPECIAL DCP	14,964	14,964	14,964	14,964
CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	17,188	17,188	17,188	17,188
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT	1,490,336	1,559,247	1,474,936	1,573,836
AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SONOBUOYS				
PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)	---	---	3,000	3,000
AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)	---	---	3,000	3,000
AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)	---	---	3,000	3,000
SONOBUOYS - ALL TYPES	49,466	49,466	49,466	49,466
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,125	26,225	25,125	28,725
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE	---	---	10,500	10,500
EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	3,304	3,304	3,304	3,304
AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	10,676	10,676	10,676	10,676
AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	36,433	36,433	36,433	36,433
METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	30,860	30,860	30,860	30,860

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	1,682	1,682	1,682	1,682
AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	20,374	16,674	30,274	26,574
AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	32,084	32,084	32,084	32,084
OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,928	4,928	21,928	21,928
TOTAL, AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	204,932	212,332	261,332	261,232
ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT				
GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	18,287	18,287	18,287	18,287
SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT				
NATO SEASPARROW	21,716	22,716	21,716	22,716
RAM GMLS	37,309	36,809	37,309	36,809
SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	9,352	9,352	9,352	9,352
AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	36,848	36,848	19,348	31,848
SURFACE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	70,562	70,562	70,562	70,562
SUBMARINE TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIP	2,883	2,883	2,883	2,883
VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	6,982	6,982	6,982	6,982
FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	2,901	2,901	2,901	2,901
STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	166,619	166,619	166,619	166,619
ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	33,814	33,814	38,114	38,114
ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	20,896	19,596	20,896	19,596
SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,978	3,978	3,978	3,978
SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,269	6,269	13,269	13,269
ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,904	6,904	6,904	6,904

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	7,525	7,525	7,525	7,525
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	5,613	5,613	5,613	5,613
OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE				
SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	7,941	7,941	7,941	7,941
SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	31,557	31,557	34,057	34,057
TOTAL, ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	497,956	497,156	494,256	505,956
CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
ARMORED SEDANS	197	197	---	---
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	94	94	60	60
GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	1,004	1,004	1,004	1,004
CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	6,238	8,238	6,238	8,238
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	2,477	2,477	2,477	2,477
TACTICAL VEHICLES	10,458	10,458	20,458	20,458
AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	51,615	51,615	51,615	51,615
POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	22,154	22,154	22,154	22,154
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,433	3,433	3,433	3,433
TOTAL, CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	97,670	99,670	107,439	109,439
SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	7,646	7,646	7,646	7,646
OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,196	5,196	5,196	5,196
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	4,081	4,081	4,081	4,081
SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	144,885	144,885	144,885	144,885
TOTAL, SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	161,808	161,808	161,808	161,808

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
TRAINING DEVICES				
TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,562	1,562	1,562	6,762
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,592	15,592	15,592	17,592
EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,076	5,076	4,076	5,076
MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,386	7,386	7,386	7,386
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,993	15,993	19,993	19,993
OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,003	25,003	25,003	25,003
ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	22,247	14,747	15,247	19,247
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	9,629	9,629	9,629	9,629
TOTAL, PERSONNEL AND COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	99,488	94,988	98,488	110,688
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	208,941	208,941	208,941	208,941
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	3,334,611	3,433,063	3,400,180	3,557,380

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	33,425	45,425	48,425	50,425
WSN-7B Ring Laser Gyro		12,000	7,000	10,000
MSC Thermal Imaging System			8,000	7,000
STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	6,206	21,206	6,206	18,206
AN/UYQ-70 Submarine Workstations		15,000		12,000
LCAC	3,559		3,559	3,559
LCAC SLEP (unobligated balances)		-3,559		
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	58,851	60,851	63,351	64,851
Unattended Paint Removal and Application system		2,000		2,000
Integrated Condition Assessment System			4,500	4,000
OPERATING FORCES IPE	2,689	2,689	2,689	19,689
Capital Purchase Plan (Pearl Harbor)				17,000
RADAR SUPPORT		25,000	8,000	25,000
AN/SYS-2 Integrated Tracking System		10,000		10,000
SPS-73 (V) Radar		14,000	8,000	14,000
BPS-15H radar enhanced bridge repeaters		1,000		1,000
SSN ACOUSTICS	106,647	114,647	106,647	112,647
TB-23 Array refurbishment		8,000		6,000
UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	847	2,847	847	2,847
Carrier Tactical Surveillance Center (CV-TSC)		2,000		2,000
SONAR SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,000		5,000
New sonar dome windows		5,000		5,000
(Note: Funding is only for completion of fabrication of production tooling and first article production dome with the new material system.)				
SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	61,524	50,024	61,524	61,024
Contract Savings/Unobligated balances		-11,500		-500
NAVY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM		10,000		7,000
Land based display emulators		10,000		7,000
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	15,853	33,853	15,853	33,853
System life extension, test sites		18,000		18,000
MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	8,989	8,989	13,989	12,989
High Resolution Multibeam Side Scanner			5,000	4,000
SHALLOW WATER MCM	16,863	16,363	16,863	16,363
Contract Savings		-500		-500
OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	21,390	24,390	21,390	29,390
Air Traffic Control On-board trainer		3,000		4,000
BFTT electronic warfare trainers		4,000		4,000
SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,945	7,945	11,945	7,945
Air Traffic Control On-Board Training Devices			4,000	
SURFACE IDENTIFICATION SYSTEMS		4,000		1,500
Shipboard Advanced Radar Target ID system (SARTIS)		4,000		1,500
TADIX-B	32	6,032	32	6,032
Additional procurement of JTT-N terminals		6,000		6,000
EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	5,378	8,378	5,378	8,378
Mobile Inshore Undersea Warfare System (MIUW) Upgrades		3,000		3,000
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,889	11,889	4,889	11,889

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
Network based shipboard interior secure voice communications (Note: funding is only for procurement of AN/UYQ-70 secure voice technology equipment for land based evaluations.)		7,000		7,000
SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS				3,000
Programmable integrated communication terminals				3,000
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	252,695	206,606	227,695	227,695
Defer procurement of EHF follow-on terminals pending sucessful end-to-end testing per GAO recommendation.		-46,809	-25,000	-25,000
JEDMICS		12,000		12,000
JEDMICS Encryption (Note: only for the continued procurement and integration of the same security solution implemented in 1999 and 2000.)		12,000		8,000
JEDMICS Enhancements			4,000	4,000
NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS	176,132	176,132	161,732	166,132
Redundant Systems			-14,400	-10,000
INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	46,563	66,563	49,563	58,563
Information Assurance: Network Intrusion Detection Device		8,000		7,000
Information Assurance: Secure Terminal Equipment		12,000	3,000	5,000
PASSIVE SONOBUOYS (NON-BEAM FORMING)			3,000	3,000
AN/SSQ-62 (DICASS)			3,000	3,000
AN/SSQ-101 (ADAR)			3,000	3,000
WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,125	26,225	25,125	28,725
Mobile Remote Emitter Simulator (MRESS) (Note: Funding provided is available only to acquire MRESS equipment for the Atlantic Test Range, Patuxent River, Md.)		15,000		7,500
Underwater Acoustic Telemetry Modem		-2,700		-2,700
GOMEX Mine Warfare Range		-1,200		-1,200
Joint Tactical Combat Training System			5,000	5,000
Naval Air Strike and Air Warfare Center			5,000	5,000
PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			10,500	10,500
General Support			3,000	3,000
Mobile Remote Emitter System			7,500	7,500
AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	20,374	16,674	30,274	26,574
CSEL - contract award slip		-3,200		-3,200
PRC-112 upgrades - contract cancellation		-500		-500
AN/AVS - 9			9,900	9,900
OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,928	4,928	21,928	21,928
Joint Tactical Data Integration			17,000	17,000
NATO SEASPARROW	21,716	22,716	21,716	22,716
Enhancement for Automatic Audio Video Tracking and Non-Cooperative Target Recognition		1,000		1,000
RAM GMLS	37,309	36,809	37,309	36,809
Contract savings		-500		-500
AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	36,848	36,848	19,348	31,848
Total ship monitoring program		5,000		5,000
Smartship fielding (unobligated balances)		-5,000		0
Program Reduction (SMARTSHIP)			-17,500	-10,000

	Budget	HAC	SAC	Conference
ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	33,814	33,814	38,114	38,114
NUKLA			4,300	4,300
SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	20,896	19,596	20,896	19,596
AN/BSG-1- operational test slip		-1,300		-1,300
SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	6,269	6,269	13,269	13,269
Surface Vessel Torpedo Tubes			7,000	7,000
SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	31,557	31,557	34,057	34,057
Data Management and Conversion			2,500	2,500
ARMORED SEDANS	197	197		
PASSENGER CARRYING VECHICLES	94	94	60	60
Excessive Growth			-34	-34
CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	6,238	8,238	6,238	8,238
Laser leveling equipment		2,000		2,000
TACTICAL VECHICLES	10,458	10,458	20,458	20,458
MTVR Trucks			10,000	10,000
TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	1,562	1,562	1,562	6,762
F-18 Technical Manual Digitization				5,200
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,592	15,592	15,592	17,592
Advanced Technical Information System				2,000
EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,076	5,076	4,076	5,076
Navy recruiting kiosks		3,000	2,000	3,000
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	15,993	15,993	19,993	19,993
Cryptology Readiness Training Support			4,000	4,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	22,247	14,747	15,447	19,247
Primary ocean prediction system - software delays		-7,500		0
Program Reduction			-7,000	-3,000

SLQ-32 Electronic Warfare System

The conferees direct the Department of the Navy to provide a report within 120 days which outlines the Navy's assessment of the operational readiness status of the AN/SLQ-32(V) electronic warfare system. The report should include an analysis of the SLQ-32 to meet current threats, together with plans and funding requirements to structure a program which insures the tactical viability of the AN/SLQ-32(V) until it is no longer the primary, shipboard EW system.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES				
TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES				
AAV7A1 PIP	83,372	83,372	83,372	83,372
RAPID ACQUISITION PROGRAM	4,930	---	---	---
LAV PIP	1,709	1,709	1,709	1,709
IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (IRV)	42,623	42,623	42,623	42,623
MODIFICATION KITS (TRKD VEH)	20,815	20,815	20,815	20,815
ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS				
MOD KITS (ARTILLERY)	3,891	3,891	3,891	3,891
MARINE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	6,413	6,413	8,413	8,413
WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES LESS THAN $5 MILLION	415	415	415	415
WEAPONS				
155 MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	11,105	11,105	11,105	11,105
OTHER SUPPORT				
OPERATIONS OTHER THAN WAR	1,347	1,347	1,347	1,347
TOTAL, WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES	176,620	171,690	173,690	173,690
GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT				
GUIDED MISSILES				
JAVELIN (MYP)	29,119	29,119	29,119	29,119
PEDESTAL MOUNTED STINGER (PMS)	10,550	10,550	10,550	10,550
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	949	949	949	949
PREDATOR (SRAW)	43,355	43,355	43,355	43,355

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER SUPPORT				
MODIFICATION KITS	3,598	3,598	3,598	3,598
TOTAL, GUIDED MISSILES AND EQUIPMENT	87,571	87,571	87,571	87,571
COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT				
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
AUTO TEST EQUIP SYS	4,714	4,714	4,714	4,714
GENERAL PURPOSE ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIP	8,241	8,241	8,241	8,241
INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	11,960	17,960	11,960	11,960
MOD KITS (INTEL)	5,041	5,041	5,041	5,041
ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (INTELL)	402	402	402	402
REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
GENERAL PURPOSE MECHANICAL TMDE	4,676	4,676	4,676	4,676
OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	14,351	14,351	22,051	21,351
OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	8,320	8,320	8,320	8,320
COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	80,656	80,656	80,656	80,656
COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	9,507	9,507	14,507	9,507
RADIO SYSTEMS	3,097	9,097	17,497	16,497
COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,152	3,152	3,152	3,152
COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	80,564	82,564	80,564	88,564
MOD KITS MAGTF C41	7,484	7,484	7,484	7,484
AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	3,152	3,152	3,152	3,152
INTELLIGENCE C2 SYSTEMS	14,666	14,666	14,666	14,666
FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,343	17,343	12,343	15,343

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TOTAL, COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS EQUIPMENT.....	272,326	291,326	299,426	303,726
SUPPORT VEHICLES				
ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES				
COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES.....	1,397	1,397	660	660
COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES.....	23,368	23,368	23,368	23,368
TACTICAL VEHICLES				
5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP).....	124,448	149,448	124,448	139,448
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT (MYP).....	325,582	325,582	325,582	325,582
OTHER SUPPORT				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION.....	12,684	12,684	12,684	12,684
TOTAL, SUPPORT VEHICLES.....	487,479	512,479	486,742	501,742
ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT				
ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT.....	3,809	3,809	3,809	3,809
BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT.....	2,704	2,704	2,704	2,704
TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS.....	7,651	7,651	7,651	7,651
DEMOLITION SUPPORT SYSTEMS.....	655	655	655	655
POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED.....	9,325	10,825	9,325	10,825
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.....	---	2,000	---	2,000
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT.....	5,317	5,317	5,317	5,317
GARRISON MOBILE ENGR EQUIP.....	5,741	5,741	5,741	5,741
MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP.....	36,311	48,411	36,311	48,411
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION.....	5,846	5,846	5,846	5,846
GENERAL PROPERTY				
FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT.....	1,914	1,914	1,914	1,914

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TRAINING DEVICES	30,791	30,791	30,791	30,791
CONTAINER FAMILY	6,902	6,902	6,902	6,902
OTHER SUPPORT ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	5,591	5,591	6,591	6,591
TOTAL, ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT	122,557	138,157	123,557	139,157
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	25,382	25,382	25,382	25,382
TRAINING DEVICES	---	3,000	---	2,000
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	1,171,935	1,229,605	1,196,368	1,233,268

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	14,351	14,351	22,051	21,351
INOD			2,700	2,000
AN/PEQ-2A			2,000	2,000
Borelight			1,000	1,000
M203 titling bracket			2,000	2,000
COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	9,507	9,507	14,507	9,507
ULCANS			5,000	0
(Note: Funds appropriated in OM, MC)				
RADIO SYSTEMS	3,097	6,000	17,497	16,497
Tactical handheld radio		6,000	8,000	7,000
Enhanced position location reporting system		0	6,400	6,400
COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	80,564	82,564	80,564	88,564
Common end user package		2,000	0	2,000
Base telecommunications infrastructure (Camp Pendelton)				6,000

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
TACTICAL FORCES				
F-22 RAPTOR	2,149,882	2,149,882	2,149,882	2,149,882
F-22 RAPTOR (AP-CY)	396,222	396,222	396,222	396,222
F-15A	---	400,000	---	400,000
F-16 C/D (MYP)	---	---	183,000	122,000
TOTAL, COMBAT AIRCRAFT	2,546,104	2,946,104	2,729,104	3,068,104
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
TACTICAL AIRLIFT				
C-17 (MYP)	2,211,923	2,185,823	---	---
C-17 (MYP) (AP-CY)	266,800	207,800	---	---
C-17 ICS	412,200	412,200	---	---
OTHER AIRLIFT				
EC-130J	---	---	90,000	90,000
C-130J	208,051	208,051	84,051	208,051
C-40	---	---	52,000	52,000
TOTAL, AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT	3,098,974	3,013,874	226,051	350,051

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
OPERATIONAL TRAINERS				
JPATS	113,825	113,825	132,725	132,725
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
HELICOPTERS				
V-22 OSPREY	335,766	335,766	335,766	335,766
V-22 OSPREY (AP-CY)	27,209	27,209	22,674	22,674
MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT				
CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	2,548	2,548	6,348	6,348
CINC SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	---	---	---	60,000
TARGET DRONES	32,915	32,915	32,915	32,915
E-8C	260,610	250,610	260,610	250,610
E-8C (AP-CY)	---	40,000	46,000	46,000
HAEUAV	22,388	22,388	22,388	22,388
PREDATOR UAV	22,078	32,078	22,078	32,078
TOTAL, OTHER AIRCRAFT	703,514	743,514	748,779	808,779
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT				
STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT				
B-2A	21,723	24,723	21,723	24,723
B-1B	48,793	48,793	48,793	48,793
B-52	8,425	20,425	33,525	42,525
F-117	32,005	32,005	32,005	32,005
TACTICAL AIRCRAFT				
A-10	33,891	37,891	45,091	40,691
F-15	258,247	305,647	306,747	322,197
F-16	248,830	248,830	328,020	309,030

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
T/AT-37	83	83	83	83
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
C-5	95,401	95,401	95,401	95,401
C-9	3,271	3,271	3,271	3,271
C-17A	97,124	97,124	108,124	97,124
C-21	1,883	1,883	1,883	1,883
C-32A	23,568	23,568	5,568	5,568
C-37A	376	376	376	376
C-141	737	737	737	737
TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
T-3 (EFS) AIRCRAFT	1,949	---	1,949	---
T-38	120,520	120,520	120,520	120,520
T-41 AIRCRAFT	89	89	89	89
T-43	4,929	4,929	4,929	4,929
OTHER AIRCRAFT				
KC-10A (ATCA)	55,370	55,370	55,370	55,370
C-12	1,521	1,521	1,521	1,521
C-18	345	345	345	345
C-20 MODS	5,235	5,235	5,235	5,235
VC-25A MOD	98	98	98	98
C-130	91,524	94,524	103,524	102,024
C-135	328,232	380,232	328,232	380,232
DARP	165,540	180,276	276,640	159,276
E-3	88,654	88,654	88,654	88,654
E-4	31,559	31,559	31,559	31,559

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
E-8	33,389	33,389	33,389	33,389
H-1	3,535	3,535	3,535	3,535
H-60	23,648	23,648	23,648	23,648
OTHER AIRCRAFT	28,214	38,214	28,214	33,714
OTHER MODIFICATIONS				
CLASSIFIED PROJECTS	16,729	16,729	16,729	16,729
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE AIRCRAFT	1,875,437	2,019,624	2,155,527	2,085,274
AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
AIRCRAFT SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	356,856	356,856	356,856	356,856
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES				
COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQ & FACILITIES	177,943	177,943	177,943	177,943
POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT				
B-2A	18,603	18,603	18,603	18,603
B-2B	42,700	42,700	42,700	42,700
C-130	1,365	1,365	1,365	1,365
E-4	1,463	1,463	1,463	1,463
F-15 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	7,267	7,267	7,267	7,267
F-16 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	25,464	37,464	25,464	31,464
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	25,352	25,352	25,352	25,352
WAR CONSUMABLES	43,015	53,015	66,115	58,015
MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	398,474	363,553	471,374	398,474
COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	4,836	4,836	4,836	4,836
DARP	98,410	136,674	98,410	14,074
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES	844,892	870,235	940,892	781,556
TOTAL, AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	9,539,602	10,064,032	7,289,934	7,583,345

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
F-16 C/D (MYP)			**183,000**	**122,000**
Four (4) Block 50/52 aircraft			183,000	122,000
C-17 (MYP)	**2,211,923**	**2,185,823**		**0**
AF requested transfer to C-17 AP		-41,000		-41,000
Simulator		14,900		0
Transfer to National Defense Airlift Fund			-2,211,923	-2,170,923
C-17 (MYP) (AP-CY)	**266,800**	**207,800**		**0**
AF requested transfer to C-17 AP		41,000		41,000
Revised C-17 AP funding requirements		-100,000		-50,000
Transfer to National Defense Airlift Fund			-266,800	-257,800
C-17 ICS	**412,200**	**412,200**		**0**
Transfer to National Defense Airlift Fund			-412,200	-412,200
EC-130J			**90,000**	**90,000**
C-130J	**208,051**	**208,051**	**84,051**	**208,051**
Funds provided are only for procurement of two C-130J aircraft for Western States firefighting in the ANG and for C-130J support		(208,051)		(208,051)
Conversion of two (2) aircraft to EC and KC models			-124,000	0
CINC SUPPORT AIRCRAFT				**60,000**
737 for CINCPAC				
B-52	**8,425**	**20,425**	**33,525**	**42,525**
Electronic countermeasures and situational awareness		12,000		9,000
Maintain 94 B-52 aircraft			25,100	25,100
F-15	**258,247**	**305,647**	**306,747**	**322,197**
Fighter datalink		21,000		12,000
BOL IR for ANG		26,400		26,400
E-kit Engine Modifications			48,000	36,000
Survivability Enhancements			26,900	0
JHMCS Delays and Technical Problems			-5,500	0
ALQ-135 Delays and Technical Problems			-20,900	-10,450
F-16	**248,830**	**248,830**	**328,020**	**309,030**
Digital Terrain System (DTS)			16,500	12,000
-229 Engine Mods for ANG Block 42 Aircraft			69,000	48,700
JHMCS Delays and Technical Problems			-11,310	-4,000
OBOGS Retrofit			5,000	3,500
AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
C-5	**95,401**	**95,401**	**95,401**	**95,401**
NOTE: The appropriated funds are for the C-5 modification program as presented in the President's Budget				
C-130	**91,524**	**94,524**	**103,524**	**102,024**
Aluminum Mesh Tank Liner System (competitively funded in FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION in RDT&E,AF)		3,000		0
HC-130 FLIR Systems for ANG			4,500	3,000
C-130 Simulator			7,500	7,500
C-135	**328,232**	**380,232**	**328,232**	**380,232**
KC-135R reengine for Air National Guard		52,000		52,000

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DARP	**165,540**	**180,276**	**276,640**	**159,276**
RC-135 RIVET JOINT transfer		5,077		5,077
U-2 transfer		-18,341		-18,341
RC-135 RIVET JOINT aircrew trainer (AMPd trainer)		22,000		0
NOTE: Funding for this project was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106 - 246).				
RC-135 RIVET JOINT Theater Airborne Warning System (TAWS)		6,000		0
RC-135 RIVET JOINT Reengining			59,900	0
RC-135 COBRA BALL digital processing/receiving			9,000	7,000
RC-135 RIVET JOINT mission trainer (EFETS)			15,500	0
NOTE: Funding for this project was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106 - 246).				
U-2 SYERS spares			3,000	0
COMPASS CALL Block 30/35 mission crew simulator			23,700	0
MISC PRODUCTION CHARGES	**398,474**	**363,553**	**471,374**	**398,474**
Defer Advanced Targeting Pod		-34,921		0
Precision Attack Targeting System Pods (Funded in USMC)			72,900	0
DARP	**98,410**	**136,674**	**98,410**	**14,074**
U-2 trainer		14,000		0
NOTE: Funding for this project was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106 - 246).				
U-2 Sensor improvements & modifications				-111,600
NOTE: The fiscal year 2001 request for this program was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106 - 246) accordingly, the funds are no longer necessary and have been reduced.				
U-2 SYERS spares		3,000		3,000
U-2 JSAF 1st Production LBSS/HBSS unit		8,000		8,000
RC-135 RIVET JOINT transfer		-5,077		-5,077
U-2 transfer		18,341		18,341
U-2 study to reopen line			(3,000)	3,000

RC-135 RIVET JOINT Theater Airborne Warning System (TAWS)

The conferees direct that all of the funds provided for the Theater Airborne Warning System (TAWS) in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000, may be obligated to purchase sensors and modify COBRA BALL or RIVET JOINT aircraft, whichever is in the best interests of National Security and at the discretion of the Secretary of the Air Force. The conferees further direct that the Future Years Defense Program should fully fund the completion of the TAWS modifications and the fielding of TAWS on whichever aircraft the Secretary determines will be modified with the fiscal year 2000 funds.

Advanced Targeting Pods

The Air Force requested $34,921,000 for the Advanced Targeting Pod program. The conferees agree to provide this amount subject to the reporting requirements directed by the House. The conferees direct that of the quantity of Advanced Targeting Pods procured with fiscal year 2001 appropriations, no less than 15 pods shall be assigned on a permanent basis to Air National Guard units deployed to Desert Storm which have otherwise not been upgraded to perform the SEAD mission. The conferees further direct the Air Force to implement its proposal to upgrade such units with F-16 Block 30 or better aircraft no later than fiscal year 2003.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE				
ROCKETS	11,466	11,466	26,466	19,466
CARTRIDGES	70,090	70,090	70,090	70,090
BOMBS				
PRACTICE BOMBS	32,731	32,731	33,731	33,731
GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	30,745	30,745	30,745	30,745
CAWCF CLOSURE COSTS	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,400
SENSOR FUZED WEAPON	107,201	107,201	107,201	107,201
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	219,848	219,848	219,848	219,848
WIND CORRECTED MUNITIONS DISPENSER	104,046	104,046	104,046	104,046
FLARE, IR MJU-7B				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	2,431	2,431	2,431	2,431
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	196	196	196	196
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,806	7,806	7,806	7,806
FUZES				
FLARES	37,432	37,432	37,432	37,432
JOINT PROGRAMMABLE FUSE(JPF)	9,342	9,342	9,342	9,342
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, AIR FORCE	634,734	634,734	650,734	643,734
WEAPONS				
SMALL ARMS	4,074	4,074	4,074	4,074
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	638,808	638,808	654,808	647,808

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
BALLISTIC MISSILES				
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	42,308	11,508	42,308	22,308
OTHER MISSILES				
STRATEGIC				
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	2,006	2,006	2,006	2,006
TACTICAL				
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	90,828	76,012	90,828	83,420
AGM-130 POWERED GBU-15	96	96	96	96
AMRAAM	98,687	98,687	98,687	98,687
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES				
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	3,017	3,017	3,017	3,017
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT - OTHER				
MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-OTHER	2,623	2,623	2,623	2,623
TOTAL, OTHER MISSILES	197,257	182,441	197,257	189,849
MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES				
CLASS IV				
SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X)	28,428	28,428	28,428	28,428
MM III MODIFICATIONS	375,129	375,129	375,129	375,129
AGM-65D MAVERICK	2,042	2,042	2,042	6,042
AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE	4,066	4,066	4,066	4,066
PEACEKEEPER (M-X)	99	---	99	---
MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	99	99	99	99
TOTAL, MODIFICATION OF INSERVICE MISSILES	409,863	409,764	409,863	413,764
MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS				
MISSILE SPARES - REPAIR PARTS	44,026	42,354	44,026	42,354

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER SUPPORT				
SPACE PROGRAMS				
WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES (SPACE) (AP-CY)	25,736	25,736	25,736	25,736
SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	9,765	9,765	9,765	9,765
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	162,068	162,596	166,637	157,137
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) (AP-CY)	17,904	17,404	13,404	17,904
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM	1,478	1,478	1,478	1,478
DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG (SPACE)	68,582	68,582	68,582	68,582
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	106,356	106,356	106,356	106,356
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM (SPACE)	22,770	22,770	22,770	22,770
TITAN SPACE BOOSTERS (SPACE)	469,720	469,720	384,720	409,720
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (SPACE)	287,996	275,996	287,996	282,996
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE (SPACE)	55,939	43,081	45,939	43,081
SPECIAL PROGRAMS				
SPECIAL PROGRAMS	968,498	902,898	952,898	908,898
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	141,080	141,080	141,080	141,080
TOTAL, OTHER SUPPORT	2,337,892	2,247,462	2,227,361	2,195,503
TOTAL, MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	3,031,346	2,893,529	2,920,815	2,863,778

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON	**90,828**	**76,012**	**90,828**	**83,420**
Decrease anti-armor variant quantity		-28,160		-14,080
Increase baseline variant quantity		13,344		6,672
SIDEWINDER MODS	**28,428**	**28,428**	**28,428**	**28,428**
Note: The conferees direct that future Air Force and Navy budget requests for AIM-9X be included in the new procurement sections of the Missile Procurement Air Force and Weapons Procurement Navy budget accounts rather than the current practice of budgeting AIM-9X as a modification.				
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	**162,068**	**162,596**	**166,637**	**157,137**
Amended budget submission		10,528	4,569	69
Program reduction		-10,000		-5,000
GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) (AP-CY)	**17,904**	**17,404**	**13,404**	**17,904**
Amended budget submission		-500	-4,500	0
MEDIUM LAUNCH VEHICLE (SPACE)	**55,939**	**43,081**	**45,939**	**43,081**
Savings from delayed GPS launches (GAO)		-12,858		-12,858
Program reduction			-10,000	0

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT				
PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES				
SEDAN, 4 DR 4X2	254	254	254	254
BUSES	4,101	4,101	4,101	4,101
AMBULANCES	646	646	646	646
LAW ENFORCEMENT VEHICLE	1,706	1,706	1,706	1,706
ARMORED SEDAN	200	200	---	---
CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES				
TRUCK MULTI-STOP 1 TON 4X2	17,593	17,593	17,593	17,593
FAMILY MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	5,869	5,869	5,869	5,869
HIGH MOBILITY VEHICLE (MYP)	13,435	13,435	13,435	13,435
CAP VEHICLES	768	768	768	768
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	29,235	29,235	29,235	29,235
SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
HMMWV, ARMORED	5,586	5,586	15,586	13,586
TRACTOR, TOW, FLIGHTLINE	5,042	5,042	5,042	5,042
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	18,373	18,373	18,373	18,373
FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT				
TRUCK CRASH P-19	8,761	8,761	8,761	8,761
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	3,700	3,700	3,700	3,700
MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
TRUCK, F/L 10,000 LB	4,857	4,857	4,857	4,857
60K A/C LOADER	96,948	96,948	96,948	96,948
NEXT GENERATION SMALL LOADER(NGSL)	24,144	11,544	14,144	24,144
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,530	4,530	4,530	4,530

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
TRUCK, DUMP	1,763	1,763	1,763	1,763
RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQUIP	5,852	5,852	5,852	5,852
MODIFICATIONS	387	387	387	387
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	8,616	18,616	8,616	13,616
TOTAL, VEHICULAR EQUIPMENT	262,366	259,766	262,166	275,166
ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP				
COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)				
COMSEC EQUIPMENT	23,346	23,346	27,346	23,346
MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	491	491	491	491
INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS				
INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	1,572	1,572	1,572	1,572
INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	5,530	36,730	5,530	24,530
ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				
AIR TRAFFIC CTRL/LAND SYS (ATCALS)	---	6,000	---	6,000
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	58,663	52,663	58,663	58,663
THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENT	15,431	14,997	15,431	14,997
WEATHER OBSERV/FORCAST	33,515	28,115	33,515	31,515
STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	20,858	20,858	20,858	20,858
CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	602	602	602	602
TAC SIGINT SUPPORT	1,447	1,447	1,447	1,447
SPECIAL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS				
AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	74,771	84,771	74,771	81,771
AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	14,753	14,753	14,753	14,753
MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	8,495	8,495	8,495	8,495

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	34,519	34,519	34,519	34,519
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	26,003	31,003	47,403	49,903
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM NET	1,584	1,584	1,584	1,584
C3 COUNTERMEASURES	15,681	15,681	15,681	15,681
BASE LEVEL DATA AUTO PROGRAM	23,788	23,788	23,788	23,788
THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYS	56,820	56,820	56,820	56,820
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS				
BASE INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE	177,283	177,283	177,283	177,283
USCENTCOM	7,335	7,335	7,335	7,335
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	17,947	17,947	17,947	17,947
DISA PROGRAMS				
NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	9,112	2,212	9,112	4,112
NUDET DETECTION SYS (NDS) SPACE	2,674	2,674	2,674	2,674
AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	39,094	39,094	39,094	39,094
SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	92,714	92,714	92,714	92,714
MILSATCOM SPACE	53,027	35,127	46,027	35,127
SPACE MODS SPACE	25,959	25,959	25,959	25,959
ORGANIZATION AND BASE				
TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	101,222	98,722	101,222	98,722
COMBAT SURVIVOR/EVADER LOCATER RADIO	3,104	3,104	3,104	3,104
RADIO EQUIPMENT	16,630	16,630	16,630	16,630
TV EQUIPMENT (AFRTV)	2,005	2,005	2,005	2,005
CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	3,227	3,227	3,227	3,227
BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	74,301	74,301	74,301	74,301
CAP COM & ELECT	386	386	386	386

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,204	7,204	7,204	7,204
MODIFICATIONS COMM ELECT MODS	54,372	54,372	54,372	54,372
TOTAL, ELECTRONICS AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	1,105,465	1,118,531	1,123,865	1,133,531
OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP				
TEST EQUIPMENT BASE/ALC CALIBRATION PACKAGE	10,106	10,106	10,106	10,106
PRIMARY STANDARDS LABORATORY PACKAGE	1,105	1,105	1,105	1,105
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,541	9,541	9,541	9,541
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	2,833	2,833	2,833	2,833
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,744	10,744	19,244	11,744
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP	---	---	---	2,500
DEPOT PLANT + MATERIALS HANDLING EQ MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	15,118	25,118	15,118	23,118
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,241	9,241	9,241	9,241
ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT FLOODLIGHTS	10,718	14,718	10,718	14,918
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,187	7,187	7,187	7,187
BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	15,171	22,171	15,171	20,671
MEDICAL/DENTAL EQUIPMENT	17,025	17,025	17,025	17,025
ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS	941	941	941	941
AIR BASE OPERABILITY	1,838	1,838	1,838	1,838
PHOTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT	6,037	6,037	6,037	6,037

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PRODUCTIVITY INVESTMENTS	8,259	8,259	8,259	8,259
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	50,021	50,021	54,021	50,021
AIR CONDITIONERS	6,217	6,217	6,217	6,217
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	25,350	25,350	25,350	25,350
SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS				
INTELLIGENCE PRODUCTION ACTIVITY	38,629	38,629	38,629	40,629
TECH SURV COUNTERMEASURES EQ	2,975	2,975	2,975	2,975
DARP RC135	12,785	27,985	12,785	15,785
DARP, MRIGS	89,049	89,049	89,049	89,049
SELECTED ACTIVITIES	5,794,849	5,824,053	5,666,049	5,788,403
SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	136,317	136,317	136,317	136,317
DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	8,985	8,985	8,985	8,985
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	1,148	1,148	1,148	1,148
MODIFICATIONS	177	177	177	177
FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	11,294	11,294	11,294	11,294
TOTAL, OTHER BASE MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT EQUIP	6,299,660	6,369,064	6,187,360	6,323,414
SPARE AND REPAIR PARTS				
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	31,636	31,636	31,636	31,636
TOTAL, OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	7,699,127	7,778,997	7,605,027	7,763,747

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIP	**5,530**	**36,730**	**5,530**	**24,530**
Senior Scout		8,200		0
Eagle Vision IV		5,000		5,000
Information Assurance: Network Intrusion Detection Device		8,000		7,000
Information Assurance: Secure Terminal Equipment		10,000		7,000
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	**26,003**	**31,003**	**47,403**	**49,903**
Force Operational Readiness and Combat Effectiveness Simulation (FORCES) for ANG		5,000		2,500
Unmanned, remotely operable threat emitter			21,400	21,400
NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	**9,112**	**2,212**	**9,112**	**4,112**
Savings from combining 2 contracts into 1		-3,800		0
Air Force rephase of alternate station funding		-3,100		0
Program reduction				-5,000
MILSATCOM SPACE	**53,027**	**35,127**	**46,027**	**35,127**
SMART T – program delays		-9,000		-9,000
GBS Receivers – program delays in broadcast system		-4,000	-7,000	-4,000
Premature procurement of CCS-Consolidated equipment. Program just starting development.		-4,900		-4,900
TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	**101,222**	**98,722**	**101,222**	**98,722**
Contract savings in FY 2000		-2,500		-2,500
PERSONAL SAFETY AND RESCUE EQUIP				**2,500**
Emergency Support Heli-Basket (transfer from Material Support)				2,500
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	**6,744**	**10,744**	**19,244**	**11,744**
Lightweight Environmentally Sealed Parachute Assembly (LESPA) for C-130, C-141, C-5, and KC-135		4,000		3,000
CLEPIR Laser Eye Protection			2,500	2,000
Supply Assets Tracking System			10,000	0
FLOODLIGHTS	**10,718**	**14,718**	**10,718**	**14,918**
MEANPALS		4,000		2,200
Cold Cathode Landing Lights				2,000
BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	**15,171**	**22,171**	**15,171**	**20,671**
Hazardous Gas Detection		3,000		2,000
Ultimate building machines for Air Force and Air National Guard civil engineering units		1,000		1,000
Master Crane		3,000		2,500
MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	**50,021**	**50,021**	**54,021**	**50,021**
Emergency Support Heli-Basket (transfer to personal safety and rescue line)			4,000	0
DARP RC135	**12,785**	**27,985**	**12,785**	**15,785**
COMBAT SENT – Install RWR + Calibration Van		4,700		3,000
RC-135 RIVET JOINT – mission trainer (EFETS)		10,500		0

NOTE: Funding for this project was provided in the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000 (P.L. 106-246).

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD/WHS				
MOTOR VEHICLES	321	321	321	321
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	64,872	116,672	39,872	107,872
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	23,191	23,191	23,191	23,191
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				
DEFENSE AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAM	11,535	11,535	11,535	11,535
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA				
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	26,655	26,655	26,655	26,655
CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS	3,233	3,233	3,233	3,233
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	19,399	32,399	19,399	19,399
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYS	3,671	3,671	3,671	3,671
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	5,136	5,136	5,136	5,136
STANDARD TACTICAL ENTRY POINT	2,469	2,469	2,469	2,469
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	14,429	14,429	14,429	14,429
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA				
DEFENSE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	82,863	87,863	82,863	86,363
AUTOMATIC DOCUMENT CONVERSION SYSTEM	---	20,000	15,000	15,000
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA				
ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,714	4,714	4,714	4,714
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	28,171	28,171	28,171	28,171
BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION				
PATRIOT PAC-3	365,457	365,457	365,457	365,457
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	74,530	74,530	74,530	74,530

(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
C4I	3,975	3,975	3,975	3,975
DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY				
VEHICLES	145	145	145	145
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	44,034	44,034	44,034	44,034
DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY				
OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	656	656	656	656
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, AFIS	4,695	4,695	4,695	4,695
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE				
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODDE	1,546	1,546	1,546	1,546
TOTAL, MAJOR EQUIPMENT	785,697	875,497	775,697	847,197
SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND				
AVIATION PROGRAMS				
SOF ROTARY WING UPGRADES	68,480	68,480	68,480	78,480
SOF TRAINING SYSTEMS	2,364	2,364	2,364	2,364
MC-130H COMBAT TALON II	10,403	10,403	10,403	10,403
CV-22 SOF MODIFICATION	8,533	8,533	8,533	8,533
AC-130U GUNSHIP ACQUISITION	13,871	13,871	13,871	13,871
C-130 MODIFICATIONS	26,237	26,237	26,237	26,237
AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	2,186	2,186	2,186	2,186
SHIPBUILDING				
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS	25,500	28,800	28,800	28,800
ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYS (AP-CY)	22,472	22,472	22,472	22,472
SUBMARINE CONVERSION	1,559	1,559	1,559	1,559
AMMUNITION PROGRAMS				

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SOF ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	36,632	36,632	36,632	36,632
SOF ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	25,978	31,978	25,978	30,978
OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS				
COMM EQUIPMENT & ELECTRONICS	74,444	74,444	74,444	74,444
SOF INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	32,309	35,309	32,309	35,309
SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	11,829	33,449	21,579	32,079
MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODS	909	909	909	909
SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	14,511	14,511	14,511	18,511
SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	11,780	11,780	11,780	11,780
SOF MARITIME EQUIPMENT	5,801	5,801	5,801	5,801
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	14,376	18,876	17,126	18,376
SOF PLANNING AND REHEARSAL SYSTEM	2,021	2,021	2,021	2,021
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	105,547	105,547	105,547	105,547
PSYOP EQUIPMENT	7,575	7,575	7,575	7,575
TOTAL, SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	525,317	563,737	541,117	574,867
CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE				
CBDP				
INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	108,725	111,725	110,525	113,225
DECONTAMINATION	12,195	13,195	12,195	13,695
JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM	141,781	141,781	141,781	141,781
COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	36,179	37,179	36,179	37,179
CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	175,056	175,056	177,556	175,956
TOTAL, CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE	473,936	478,936	478,236	481,836
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	490,358	384,966	499,858	442,358
TOTAL, PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	2,275,308	2,303,136	2,294,908	2,346,258

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	BUDGET	HOUSE	SENATE	QTY	CONFERENCE
MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	64,872	116,672	39,872		107,872
High Performance Computing Modernization [Note: Within this amount, $1,000,000 is only for the Army High Performance Computing Research Center.]		48,000	----		40,000
Mentor Protégé		3,000	----		3,000
Information Assurance:JCOATS-IO		800	----		----
Excessive growth		----	-25,000		----
SOF Rotary Wing Upgrades	68,480	68,480	68,480		78,480
MH-60L Aerial Refueling Probes and MH-60 internal auxiliary fuel tanks			[18,900]		10,000
SOF SMALL ARMS & WEAPONS	11,829	33,449	21,579		32,079
Body Armor Load Carriage System		5,000	9,750		9,750
Modular Integrated Communications Helmet		4,620	----		2,500
Special Operations Peculiar Modification to the M-4 Carbine		12,000	----		5,000
ALGL/STRIKER [Transferred from RDTE,DW]		----	----		3,000
SOF COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	14,511	14,511	14,511		18,511
Integrated Bridge System for NSW RIB	----	----	[7,000]		4,000
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	14,376	18,876	17,126		18,376
Low Profile Night Vision Goggles		4,500	----		4,000
NAVSCIATTS Collateral Equipment [Note: Funds Appropriated in O&M, DW.]		----	2,750		----
INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	108,725	111,725	110,525		113,225
MEU E-NBC Capability Sets		3,000	----		3,000
C2A1		----	1,800		1,500
CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	175,056	175,056	177,556		175,956
M291 Decontamination kit		----	2,500		----
WMD Civil Support Teams Equipment					900

HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION

The conferees have provided $79,978,000 for the High Performance Computing Modernization Program, an increase of $40,000,000 above the budget request amount. The conferees direct that $30,000,000 of the increased amount shall be available only for the modernization of the computing equipment at an existing supercomputing center purchased with research, development, test and evaluation funds.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

The conferees agree to provide a total of $3,000,000 for the Defense Production Act account. Of this amount $2,000,000 is only for microwave power tubes and $1,000,000 is only for the Wireless Vibration Sensor Supplier Initiative.

NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				
RESERVE EQUIPMENT				
ARMY RESERVE				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	20,000	5,000
NAVY RESERVE				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	20,000	5,000
MARINE CORPS RESERVE				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	10,000	5,000
AIR FORCE RESERVE				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	20,000	5,000
TOTAL, RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	70,000	20,000
NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT				
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	50,000	50,000
AIR NATIONAL GUARD				
MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	---	---	30,000	30,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD EQUIPMENT	---	---	80,000	80,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT	---	---	150,000	100,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

The conferees agree that each of the Chiefs of the Reserve and National Guard components should exercise control of modernization funds provided in this account including aircraft and aircraft modernization. The conferees further agree that separate submissions of a detailed assessment of its modernization priorities by the component commanders is required to be submitted to the defense committees. The conferees expect the component commanders to give priority consideration to the following items: multiple launch rocket system (MLRS), Paladin, onboard oxygen generating system field evaluation for the Air National Guard, LITENING II targeting pod system, SINCGARS radios, F16 SADL ''D'', Bradley Fighting Vehicles upgrades, F15 BOL systems, HMMWV Striker Vehicles, support equipment for Patriot missile air defense battalions, Heavy Expanded Mobility Tactical Truck for MLRS units, Army tank recovery vehicle program, fire fighting trucks for Air Guard, air traffic control landing system (ATCALS), maneuver control system, construction equipment service life extension program, family of medium tactical vehicles, C130J procurement, A10 upgrades, F15 E-kit upgrades, F16 BLK 42 engine modification kits, Precision Attack Targeting System (PATS), simulators for Norwich Army, master cranes, modular command post system, laser marksmanship, UH60/UH1 flight simulators, F16 modernization, standard integrated command post system (SICPS), situational awareness data link, KC135 multi-point refueling, Naval Construction Force Communications Equipment, and C212 STOL fixed wing aircraft. Night Vision PVS–7, CH–47 Internal Crashworthy Fuel Cells, Blackhawk External Fuel Tanks, Multi-Purpose Range Targetry Electronics, Armored Security Vehicle, Controlled Environmental Storage Shelters, DRFTP, Quadruple Containers, Pallet Containers, C–141 8.33 Khz Radios, HC130 FLIR (AAQ–22), HH–60 SATCOM (AN/ARC–210 Radios), CH–53 Aircrew Procedures Trainer Flight Simulator, CH–46 Aircrew Procedures Training Flight Simulator, A–10 Lightweight Airborne Recovery System, C–130 ALR–69 Radar Warning Receiver, HC–130 Armor, Scope Shield II Tactical Radios, F–16 Helmet Mounted Cueing System, Mobile Chemical Agent Detector, Multi-Mission Patrol Craft, COTS, DFIRST, A/OA–10, AN/AAQ–29 CH–53E FLIR, P–3C Update III BMUP, RAID Electro-Optical/Infrared Sensor Upgrade Program, CH–47 Fuel tanks, and AFIST XXI.

TITLE IV - RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION

The conference agreement is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RECAPITULATION				
RDTE, ARMY	5,260,346	6,025,057	5,683,675	6,342,552
RDTE, NAVY	8,476,677	9,222,927	8,812,070	9,494,374
RDTE, AIR FORCE	13,696,359	13,760,689	13,931,145	14,138,244
RDTE, DEFENSE-WIDE	10,238,242	10,918,997	10,952,039	11,157,375
DEVELOPMENTAL TEST AND EVALUATION	---	---	---	---
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	201,560	242,560	218,560	227,060
GRAND TOTAL, RDTE	37,873,184	40,170,230	39,597,489	41,359,605

JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER

The conferees have provided a total of $688,650,000 to continue JSF development, allocated between the demonstration/validation effort and the engineering and manufacturing development program. The reduction to the total budget request reflects the acknowledged delay of at least three months in moving the program into the EMD phase. The conferees direct that all flight testing should be completed and fully evaluated prior to the selection of a JSF EMD design. The conferees direct that DoD conduct a complete flight test program for the JSF prototypes and perform a full evaluation of all flight test results as part of the EMD proposal review.

The conferees' recommendation includes an increase of $225,000,000 to pay for the industry costs of extending the JSF demonstration/validation effort. The conferees commend DoD for its efforts to maintain financial parity between the JSF airframe competitors. However, the conferees are opposed to DoD plans to require industry to make additional unreimbursed investments in the JSF development program. The conferees direct that the added funds shall only be available to pay each team for the costs of fully executing the demonstration/validation phase and completing all planned and necessary testing.

The conferees endorse the DoD decision to proceed with the original acquisition strategy of selecting a single design, and associated industry team, to develop the Joint Strike Fighter. The conferees continue to believe that industrial base concerns can best be addressed after the source selection decision.

To ensure that Congress is kept apprised of the status of the JSF program, the conferees direct that the Secretary of Defense provide a report on the status of the JSF program with the submission of the Fiscal Year 2002 Defense Budget Request. The report should provide an overview of the status and results of the JSF technical development and flight test program. Based on the results achieved prior to the budget submission, the report should provide a detailed schedule for completion of the dem/val phase as well an updated plan for the EMD program. Finally, the report should provide current estimates for the cost to complete the JSF dem/val and EMD phases as well as a re-validated estimate of the JSF unit flyaway and total production program cost.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, ARMY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	14,459	14,459	14,459	14,459
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	132,164	132,164	136,414	137,914
UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	54,365	55,365	60,865	59,865
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	200,988	201,988	211,738	212,238
APPLIED RESEARCH				
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	11,557	15,557	24,557	27,557
SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	20,722	24,722	20,722	23,222
TRACTOR HIP	7,226	7,226	7,226	7,226
AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	31,080	31,080	31,080	31,080
EW TECHNOLOGY	17,310	17,310	17,310	22,210
MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	47,183	69,183	55,183	70,683
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	993	7,993	993	6,693
MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	30,479	32,479	35,479	36,479
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	63,589	68,589	87,089	89,089
BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	49,750	49,750	55,750	53,750
CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,530	3,530	3,530	3,530
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,415	5,415	10,415	5,415
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,761	48,761	38,761	48,261
ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	23,869	40,969	34,469	41,269
NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	20,465	25,465	20,465	23,965
COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	12,386	17,786	17,786	17,886
HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	15,786	19,486	15,786	18,286
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	13,994	54,494	19,994	60,994

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	23,314	23,314	23,314	23,314
COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	3,987	3,987	3,987	3,987
MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	42,344	47,344	53,844	55,844
MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	11,869	11,869	11,869	11,869
WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	24,659	28,159	26,659	28,159
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,729	98,729	102,229	112,729
ARMY ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY	1,338	1,338	1,338	1,338
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,154	10,154	10,154	10,154
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	602,489	764,689	729,989	834,989
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,469	17,469	20,469	21,969
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,512	254,192	73,012	223,132
AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,810	28,810	28,810	28,810
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,738	59,738	29,738	55,738
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	148,114	162,114	89,114	168,114
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,505	28,505	21,505	28,505
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,072	6,072	3,072	7,072
TRACTOR HIKE	12,217	12,217	12,217	12,217
TRACTOR RED	984	984	984	984
TRACTOR ROSE	10,892	10,892	10,892	10,892
MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	5,889	5,889	5,889	5,889
TRACTOR HIP	980	980	980	980
GLOBAL SURVEILLANCE/AIR DEFENSE/PRECISION STRIKE TECH.	21,307	21,307	21,307	21,307
EW TECHNOLOGY	15,359	20,359	15,359	30,859
MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,107	25,107	47,107	52,107

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TRACTOR CAGE	3,083	3,083	3,083	3,083
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,894	20,894	20,894	20,894
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	4,469	4,469	4,469	4,469
LINE-OF-SIGHT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION	50,727	50,727	50,727	50,727
NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	33,341	46,141	33,341	43,141
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,616	11,116	1,616	11,116
MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,207	5,207	5,207	5,207
ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECH	15,613	15,613	15,613	15,613
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	490,905	811,885	515,405	822,825
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,573	28,173	92,573	97,273
LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER - ADV DEV	22,803	22,803	22,803	22,803
TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,139	50,139	45,139	50,139
ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	118,139	268,139	268,139	268,139
ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM	17	17	17	17
SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	13,574	13,574	13,574	13,574
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,968	10,968	16,068	14,968
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEM/VAL	4,897	14,897	4,897	13,397
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	1,920	1,920	1,920	1,920
AVIATION - ADV DEV	5,848	5,848	10,848	9,848
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	28,679	36,179	28,679	36,179
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ADV DEV	6,317	6,317	6,317	6,317
COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION	13,753	13,753	13,753	13,753
MEDICAL SYSTEMS - ADV DEV	15,259	15,509	15,259	15,509
TRACTOR CAGE (DEM/VAL)	979	979	979	979

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	355,309	355,309	200,309	355,309
SCAMP BLOCK II DEM/VAL	20,277	20,277	20,277	20,277
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	661,451	864,801	761,551	940,401
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL				
AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	42,280	42,280	42,280	42,280
ARMED, DEPLOYABLE OH-58D	532	532	532	532
COMANCHE	614,041	614,041	614,041	614,041
EW DEVELOPMENT	61,056	61,056	79,056	70,056
JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	62,218	62,218	62,218	62,218
ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	44,084	44,084	44,084	44,084
TRACTOR CAGE	2,916	2,916	2,916	2,916
MODERNIZED HELLFIRE	4,969	4,969	4,969	4,969
INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	2	2	2	2
MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	1,959	1,959	1,959	1,959
SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ENG DEV	3,461	3,461	3,461	3,461
JAVELIN	490	490	490	490
LANDMINE WARFARE	15,902	15,902	15,902	15,902
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	2,026	2,026	2,026	2,026
TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	---	300	---	300
LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	9,893	9,893	9,893	9,893
ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)-ENG. DEV	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
ENGINEER MOBILITY EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	---	---	15,000	15,000
NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	32,574	32,574	34,074	34,074
COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	86,321	86,321	89,821	89,321
NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES - ENG DEV	73,295	73,295	73,295	73,295

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TERRAIN INFORMATION - ENG DEV	6,082	6,082	6,082	6,082
INTEGRATED METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,771	1,771	1,771	1,771
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	6,060	6,060	6,060	6,060
AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE - ENG DE	16,462	16,462	16,462	16,462
AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	12,956	12,956	12,956	12,956
DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS) - ENG DEV	20,689	20,689	20,689	20,689
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD	57,419	43,419	57,419	58,419
BRILLIANT ANTI-ARMOR SUBMUNITION (BAT)	96,102	101,102	96,102	98,102
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	17,898	26,898	21,898	28,898
POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)	2,420	2,420	2,420	2,420
COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	18,498	18,498	18,498	18,498
AVIATION - ENG DEV	7,104	12,104	12,104	12,104
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	22,505	30,505	31,505	33,005
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,457	20,457	20,457	24,557
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	49,316	49,316	49,316	61,816
MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT	6,318	6,318	9,318	6,318
LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER - ENG DEV	69,584	69,584	99,584	94,584
SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	52,848	---	52,848	31,805
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION	5,362	5,362	5,362	5,362
ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	33,420	39,420	33,420	39,420
LOSAT	26,800	26,800	26,800	26,800
RADAR DEVELOPMENT	8,429	8,429	13,429	13,429
FIREFINDER	37,363	37,363	47,363	47,363
ARTILLERY SYSTEMS - EMD	20,105	20,105	20,105	20,105
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	94,170	94,170	98,170	98,170

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	1,770,357	1,736,809	1,878,357	1,874,214
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,901	16,101	18,801	21,001
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,346	13,346	10,346	10,346
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	44,019	44,019	44,019	44,019
RAND ARROYO CENTER	19,872	19,872	19,872	19,872
ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	153,326	153,326	153,326	153,326
CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	15,410	15,410	20,410	18,910
ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	119,657	129,657	119,657	122,657
ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	33,156	37,256	33,156	37,256
SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	27,248	34,748	43,248	37,248
DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,521	35,521	38,921	37,521
AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200
METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,927	6,927	6,927	6,927
MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	8,737	8,737	8,737	8,737
EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	3,582	3,582	3,582	3,582
SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	71,079	71,079	68,779	68,779
ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	26,337	26,337	26,337	26,337
PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	73,811	73,811	73,811	73,811
TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	26,749	30,499	26,749	30,499
MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	11,276	14,776	13,276	16,776
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	---	3,000	---	2,500
ARMY ACQUISITION POLLUTION PREVENTION PROGRAM	5,418	5,418	5,418	5,418
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	5,371	5,371	8,371	8,371

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	696,943	751,993	746,943	757,093
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT				
MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	59,523	59,523	75,523	69,523
AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	24,996	24,996	26,996	26,996
DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS AGAINST WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCT	---	3,000	---	3,000
ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	36,816	36,816	36,816	36,816
COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	99,423	112,823	63,923	101,523
MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	48,910	48,910	48,910	48,910
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	95,829	97,829	107,829	107,829
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,929	7,929	2,929	5,929
DIGITIZATION	29,671	31,671	29,671	30,671
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	63,601	63,601	63,601	64,601
FORCE TWENTY-ONE (XXI), WARFIGHTING RAPID ACQUISITION	6,021	---	---	---
MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	12,365	12,365	12,365	12,365
OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	64,418	64,418	56,418	56,418
TRACTOR CARD	3,837	3,837	3,837	3,837
JOINT TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAM (TRI-TAC)	38,926	38,926	38,926	38,926
JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	6,267	6,267	6,267	6,267
SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	5,215	5,215	5,215	5,215
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,140	20,440	8,140	14,640
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	71,955	71,955	71,955	71,955
SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	43,229	43,229	43,229	43,229
WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,234	14,234	14,234	14,234
TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEM	783	783	783	783
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	29,427	29,427	36,427	34,427
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,898	4,898	4,898	4,898
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	7,894	7,894	7,894	7,894
END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	57,906	81,906	72,906	89,906
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	837,213	892,892	839,692	900,792
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	5,260,346	6,025,057	5,683,675	6,342,552

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[in thousands of dollars]

	Budget Request	House	Senate	Conference
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	132,164	132,164	136,414	**137,914**
Cold regions military engineering		0	1,250	1,250
Force protection from terrorist weapons		0	3,000	3,000
Display Performance and Environmental Evaluation Project			(3,000)	1,500
UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	54,365	55,365	60,865	**59,865**
Science-based regulatory compliance study		1,000	0	1,000
Army High Performance Computing Research Center		(610)	0	(610)
BH62 electronmechanics and hypervelocity physics		0	3,000	2,000
Army Centers for excellence		0	500	500
National automotive center		0	3,000	2,000
MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	11,557	15,557	24,557	**27,557**
Amorphous metal kinetic energy penetrator		4,000	0	3,000
Composite materials		0	6,000	6,000
Advanced materials processing		0	7,000	7,000
EW TECHNOLOGY	17,310	17,310	17,310	**22,210**
Multifuctional intelligence and remote signal sensor		0	0	4,900
(Note: House originally added funds in RDTE, MC PE 06030611M and RDTE, DW PE 1160404BB)				
MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	47,183	69,183	55,183	**70,683**
Acceleration of development and testing for tactical missile components		8,000	0	8,000
Aero-optics evaluation center		5,500	0	3,500
Low cost guidance and navigation unit		6,000	0	4,500
Enhanced SCRAMJET mixing		2,500	0	1,500
Future Army tactical missile integration program (FMTI)		0	8,000	6,000
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	993	7,993	993	**6,693**
Minature detection devices and analysis methods for lightweight power sensors and isotope identification techniques		3,000	0	3,000
Zeus laser ordnance neutralization		4,000	0	3,200
Transfer to High Energy Laser in RDTE, DW				-500
MODELING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	30,479	32,479	35,479	**36,479**
STRICOM -- Online contract document management		2,000	0	1,000
Photonics		0	5,000	5,000
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	63,589	68,589	87,089	**83,089**
VID/Smart truck		2,000	0	2,000
Advanced tactical transportation technology initiative		3,000	0	3,000
Hybrid electric HMMWV field evaluation and technology insertion		0	7,000	7,000
Alternative vehicle propulsion		0	10,000	8,000
National Automotive Center -- Smart Truck		0	3,500	3,500
Full spectrum active protection		0	3,000	2,000
JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,415	5,415	10,415	**5,415**
Objective crew served weapon		0	5,000	0
(Note: Funds add in PE 0603004A)				
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,761	48,761	38,761	**48,261**
Multi-role future combat system armaments system		4,000	0	4,000
Single crystal tungsten alloy penetrators		8,000	0	4,500
Low cost course correction technology for ammunition and rockets		3,000	0	3,000
Weapons and munitions technology program initiatitive		0	5,000	3,000
ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	23,869	40,969	34,469	**41,269**
Logistics fuel reformer technology		3,000	0	2,000
"AA" Zinc air battery for military applications		1,900	1,900	1,900
Improved high rate alkaline cell		1,200	1,200	1,200
Rechargeable cylindrical cell systems		1,600	1,600	1,600
Low cost reuseable alkaline manganese -zinc		500	500	500
Phase III of intelligent power control for sheltered systems and vehicles		6,900	0	2,800
(Note: $4,100,000 appropriated under PE 0604804A)				
Extrusion of polymer electrolytes and polymer multilaminate materials		2,000	0	2,000
Lithium carbon monoflouride coin cell		0	900	900

AA zinc air battery production		0	2,000	2,000
(NOTE: House added funds in PE 0708045A)				
Portable hybrid electron power systems		0	1,500	1,500
Polymer extrusion		0	1,000	1,000
COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	12,386	17,786	17,786	**17,886**
Nonlinear acoustic mine detection		1,400	0	1,000
Acoustic mine detection		4,000	2,500	2,500
Landmine warfare and barrier advanced development		0	2,900	2,000
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	13,994	54,494	19,994	**60,994**
Sustainable green manufacturing		7,000	0	5,500
Range Safe demonstration program (TACOM-ARDEC)		5,000	0	5,000
Army's heavy metals office initiative		6,000	0	6,000
Proton Exchange Membrane (PEM) fuel cell demonstration		5,000	0	4,000
Demanufacturing of electronic equipment for reuse and recycling (DEER2)		12,500	0	12,500
Technologies to reduce non-hazardous waste		5,000	0	5,000
Environmental quality technology		0	6,000	6,000
Environmental clean up demonstration				3,000
(Note: Only to demonstrate and validate new environmental clean up technology at Porta Bella)				
MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	42,344	47,344	53,844	**55,844**
Fuel cell development		5,000	0	5,000
Cold regions base camps		0	1,500	1,500
Center for Geosciences		0	3,000	0
(NOTE: Funds appropriated in RDTE, DW)				
University partnering for operational support		0	4,000	4,000
Thermoelectric power generation for military applications		0	3,000	3,000
WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	24,659	28,159	26,659	**28,159**
Combat feeding		2,500	0	1,500
Affordable guided airdrop system		1,000	0	1,000
Blisterguard socks		0	2,000	1,000
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	75,729	98,729	102,229	112,729
Comprehensive breast cancer clinical care project [Note: The conferees support continuation of a public/private effort, in coordination with a rural medical center and a not-for-profit medical foundation, to provide a program in breast care risk assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and research for the Department of Defense. The program shall be a coordinated effort among Walter Reed Army Medical Center, National Naval Medical Center, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a rural primary health care center, with funding management accomplished by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.] [Transferred to DHP.]		7,000	----	----
Emergency Hypothermia for Advanced Combat Casualty and delayed resuscitation		3,000	----	3,000
IMED Tools		6,000	----	6,000
Minimally Invasive research [Note: Only to continue research into the development of minimally invasive surgical procedures for the brain, spinal cord, and spine under DAMD 17-99-1-9022.]		2,000	----	2,000
Real-time heart rate variability		5,000	----	2,500
Center for Innovative Minimally Invasive Therapy		----	12,000	12,000
Dye Targeted Laser Fusion		----	5,000	4,000
Emergency Blood Purification for Combat Casualty Care [Note: Only for deployment of a biocidal hemoperfusion device comprised of a high pressure/thermal iodinated anionic polymers.]		----	2,000	1,500
Osteoporosis and Bone Disease Research		----	7,500	6,000
WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,469	17,469	20,469	**21,969**
Metrology		2,000	0	1,500
Biosciences Technology		0	5,000	5,000

MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	16,512	254,192	73,012	223,132
Advanced Cancer Detection		3,500	—	3,500
Integrative Medicine Distance-Learning Program [Note: Only to develop a distance-learning partnership in integrative medicine between educational organizations and U.S. military personnel, including doctors, nurses and other health professionals who, for various reasons, are unable to attend a resident program of integrative medicine education. This partnership shall include at least one party with background in both distance-learning and training of doctors, nurses and other health professionals in the fields of complementary and alternative medicine.]		1,000	—	800
Artificial Hip (Volumetrically Controlled Manufacturing)		4,000	—	3,500
Biosensor Research [Note: The conferees recommend $2,500,000 only for cooperative efforts with federal and non-federal organizations to support the location, identification, assessment, integration and development of advanced technologies for the remote monitoring, biosensoring and analysis of both normal and abnormal metabolic conditions.]		4,000	—	2,500
Blood Safety [Note: The conferees recommend $7,000,000 only for improved blood products and safety in systems compatible with military field use.]		7,500	—	7,000
Cancer Center of Excellence		1,000	—	1,000
SEATreat Cancer Technology [Note: The conferees recommend $1,500,000 only for a minimally invasive photodynamic therapy system of incorporating real-time tumor visualization and precision dose monitoring for both skin and cervical cancer treatments.]		3,000	—	1,500
Center for Aging Eye		3,000	—	2,000
Chronic Fatigue		3,000	—	1,500
Cervical Cancer Vaccine Research		3,000	—	—
Chronic Disease Management		5,500	—	4,500
Clinical Assessment Recording Environment (CARE)		—	—	1,000
Diabetes Project (Joslin)		7,000	—	7,000
DREAMS		10,000	—	9,500
Echocardiogram (Far-forward Echocariogram Device]		4,000	—	2,000
Epidermolysis Bullosa		3,000	—	3,000
Gallo Alcoholism Research		7,000	—	—
Gallo Cancer Center		4,000	—	4,000
HIV Research		15,000	—	10,000
Diabetes Project (Pittsburgh)		7,000	—	7,000
Laser Vision Correction		6,000	—	5,500
Ligament Healing		3,000	—	1,500
LSTAT		4,000	—	4,000
Lung Cancer Detection (CT Scan)		7,500	—	3,000
Lung Cancer Research -- M.D. Anderson Center		6,000	—	4,500
Medical Free Electron Laser (Duke)		3,500	—	—
Minimally Invasive Therapy		15,000	—	—
Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research Program [Note: The conferees recommend $8,000,000 only to continue the Army Molecular Genetics and Musculoskeletal Research Program.]		8,000	—	8,000
Functional Magnetic Resource Imaging		1,000	—	500
National Medical Testbed		15,000	—	15,000
Neurofibromatosis Research		17,000	—	17,000
Neurotoxin Exposure Treatment		15,000	—	15,000
Nutrition Research		3,760	—	1,500
Ovarian Cancer Research		10,000	—	—
Remote Acoustic Hemostasis		—	—	4,000
Polynitroxilated Hemoglobin [Note: $1,000,000 to continue the development of polynitroxylated hemoglobin as an oxygen-carrying red cell substitute for combat casualty care.]		6,000	—	1,000
Ocular Fatigue Measurement (PMI) [Note: Only for the acquisition of fatigue measuring devices using controlled light eye testing.]		420	—	420
Synchrotron-based scanning research [Note: The conferees recommend $7,000,000 only to continue the Army synchrotron-based scanning research technology for treatment of large field tumors, including breast and lung cancers.]		7,000	—	7,000
Tissue Repair		3,000	—	2,300
Secure Telemedicine Technology		3,000	—	2,500
Wound Healing		2,000	—	1,000
Virtual Retinal Display Technology		6,000	—	4,000
Molecular and cellular bioengineering research [Note: $600,000 is only for cellular and macromolecular structures research including integration of the geometry and topography of biological complexes as revealed by elecron microscopy, x-ray crystallography, magnetic resonance spectroscopy, and computational analysis.]		[600]		600
Center for Prostate Disease Research at WRAMC		—	7,500	7,500
Gallo Center for Alcoholism Research		—	10,000	8,500
Joint Diabetes Project		—	14,000	—
Neuroscience Research (NRCH)		—	6,000	6,000
Life Support for Trauma and Transport (LSTAT)		—	1,000	—
MicroPET at UAB		—	1,000	1,000
Recombinant Vaccine Research		—	6,000	6,000
Tafenoquine Antimalarial Agent		—	2,000	2,000
Volume AngioCAT		—	6,000	6,000
Gallo Prostate Cancer Center			3,000	—

WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,738	59,738	29,738	**55,738**
Multi-role future combat system armaments system		10,000	0	10,000
Precision guided mortar munition		8,000	0	6,000
Viking indirect fire module		7,000	0	5,000
SMAW-D -- concept demonstration testing of confined space propulsion system		5,000	0	5,000
COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	148,114	162,114	89,114	168,114
Future Combat System		46,000	0	46,000
Future Scout and Calvary System		-69,000	-85,000	-69,000
National Automotive Center -- university innovative research		3,000	0	3,000
Composite armored vehicle		4,000	0	4,000
Mobile parts hospital		10,000	8,000	8,000
Advanced tactical transportation technology initiative		3,000	0	0
Combat vehicle and automotive technology weight reduction		8,000	0	5,000
IMPACT		4,000	5,000	5,000
Silicon carbide research		5,000	(15,000)	8,000
National Automotive Center & Warfighting Labs		0	5,000	4,000
Fuel cell auxilary power units		0	4,000	3,000
Advanced combat vehicle technology program		0	4,000	3,000
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	21,505	28,505	21,505	28,505
Big Crow Program Office Support		3,000	0	3,000
(Note: Senate added funds in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, AF)				
Intelligence analysis advanced tool set		4,000	0	4,000
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,072	6,072	3,072	**7,072**
Aircrew coordination Training		3,000	0	2,000
ATSC/Learning Systems Institute reusable educational objects			0	2,000
EW TECHNOLOGY	15,359	20,359	15,359	**30,859**
SHORTSTOP		5,000	0	3,000
Multifunctional intelligence and remote signal sensor				12,500
(Note: House originally added funds in PE 060306111M and PE 1160404BB)				
MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,107	25,107	47,107	**52,107**
AMCOM technical base		0	10,000	7,500
Counter active protection systems		0	2,000	1,500
Missile simulation technology		0	10,000	8,000
Starstreak/Stinger Live Fire Test			(15,000)	10,000
NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	33,341	46,141	33,341	**43,141**
Helmet mounted infrared sensor (vision technology)		3,800	0	3,800
Backpack UAV for brigade combat tests (BUSTER)		9,000	0	6,000
ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (DEM/VAL)	12,573	28,173	93,273	**97,273**
Full dimensional visualization software		9,000	0	6,000
Aero acoustic instrumentation		2,500	4,000	3,000
Family of systems simulator		4,100	3,000	3,000
Army space control		0	5,000	3,000
Army COE acoustics		0	3,000	2,000
Low cost interceptor		0	9,000	7,000
SMDC Battlellab/Space Tech Integration		0	15,000	11,000
Tactical High Energy Laser (THEL)		0	15,000	15,000
Acoustic Technology Research		0	4,000	4,000
Radar Power Technology		0	4,000	4,000
Supercluster distributed memory technology		0	2,000	1,500
Scramjet acoustic combustion enhancement		0	2,000	1,500
Northern Edge range safety instrumentation		0	8,400	8,400
Northern Edge launch range infrastructure and equipment		0	6,300	6,300
Northern Edge launch range common infrastructure				3,000
(Note: Senate added funds in RDTE, DW)				
Payload, Development, Integration, Research				4,000
(Note: Senate added funds in RDTE, DW)				

Eagle eyes-- Research for nuclear detection				2,000
TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,139	50,139	45,139	**50,139**
XM-1007		20,000	15,000	17,000
Trajectory correctable munition				3,000
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ADV DEV	28,679	36,179	28,679	**36,179**
Objective crew served weapon		7,500	0	7,500
(Note: Senate added funds in PE#0602623A)				
TACTICAL EXPLOITATION OF NATIONAL CAPABILITIES - EMD	57,419	43,419	57,419	**58,419**
Semi-Automated imagery processor		3,000	0	2,000
Lower priority projects		-17,000	0	-1,000
JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	17,898	26,898	21,898	**28,898**
COTS technology insertion		9,000	0	7,000
SCDL systems improvements		(4,000)	4,000	4,000
WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS - ENG DEV	22,505	30,505	31,505	**33,005**
M2HB .50 caliber quick change barrel		1,500	1,500	1,500
Small arms fire control system		2,500	2,500	2,500
120MM Short Range Practice cartridge		4,000	0	1,500
Mortar anti-personnel/anti-material (MPAM)		0	5,000	5,000
LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT - ENG DEV	20,457	20,457	20,457	24,557
Phase III of intelligent power control for sheltered systems and vehicles		0	0	4,100
(Note: House appropriated funds under PE 0602705A -- Phase III of intelligent power control for sheltered systems and vehicles)				
COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS - ENG DEV	49,316	49,316	49,316	**61,816**
Applied Communications and information networking program				12,500
(NOTE: Senate added funds in RDTE, N)				
SENSE AND DESTROY ARMAMENT MISSILE - ENG DEV	52,848	0	52,848	**31,805**
SADARM P3I		-21,043	0	-21,043
XM982		-31,805	0	0
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	94,170	94,170	98,170	**98,170**
Joint computer aided acquisition & logistics support		0	3,000	3,000
Electronic commodity pilot		0	1,000	1,000
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	13,901	16,101	18,801	**21,001**
Next generation anti-tank guided missile program (XM-ATGM)		2,200	0	2,200
Threat mine simulator		0	2,500	2,500
Threat information operations simulator		0	2,100	2,100
XM18S		0	-2,700	-2,700
XM-Millimeter wave jammer		0	3,000	3,000
ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	119,657	129,657	119,657	**122,657**
White Sands missile range test instrumentation		10,000	5,000	8,000
Stinger Block II		0	-5,000	-5,000
DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	14,521	35,521	38,921	**37,521**
HELSTF		3,000	4,400	3,000
Heat capacity solid state laser program		18,000	20,000	20,000
(NOTE: As directed in the House report, no less than $5,000,000 is only for industrially developed solid state laser diode arrays and no less than $3,000,000 is only for optoelectronics)				

TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	26,749	30,499	26,749	**30,499**
Army High Performance Computing Research Center		(1,147)	0	(1,147)
Army High Performance Computing Research Center		3,750	0	3,750
MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	11,276	14,776	13,276	**16,776**
Cyrofracture anti-personnel mine disposal system		3,500	0	3,500
Munitions standardization		0	2,000	2,000
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE	0	3,000	0	**2,500**
Natural gas boilers		3,000	0	1,500
Natural gas microturbines				1,000
(Note: Only for the demonstration of natural gas microturbine and advanced reciprocating engine distributed generation technologies)				
COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	99,423	112,823	63,923	**101,523**
Field emission display program		5,900	0	4,000
AN/VVR-1 upgrade		4,000	0	3,000
M1 track development program		3,500	0	3,000
Abrams legacy fleet digitization		0	4,500	4,000
Engine upgrade		0	-40,000	-20,000
Bradley electronics (Note: Only to develop a VME architecture to reduce military component obsolescence in the Bradley hull and turret)				2,000
Transfer of system technical support funding from WTCV, A				6,100
AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	95,829	97,829	107,829	**107,829**
Tactical integrated broadcast system on Guardrail		2,000	0	2,000
AH-64D Apache Longbow focused modernization		0	12,000	10,000
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	2,929	7,929	2,929	**5,929**
Full authority digital engine control		3,000	0	2,000
Variable displacement vane pump & liquid-or-light end air boost pump equipped fuel delivery unit		2,000	0	1,000
FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)	63,601	63,601	63,601	64,601
Tactical navigation electronic digital compass system				1,000
SPECIAL ARMY PROGRAM	5,215	5,215	5,215	5,215
Comprehensive Analysis Support System (CAAS)		(4,000)		(2,000)
(Note: From within available funds, $2,000,000 shall be only for the Comprehensive Analysis Support System (CAAS) at the Intelligence Center and School Battle Laboratory)				
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,140	20,440	8,140	14,640
Information Assurance: PKI		4,500	0	4,500
National Ground Intelligence Center/National Collaborative Environment		3,800	0	2,000
National Ground Intelligence Center/FIRES project		4,000	0	0
(Note: Funds appropriated in O&M, DW)				
END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	57,906	81,906	72,906	**89,906**
TIME		4,000	10,000	7,000
Optics manufacturing		3,000	0	2,000
"AA" zinc air batteries for military applications		2,000	0	0
(Note: Funds appropriated under PE 0602705A)				
Continuous manufacturing technology (MANTECH)		0	3,000	3,000
SINCGARS		0	2,000	1,000
Munitions manufacturing		15,000	0	15,000
Printed Wiring Board Manufacturing and Technology Center			(5,000)	3,000
Air compressors				1,000
(Note: Only to continue a cost-share demonstration by the Army Material Command for environmentally benign natural gas engine-driven air compressor technology)				

ARTILLERY SYSTEMS – DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION

The Conferees direct that 50 percent of the fiscal year 2001 funding for Crusader not be obligated or expended until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a comprehensive Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) on Crusader. The AOA is to include an analysis of Crusader and the Future Combat System (FCS) in the objective force.

ENHANCED SKILLS TRAINING PROGRAM

The conferees understand that the Army has decided to terminate the Enhanced Skills Training Program (ESTP) for students at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and to replace it with a distance learning program. Because of the historic role that HBCU's have played in integrating the Army, the conferees direct the Army to maintain through fiscal year 2001 the ESTP as configured during fiscal year 2000. To better understand the benefits of ESTP, the conferees direct the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2000, on its long term plans for its partnership with HBCU's in preparing students for the Army.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT,TEST AND EVALUATION, NAVY

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	16,343	16,343	16,343	16,343
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	381,139	381,139	381,139	381,139
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	397,482	397,482	397,482	397,482
APPLIED RESEARCH				
AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,966	52,966	49,966	55,466
SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	44,563	47,563	59,063	56,813
AIRCRAFT TECHNOLOGY	21,057	21,057	21,057	21,057
MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	9,793	9,793	12,793	12,293
COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELLIGENCE	79,905	91,905	132,905	114,905
HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,939	38,139	33,939	40,439
MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	68,076	92,026	87,576	106,526
ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,043	26,043	26,043	26,043
UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	52,488	53,388	52,488	53,388
MINE COUNTERMEASURES, MINING AND SPECIAL WARFARE	50,864	50,864	50,864	50,864
OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,320	68,070	65,320	77,070
UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	35,028	37,028	41,228	41,028
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,067	11,067	12,067	12,567
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	527,109	599,909	645,309	668,459
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,667	54,667	45,367	61,167
PRECISION STRIKE AND AIR DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	68,555	68,555	68,555	68,555
ADVANCED ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,583	17,583	17,583	17,583

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	37,432	68,232	57,232	73,432
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)..	54,749	61,249	58,749	61,249
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT.....	10,110	94,110	10,110	85,610
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV.....	26,988	42,988	29,988	45,988
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOG	24,002	39,002	42,202	52,502
NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM.....	49,506	49,506	52,506	51,506
UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	58,296	62,296	61,296	66,796
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY....	45,618	45,618	48,618	48,618
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION.....	76,333	79,533	102,533	100,033
C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY.....	29,673	35,673	44,673	45,673
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT.....	538,512	719,012	639,412	778,712
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS.....	30,337	30,337	32,837	32,837
AVIATION SURVIVABILITY.....	7,536	7,536	7,536	7,536
ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	19,680	24,680	24,680	27,680
TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE.....	1,956	2,356	1,956	2,356
ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY.....	6,943	6,943	6,943	6,943
SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES.....	97,929	99,429	102,929	102,929
SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE.....	---	11,000	---	16,000
CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT.....	148,952	152,952	148,952	150,952
SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT.....	244,437	254,437	252,437	258,437
PILOT FISH.....	107,598	107,598	107,598	107,598
RETRACT LARCH.....	11,895	11,895	11,895	11,895
RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL.....	572	572	572	572
SURFACE ASW.....	6,752	6,752	6,752	6,752

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SSGN CONVERSION	34,762	34,762	39,762	37,762
ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	113,269	129,769	127,769	129,269
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	162	5,162	162	5,162
SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	46,896	46,896	50,496	56,896
ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	168,483	168,483	168,483	168,483
ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,635	5,635	10,135	9,635
CHALK EAGLE	64,770	64,770	64,770	64,770
COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,966	65,966	37,966	54,966
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	28,619	30,619	31,619	33,619
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	137,981	144,281	155,481	150,481
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	23,216	25,216	43,516	32,716
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	13,131	14,681	13,131	14,681
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	119,257	179,257	149,257	179,257
OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,371	15,371	15,371	15,371
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	62,194	62,194	62,194	62,194
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,942	7,942	4,942	7,942
FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	1,824	1,824	1,824	1,824
CHALK CORAL	52,886	52,886	52,886	52,886
NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	---	11,000	---	13,000
RETRACT MAPLE	125,222	125,222	125,222	125,222
LINK PLUMERIA	42,372	42,372	42,372	42,372
RETRACT ELM	13,541	13,541	13,541	13,541
SHIP SELF DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	6,610	6,610	6,610	6,610
LINK EVERGREEN	9,712	9,712	9,712	9,712

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
SPECIAL PROCESSES	62,510	62,510	62,510	62,510
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	8,992	8,992	8,992	8,992
LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	143,044	146,044	133,244	140,244
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	131,566	206,566	327,660	243,050
NONLETHAL WEAPONS - DEM/VAL	23,580	23,580	29,580	29,580
ALL SERVICE COMBAT IDENTIFICATION EVALUATION TEAM	13,110	13,110	13,110	13,110
SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	34,100	38,100	38,100	38,100
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	2,229,666	2,483,916	2,549,860	2,560,800
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL				
OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	24,393	38,393	24,393	36,393
AV-8B AIRCRAFT - ENG DEV	38,061	38,061	24,961	24,961
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	95,814	103,814	95,814	101,814
MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	69,946	79,946	79,946	83,946
S-3 WEAPON SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT	455	455	455	455
AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	6,051	6,051	6,051	6,051
P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,906	8,906	2,906	7,406
TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	57,817	60,817	57,817	59,817
H-1 UPGRADES	139,680	139,680	139,680	139,680
ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	20,766	20,766	20,766	20,766
V-22A	148,168	148,168	148,168	148,168
AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,466	34,466	16,027	28,966
EW DEVELOPMENT	97,281	133,781	122,281	134,781
SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	305,274	257,274	313,274	292,274
SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	179,684	179,684	204,684	202,184
LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	273	273	273	273

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TRI-SERVICE STANDOFF ATTACK MISSILE	2,024	2,024	2,024	2,024
STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	1,194	1,194	1,194	1,194
AIRBORNE MCM	47,312	50,312	47,312	51,312
SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	34,801	62,801	49,801	72,801
AIR CONTROL	13,538	13,538	13,538	13,538
ENHANCED MODULAR SIGNAL PROCESSOR	875	875	875	875
SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	9,833	9,833	9,833	9,833
COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	3,720	3,720	3,720	3,720
SUBMARINE COMBAT SYSTEM	3,642	3,642	3,642	3,642
NEW DESIGN SSN	207,091	212,091	210,091	214,091
SSN-21 DEVELOPMENTS	6,617	6,617	6,617	6,617
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	20,492	26,492	20,492	26,492
SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,204	72,204	72,204	78,204
NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,291	28,291	3,291	30,891
MINE DEVELOPMENT	1,968	1,968	1,968	1,968
UNGUIDED CONVENTIONAL AIR-LAUNCHED WEAPONS	2,581	2,581	2,581	2,581
LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	9,347	9,347	9,347	9,347
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	26,151	29,151	26,151	29,151
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,102	7,102	7,102	7,102
PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	1,271	1,271	1,271	1,271
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	5,531	5,531	5,531	5,531
BATTLE GROUP PASSIVE HORIZON EXTENSION SYSTEM	2,232	2,232	2,232	2,232
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	20,823	20,823	20,823	20,823
SHIP SELF DEFENSE - EMD	85,049	85,049	87,149	87,149
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	5,273	27,273	11,773	27,773

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	18,487	18,487	18,487	18,487
DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,710	35,710	40,710	40,710
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	295,962	145,962	---	101,275
SMART CARD DEV/MOD	1,240	1,240	1,240	1,240
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	6,833	6,833	6,833	6,833
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,259	23,259	18,259	29,259
NAVY STANDARD INTEGRATED PERSONNEL SYSTEM (NSIPS)	5,917	5,917	5,917	5,917
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	2,152,405	2,173,905	1,969,504	2,201,818
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,293	24,293	24,293	24,293
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	41,138	41,138	41,138	41,138
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,707	44,707	43,707	45,707
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,056	6,056	8,056	6,056
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,889	43,889	38,889	43,889
FLEET TACTICAL DEVELOPMENT	2,886	2,886	2,886	2,886
TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	949	10,949	949	10,949
MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	17,644	17,644	17,644	17,644
STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	2,403	2,403	2,403	2,403
RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	53,380	53,380	53,380	53,380
RDT&E INSTRUMENTATION MODERNIZATION	12,045	12,045	12,045	12,045
RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	76,128	76,128	76,128	76,128
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,327	270,327	272,327	272,327
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	8,957	8,957	8,957	8,957
NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,262	3,262	3,262	3,262
SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,694	7,694	12,694	11,694

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,091	14,891	9,091	17,891
TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	4,666	4,666	4,666	4,666
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	631,515	645,315	632,515	655,315
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT				
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS	207,000	207,000	207,000	207,000
RETRACT VIOLET	30,161	30,161	30,161	30,161
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	12,485	12,485	12,485	12,485
STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	42,687	54,687	44,687	53,687
SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,173	31,173	31,173	31,173
SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	879	879	879	879
F/A-18 SQUADRONS	248,093	248,093	243,093	243,093
E-2 SQUADRONS	18,698	37,698	18,698	50,698
FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	12,012	12,012	12,012	12,012
TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	91,436	91,436	91,436	91,436
INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	16,928	27,928	16,928	27,928
AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS	7,911	7,911	7,911	7,911
CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,059	34,559	32,059	38,559
ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	9,924	9,924	9,924	9,924
HARM IMPROVEMENT	21,355	46,355	26,355	41,355
TACTICAL DATA LINKS	26,245	26,245	26,245	26,245
SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	29,585	29,585	29,585	29,585
MK-48 ADCAP	15,853	15,853	15,853	15,853
AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	51,018	51,018	51,018	51,018
NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	---	---	19,000	19,000
F-14 UPGRADE	1,228	1,228	11,228	11,228

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	53,435	53,435	53,435	53,435
MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	96,153	107,153	99,153	109,153
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	22,124	39,424	22,124	39,424
MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	2,854	2,854	2,854	2,854
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,705	21,705	21,705	21,705
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	12,140	12,140	12,140	12,140
SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	37,778	37,778	37,778	37,778
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	21,530	30,130	21,530	32,130
NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	19,730	19,730	19,730	19,730
JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	7,795	7,795	9,795	9,795
JOINT MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	113,052	129,052	113,052	123,052
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,759	15,759	8,759	23,759
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	27,479	65,079	27,479	46,479
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	4,482	4,482	4,482	4,482
NAVAL SPACE SURVEILLANCE	2,038	1,438	2,038	1,438
SPACE ACTIVITIES	---	---	2,000	2,000
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,106	12,106	14,106	14,106
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	34,166	34,166	34,166	34,166
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,626	69,626	59,626	69,626
MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	9,366	9,366	9,366	9,366
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	531,940	546,940	457,940	546,940
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	1,999,988	2,203,388	1,977,988	2,231,788
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	8,476,677	9,222,927	8,812,070	9,494,374

[in thousands of dollars]

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
AIR AND SURFACE LAUNCHED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	37,966	52,966	49,966	55,466
Pulse detonation engine technology		4,000	7,000	5,000
Free electron laser upgrade		5,000	5,000	5,000
Reduction to High Energy Laser				-500
Solid fuel RAMJET		6,000		4,000
Spike Urban Warfare System				4,000
SHIP, SUBMARINE & LOGISTICS TECHNOLOGY	44,563	47,563	58,813	56,813
Three dimensional printing metalworking technology		3,000	5,000	5,000
Biodegradable Polymers			1,250	1,250
Non-Magnetic, Stainless Steel Adv. Double Hull			5,000	4,000
Bio-environmental Hazards Research Program (BHRP)			3,000	2,000
MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	9,793	9,793	12,793	12,293
Center for Emerging Threats and Opportunities			3,000	2,500
COMMUNICATIONS, COMMAND AND CONTROL, INTELLIGENCE	79,905	91,905	132,905	114,905
Center for Communications and Networking Technologies		10,000		0
Optoelectric high definition camera prototypes		2,000		2,000
Hyperspectral Research			3,000	3,000
Networking Program, ACIN			15,000	0
UESA Signal Processing			10,000	10,000
Tactical Component Network Demonstration			10,000	10,000
E-2C RMP Littoral Surveillance			15,000	0
(Note: Funding transferred to PE 204152N)				
CEC P3I				10,000
HUMAN SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	30,939	38,139	33,939	40,439
Biological hazard detection system		5,000		3,500
Marine Fire Training Center at the Marine and Environmental Research and Training Station (MERTS)		2,200		2,000
Maritime Fire Training/Barbers Point				2,000
Cognitive Research			3,000	2,000
MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY	68,076	92,026	87,576	106,526
Wood composite technology		2,000	1,500	2,000
Silicon carbide semiconductor material		5,000	4,000	4,000
Defense productivity software initiative		3,200		3,200
Ceramic and carbon based composites for use in strategic missiles and hypersonic vehicles		3,000		2,000
Aerospace Materials Technology Consortium		4,000		3,000
Environmentally sound ship program		1,250		1,250
Hybrid fiberoptic wireless communications		2,500		2,000
Battlespace information display technology initiative development demonstration		3,000		3,000
Materials Electronics & Computer Technology Program			2,000	1,500
Vacuum Electronics			-5,000	-2,500
Advanced Materials Processing Center			5,000	5,000
Innovative Communications Materials			2,000	2,000
Intermediate Modulus Carbon Fiber Qualification			2,000	2,000
Nanoscale Science and Technology Program			3,000	2,500
Composite Storage Module			3,000	3,000
Advanced Materials Innovative Communications Materials			2,000	1,500
Materials micronization technology				1,000
Virtual Company LINK				2,000
UNDERSEA WARFARE SURVEILLANCE TECHNOLOGY	52,488	53,388	52,488	53,388
Lithium carbon monofluoride coin cells for battery applications		900		900
OCEANOGRAPHIC AND ATMOSPHERIC TECHNOLOGY	60,320	68,070	65,320	77,070
Chemical, optical and physical sensor systems for mine countermeasures		6,000		10,000

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
South Florida Ocean Measurement Center		1,750		1,750
Littoral Acoustic Demonstration System			2,000	2,000
Distributed Marine Environmental Forecasting System			3,000	3,000
UNDERSEA WARFARE WEAPONRY TECHNOLOGY	35,028	37,028	41,228	41,028
Undersea warfare microelectromechanical systems (MEMS)		2,000	2,200	2,000
Computational Engineering Design			4,000	4,000
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,067	11,067	12,067	12,567
NAVAIR technology commercialization initiative		1,000		1,000
Energy and Environmental Technology Initiative			2,000	1,500
AIR SYSTEMS AND WEAPONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	39,667	54,667	45,367	61,167
Aircraft affordability project DP-2		3,500		4,500
IHPTET		1,000		1,000
Integrated hypersonic aeromechanics tool program (IHAT)		2,500		2,500
Eye safe LADAR		8,000		5,000
Precision Strike Navigator			5,700	4,500
SAR All Weather Precision Targeting System (AWPTS)				4,000
SURFACE SHIP & SUBMARINE HM&E ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,432	68,232	57,232	73,432
Superconducting DC motor		10,000		7,500
Portable hybrid electric power systems		3,000		2,500
Virtual testbed for reconfiguring ships		3,000	2,000	2,500
Electromagnetic propulsion systems		4,000		2,000
Ship service fuel cell		2,800		2,000
Project M		4,000		3,000
Advanced waterjet propulsor (AWJ-21)		4,000	4,000	4,000
Laser Welding and Cutting			2,800	2,000
Modular Composite Hull			4,000	3,000
Composite Helo Hangar Door			5,000	4,000
Supply Chain Best Practices Program			2,000	0
AC Synchronous high-temperature superconductor electric motor			[5000]	3,500
MARINE CORPS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	54,749	61,249	58,749	61,249
C3RP		1,500		1,500
Spike Urban Warfare System		5000		
(Note: Funding transferred to PE602111N)				
Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Project Albert			4,000	4,000
Remote precision gun aiming platform				1,000
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	10,110	94,110	10,110	85,610
National Bone Marrow Program		34,000		34,000
Coronary / Prostate Disease Reversal [Transferred to DHP]		6,000		
Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance		5,000		5,000
Fleet Health Technology				3,000
Medical Readiness Technology		9,000		9,000
(Note: Only for continuation of the medical readiness technology initiatives to verify and validate telemedicine's clinical impact afloat and ashore, and to integrate crucial medical data transfer systems for operations in a joint environment.)				
Naval Blood Research Laboratory		4,000		4,000
Optical Imaging of Brain		4,000		2,000
Post-Polio Syndrome [Transferred to DHP]		3,000		
RobotEyes (Note: Only to integrate RobotEyes optical sensing system with with prosthesis devices to improve opportunities for disabled / handicapped service members to remain on active duty.)		1,000		1,000
Rural Health (Note: Includes first responder emergency communications and telerehabilitation.)		8,700		8,700
Rural Health Deployed Military Patient Records		2,300		2,300

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
Vectored Vaccine Research (Note: The conferees recommend $3,500,000 only to develop NTVS for non-invasive vaccination at the surface of the skin.)		4,000		3,500
Teleradiology (Note: The conferees recommend $3,000,000 only for teleradiation and mammography imaging.)		3,000		3,000
MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADV TECH DEV	26,988	42,988	29,988	45,988
Advanced Distributed Learning (Note: Funds are only to continue efforts to standardize distributed learning courseware.)		10,000		10,000
WARCON (Note: Funding is only for the continuation of the Distributed Simulation Warfighting Concepts to Future Ship Design (WARCON) program to develop and implement an integrated acquisition environment architecture.)		6,000		6,000
RIT Center for Integrated Manufacturing			3,000	3,000
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND LOGISTICS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,002	39,002	42,202	52,502
Depleted Uranium Stabilization Technologies (Note: only for field demonstration of this range maintenance technology at China Lake Naval Air Weapons Station and other facilities.)		8,000		8,000
Resource Preservation Initiative		4,000		2,000
Aviation depot maintenance technology demonstration at NADEP Jacksonville		3,000		2,000
Ocean Power Technology			3,000	3,000
Hybrid Lidar-Radar			3,000	3,000
Geotrack Positioning Technology Program			7,500	6,000
Smart base Initiative			2,700	2,500
Visualization of Technical Information			2,000	2,000
NAVY TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION SYSTEM	49,506	49,506	52,506	51,506
(Note: Up to $2,000,000 is only for the continuation of the Center for Defense Technology and Education at the Naval post-graduate school.)		[2,000]		[2,000]
Joint Experimentation			3,000	2,000
Digitization of F-18 aircraft technical manuals			[5,200]	
UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	58,296	62,296	61,296	66,796
Advanced technology demonstration to prototype a multi-function hull-mounted sonar		4,000		3,000
Magnetrestrictive Transduction			3,000	2,500
Low frequency broadband acoustic airgun source				3,000
MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	45,618	45,618	48,618	48,618
Ocean Modeling for Mine and Expeditionary Warfare			3,000	3,000
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION	76,333	79,533	102,533	100,033
Vectored thrust ducted propeller		3,200	3,200	3,200
Advanced Hull Form Inshore Demonstrator			8,000	8,000
HYSWAC			5,000	5,000
USMC ATT Initiative			10,000	7,500
C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	29,673	35,673	44,673	45,673
Dominant battlespace command initiative		6,000		6,000
National Technology Alliance			15,000	10,000
AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	30,337	30,337	32,337	32,837
National Center of Excellence in Hydrography			2,500	2,500
ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,680	24,680	24,680	27,680
Stochastic Resonance and BEARTRAP Initiatives		5,000		4,000
Advanced Periscope Detection			5,000	4,000
TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	1,956	2,356	1,956	2,356
Spares procurement for Predator UAV under Navy testing authority		400		400
SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	97,929	99,429	102,929	102,929
UUV Center of Excellence at NUWC		1,500		1,500
Minesweeper Integrated Combat Weapon System			5,000	3,500
SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE		11,000		16,000
Anti-torpedo all-up-round		6,000		6,000

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
Ship-towed tripwire sensor		3,000		8,000
Distributed Engineering Center		2,000		2,000
CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	148,952	152,952	148,952	150,952
ASW tactical decision aids - integrating software/prototype fielding		4,000		2,000
SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT	244,437	254,437	252,437	258,437
Permanent magnet motor		10,000		7,000
MTTC/IPI			8,000	7,000
SSGN CONVERSION	34,762	34,762	39,762	37,762
Conversion			5,000	3,000
ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	113,269	129,769	127,769	129,269
Conformal acoustic velocity sonar (CAVES)		5,000	5,000	5,000
Common Towed Array		8,000	5,000	6,000
High performance brush technology		3,500	2,000	3,000
C128 Advanced Composite Submarine Sail			2,500	2,000
SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	162	5,162	162	5,162
Human integration information system		5,000		5,000
SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES	46,896	46,896	50,496	56,896
Shipboard Simulator for USMC Operations			20,000	20,000
JCCX Analysis of Alternatives			-16,400	-10,000
ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	5,635	5,635	10,135	9,635
Naval Combat Survivability			4,500	4,000
COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	32,966	65,966	37,966	54,966
Optically multiplexed wideband radar beamfinder		3,000		2,000
Common command and decision functions for theater air and missile defense (Note: Of the funding made available $10,000,000 is only for continuation of the SBIR Surface Ship Middleware follow-on.)		30,000	5,000	20,000
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	28,619	30,619	31,619	33,619
Demonstration / validation and production of environmentally safe energetic materials		2,000		2,000
Navy Insensitive munitions			3,000	3,000
MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	137,981	144,281	155,481	150,481
Advanced radio antenna interface unit		6,300		0
Marine Corp Assault Vehicles			17,500	12,500
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	23,216	25,216	43,516	32,716
Advanced modeling and simulation for the USMC integrated infantry combat system program		2,000		2,000
SMAW Follow-on			3,000	3,000
High Mobility Artillery Rocket System			17,300	0
Innovative Stand-off Door Breaching Munition			[4,500]	4,500
JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	13,131	14,681	13,131	14,681
Remote ordnance neutralization system (RONS)		1,550		1,550
COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	119,257	179,257	149,257	179,257
(Note: Only for DII-COE compliance, data analysis for large networks, multi-level secure operations, CEC network node expansion, airborne antennae improvements and planar array production.)		60,000	20,000	60,000
CEC P3I			10,000	0
(Note: Funding transferred to PE 602232N)				
NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	4,942	7,942	4,942	7,942
Proton exchange membrane (PEM) fuel cells (Note: Only to demonstrate domestically produced PEM fuel cells at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center.)		3,000		3,000
NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY		11,000		13,000
Virtual systems implementation program		6,000		6,000
Rapid retargeting logistics technology		5,000		3,500

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
Compatible Processor Upgrade Program (CPUP)			[5,000]	3,500
LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	143,044	146,044	133,244	140,244
Naval Fires Network Demonstrator and Tactical Dissemination Module		3,000		1,000
Extended Range Guided Munition			10,000	7,000
ALAM			-19,800	-10,800
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - DEM/VAL	131,566	206,566	327,666	243,050
Additional risk reduction and flight test (Note: The Committee designates the Joint Strike Fighter as an item of special congressional interest.)		75,000		
Flight Test Extension			10,000	
Demonstration/Validation Extension			186,094	
Air Vehicle Dem/Val Bridge Contracts				88,984
Engine Dem/Val Bridge Contracts				22,500
NONLETHAL WEAPONS DEM/VAL	23,580	23,580	29,580	29,580
Joint Nonlethal Weapons Laboratory			2,000	2,000
Non-lethal Research and Technology			4,000	4,000
SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINE	34,100	38,100	38,100	38,100
Navy collaborative integrated information technology initiative		4,000	4,000	4,000
OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	24,393	38,393	24,393	36,393
Upgrade ship ground station at NAWCAD to a ship and air integration facility		4,000		2,000
CH-60S airborne mine countermeasures (Note: Only for continued systems engineering development of the CH-60S carriage, stream, tow, and recovery system.)		10,000		10,000
AV-8B AIRCRAFT ENG DEV	38,061	38,061	24,961	24,961
Laser Spot Tracker			-13,100	-13,100
STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	95,814	103,814	95,814	101,814
Joint services metrology program		5,000		4,000
Calibration and measurement technology for reduced crew size		3,000		2,000
MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	69,946	79,946	79,946	83,946
ATIRCM/CMWS integration on the SH-60R		5,000	6,000	5,000
TADIRCM		5,000		5,000
Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasures			4,000	4,000
P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	2,906	8,906	2,906	7,406
APS-137B(V)5 radar		6,000		4,500
TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	57,817	60,817	57,817	59,817
Ocean surveillance information system (OSIS-OED)		3,000		2,000
AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,466	34,466	16,027	28,966
Joint helmet mounted queuing system		7,000		3,500
Modular flight helmet / Advanced visionics helmet system / Helicopter integrated life support system (HAILSS)		6,000		4,000
K-36 ejection seat		-6,439	-6,439	-6,439
Joint ejection seat program		10,439	5,000	10,439
EW DEVELOPMENT	97,281	133,781	122,281	134,781
Spray cooling technology for EA-6B ICAP III program		8,500		8,500
Location of GPS system jammers (LOCO GPSI)		6,000		3,000
EA-6B Link-16 connectivity		15,000	30,000	23,000
Integrated defensive electronic countermeasures (IDECM)		7,000		3,000
ICAP III Reserve			-5,000	0
SC-21 TOTAL SHIP SYSTEM ENGINEERING	305,274	257,274	313,274	292,274
Development cost growth		-50,000		-20,000
Power node control centers		2,000	3,000	3,000
Multi-function Radar (AN/SPY-3)			5,000	4,000
SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	179,684	179,684	204,684	202,184
Aegis Combat System Engineering Upgrade			25,000	20,000
Advanced Food Service Technology				2,500

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
AIRBORNE MCM	47,312	50,312	47,312	51,312
Remote technical assistance support to deploying MCM ships		3,000		3,000
AQS-20 sonar data recording capability				1,000
SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	34,801	62,801	49,801	72,801
Advanced food service technology		3,000		0
Multi-purpose processor (MPP) SBIR follow-on for advanced processing builds		25,000		25,000
ARCI			10,000	8,000
Antenna Technology Improvement			5,000	5,000
NEW DESIGN SSN	207,091	212,091	210,091	214,091
MPP-SBIR follow-on for technology insertion and refresh for Virginia SSN combat system		5,000		5,000
Submarine Common Architecture			3,000	2,000
SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	20,492	26,492	20,492	26,492
Integration of advanced tactical software, AN/UYQ-70 and other off the shelf products into backfit submarine combat control systems		6,000		6,000
SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	62,204	72,204	72,204	78,204
Littoral support fast patrol craft		10,000		8,000
Nuclear Aircraft Carrier Design and Product Modeling			10,000	8,000
NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,291	28,291	3,291	30,891
AN/UYQ-70 (Note: Only to develop and implement technology refresh capabilities to incorporate into future AN/UYQ-70 workstation production across surface, submarine, and air platforms.)		25,000		19,600
Submarine combat system Q-70 retrofits and technology refreshment				8,000
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	26,151	29,151	26,151	29,151
DAMASK component packaging		3,000		3,000
SHIP SELF-DEFENSE - EMD	85,049	85,049	87,149	87,149
Anti-Ship Missile Decoy System			2,100	2,100
MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	5,273	27,273	11,773	27,773
Bone Marrow Transplant Technology (Note: The conferees recommend $3,000,000 only for the unrelated donor marrow transportation clinical trials of graft engineering.)		4,000		3,000
Dental Research		6,000		4,000
High Resolution Digital Mammography		4,000		2,000
Mobile integrated Diagnostic and Data Analysis System (MIDDAS)		2,000		1,500
Voice Interactive Device (Note: Only for continued modification, demonstration, and validation of the Naval voice interactive device as a tool for medical personnel on-board ships or in the field to facilitate the collection, processing, storing, and forwarding of critical medical data for treating combat casualties.)		6,000		6,000
Smart Aortic Arch Catheter			1,500	1,000
Coastal Cancer Control			5,000	5,000
DISTRIBUTED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	20,710	35,710	40,710	40,710
ADS-P3I for alternative power source (FDS-C)		9,500		0
ADS-risk mitigation/processing software		5,500		0
Advanced Deployable system			20,000	20,000
(Note: $5,500,000 is available only for SBIR follow-on Field Processing and Automation Technology Insertion and $9,500,000 is only for the Remote Powered-All Optical FDS-C system)				
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF) - EMD	295,962	145,962		101,275
EMD deferment (Note: The Conferees designate the Joint Strike Fighter as an item of special congressional interest.)		-150,000	-295,962	-194,687
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,259	23,259	18,259	29,259
Human Resource Enterprise Strategy		8,000	3,000	9,000
Information Technology Center			8,000	0
Distance Learning IT Center at California State University, San Bernardino				5,000

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
in conjunction with the Information Technology Center in New Orleans, Louisiana.				
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	40,707	44,707	43,707	45,707
Acquisition / installation of refurbished SPS-48E radar systems for test and evaluation support		4,000		3,000
Fleet Air Training			3,000	2,000
STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT - NAVY	8,056	6,056		6,056
Freeze to fiscal year 2000 level		-2,000		-2,000
CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	43,889	43,889	38,889	43,889
Program Reduction			-5,000	
TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	949	10,949	949	10,949
Supply Chain Management		4,000		4,000
Commercialization of Advanced Technology (CAT) program (Note: only to establish the CAT program at the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center.)		6,000		6,000
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	270,327	270,327	272,327	272,327
PMRF			2,000	2,000
SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	12,694	7,694	12,694	11,694
Lower priority TENCAP projects		-5,000		-1,000
MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	8,091	14,891	9,091	17,891
Consequence Management Information System		6,800		6,800
Marine Corps University			1,000	1,000
CIBRF: Chemical agent warning network			[3,000]	2,000
STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	42,687	54,687	44,687	53,687
Radiation hardened technology computer aided design program		10,000		7,000
Alternate pendulous integrating gyro accelerometer and Hemispherical resonator gyro development		2,000		2,000
Reentry Systems Application Program			2,000	2,000
F/A 18 SQUADRONS	248,093	248,093	243,093	243,093
ATFLIR Reserve			-4,000	-4,000
JHMCS Contract Savings			-1,000	-1,000
E-2 SQUADRONS	18,698	37,698	18,698	50,698
E-2/C-2 eight blade composite propeller		8,000		4,000
E-2C Middleware Technology and Advanced Processing Builds		5,000		5,000
E-2C RMP Littoral Surveillance				15,000
Improved Composite Rotordome				2,000
NCW development, test and evaluation in support of Naval Fires Network Demo		6,000		6,000
INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	16,928	27,928	16,928	27,928
Web Centric Warfare (Wecan) technology expansion to other warfare areas and domains.		5,000		5,000
ASW Combat Systems Integration - onboard signal processor development		6,000		6,000
CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,059	34,559	32,059	38,559
Battleforce tactical trainer (Note: Only for the continuation of the current upgrade of the BFTT system to a Windows-NT/PC based system to improve the interfaces to other ship and shore based systems.)		7,500		7,500
Joint Tactical Training Combat Training System			5,000	4,000
HARM IMPROVEMENT	21,355	46,355	26,355	41,355
AARGM		25,000		15,000
Quick Bolt, ACTD Program			5,000	5,000
NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM			19,000	19,000
LASH			10,000	10,000
Range Airship			9,000	9,000
F-14 UPGRADE	1,228	1,228	11,228	11,228
Demonstrate a SAR-podded reconnaissance system			9,000	9,000

	Request	HAC	SAC	Conference
RWR Antenna Replacement and System Enhancement			1,000	1,000
MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	96,153	107,153	99,153	109,153
MEWSS P3I		5,000		5,000
Combined Arms Command and Control Training Upgrade (CACTUS)		6,000		6,000
(Note: Only for the upgrade of the USMC training facilities to implement the Joint Simulation System for use in the Marine force's CACTUS)				
Joint Enhanced Core Communications System			3,000	2,000
MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	22,124	39,424	22,124	39,424
Expeditionary indirect fire general support weapon system		17,300		17,300
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	21,530	30,130	21,530	32,130
Information Assurance - PKI		8,600		8,600
Naval Intelligent Agent Security Module				2,000
JOINT C4ISR BATTLE CENTER (JBC)	7,795	7,795	9,795	9,795
Interoperability Process Software Tools			2,000	2,000
TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	113,052	129,052	113,052	123,052
MSAG for Tactical Control System (TCS)		10,000		7,000
Navy joint operational testbed for UAVs		5,000		3,000
Navy UAV display system to combine data retrieved from multiple UAVs into a network.		1,000		0
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,759	15,759	8,759	23,759
Upgrade Storyfinder/Landmark systems with SEI		6,000		3,000
EP-3 upgrade/weight reduction study; redesign of common electronic receivers/tuners; development, design, and flight test of new lightweight equipment racks.		5,000		4,000
Hyperspectral Modular Upgrades to Airbrone Reconnaissance System			4,000	4,000
Develop/upgrade the sensor to an 18-inch lens and integrate an existing dual band sensor into the TARPS Pod				5,000
Develop an advanced focal plane array for smaller electro-optical framing size				3,000
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	27,479	65,079	27,479	46,479
Sensor upgrade on special project aircraft		2,600		1,000
Ongoing SHARP development efforts		18,000		18,000
(Note: Of which $2,000,000 may be used to study the feasibility of incorporating a small synthetic aperture radar into the SHARP pod.)				
Acquisition and test of small SAR for potential SHARP P3I		9,000		0
Lens development for longer stand-off range		5,000		0
Advanced focal plane array for increased sensor reliability		3,000		0
NAVY SPACE SURVEILLANCE	2,038	1,438	2,038	1,438
SPACE ACTIVITIES			2,000	2,000
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	9,106	12,106	14,106	14,106
C4ISR modeling and simulation / SPAWAR Project		3,000	5,000	5,000
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	59,626	69,626	59,626	69,626
Program increase		10,000		10,000

Network Centric Warfare (NCW)

The conferees agree to provide a total of $7,000,000 for NCW and a Naval Fires Network Demonstration. The conferees agree that these funds should be used to continue development of the Naval Fires Network Demonstrator, test the tactical dissemination of intelligence for Time Critical Strike capabilities, and refine the NCW concept of operations. The conferees are pleased with the progress the Navy has made in advancing NCW from theory to substance and supports the NCW development and implementation plan through the proposed Executive Integrated Process Team (EIPT) and working group structure.

Navy Information Technology Center

The Conferees have provided $6,000,000 in Operation and Maintenance, Navy and $9,000,000 in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy only for continuing the human resource enterprise strategy in accordance with Section 8147 of the 1999 Defense Appropriations Act including operational support costs and equipment needs at the Navy Program Executive Office for Information Technology's (PEO/IT) ITC and the completion of Navy and Naval Reserve manpower and personnel central design activity consolidations.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF				
BASIC RESEARCH				
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	206,149	216,149	208,149	213,649
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	206,149	216,149	208,149	213,649
APPLIED RESEARCH				
MATERIALS	72,815	83,515	97,415	97,315
AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	48,775	52,315	49,327	53,675
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	62,619	63,019	68,619	67,019
AEROSPACE PROPULSION	116,262	118,262	128,362	124,762
AEROSPACE SENSORS	65,644	69,644	65,644	67,644
HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	---	5,000	---	---
SPACE TECHNOLOGY	57,687	61,687	68,287	69,487
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	45,223	45,223	45,223	53,223
DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	32,337	32,337	32,337	32,337
COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	78,749	90,549	78,749	87,249
DUAL USE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	10,144	10,144	10,144	10,144
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	590,255	631,695	644,107	662,855
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
LOGISTICS SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	13,895	13,895	13,895	13,895
ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	21,678	48,928	25,178	43,978
AEROSPACE PROPULSION SUBSYSTEMS INTEGRATION	34,440	35,440	34,440	34,940
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	28,311	44,811	40,311	46,811
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	2,445	7,645	6,272	11,045
AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	12,961	12,961	19,161	18,461

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	41,964	45,464	41,964	43,814
PERSONNEL, TRAINING AND SIMULATION TECHNOLOGY	6,491	6,491	6,491	6,491
CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	12,479	19,479	17,479	17,479
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	13,184	18,184	16,184	18,126
ADVANCED SENSOR INTEGRATION	5,350	5,350	5,350	5,350
ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	25,882	27,882	25,882	26,882
SPACE AND MISSILE ROCKET PROPULSION	24,283	28,283	24,283	28,033
BALLISTIC MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	---	23,000	---	23,000
ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	97,327	60,087	117,742	63,602
SPACE SYSTEMS ENVIRONMENTAL INTERACTIONS TECHNOLOGY	3,412	3,412	3,412	3,412
MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	4,625	4,625	19,625	19,625
CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	22,731	22,731	22,731	22,731
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	33,371	42,371	45,371	43,371
ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	---	---	2,000	1,000
AEROSPACE INFO TECH SYS INTEGRATION	7,429	7,429	8,029	7,429
C3I ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,468	19,468	19,468	19,468
SPACE-BASED LASER	63,216	35,000	73,216	73,216
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	494,942	532,936	588,484	592,159
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,401	4,401	4,401	4,401
AIRBORNE LASER PROGRAM	148,637	148,637	241,037	233,637
ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	246,396	246,396	246,396	246,396
POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	26,068	26,068	26,068	26,068
NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL	76,654	76,654	76,654	76,654
SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	9,728	9,728	9,728	9,728

(in thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMAND, CONTROL, AND COMMUNICATION APPLICATIONS.....	7,828	7,828	7,828	7,828
INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY.....	991	---	991	---
COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY.....	10,933	10,933	10,933	10,933
NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT(H).....	5,509	5,509	5,509	5,509
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER.....	129,538	204,538	325,632	243,050
INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (DEM/VAL).....	24,488	15,788	24,488	15,788
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL.....	39,246	39,246	58,446	51,446
WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE).....	134,029	134,029	101,029	121,029
AIR FORCE/NATIONAL PROGRAM COOPERATION (AFNPC).....	3,370	1,370	3,370	2,370
POLLUTION PREVENTION (DEM/VAL).....	2,543	2,543	2,543	2,543
JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS - DEM/VAL	18,092	18,092	18,092	18,092
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION.....	888,451	951,760	1,163,145	1,075,472
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL				
JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS).....	1,312	1,312	1,312	1,312
INTEGRATED AVIONICS PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT.....	712	---	712	---
NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT.....	10,133	10,133	10,133	10,133
B-1B.....	168,122	158,122	168,122	158,122
DISTRIBUTED MISSION TRAINING (DMT).....	3,782	3,782	3,782	3,782
SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE PILOT TRAINING.....	23,853	23,853	23,853	23,853
F-22 EMD.....	1,411,786	1,411,786	1,411,786	1,411,786
B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER.....	48,313	145,313	53,313	130,313
EW DEVELOPMENT.....	58,198	56,298	66,198	53,098
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD.....	569,188	569,188	569,188	569,188
SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) LOW EMD.....	241,021	241,021	241,021	241,021
MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE).....	236,841	241,841	232,841	237,341

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,876	25,876	8,876	21,876
SUBMUNITIONS	4,775	4,775	4,775	4,775
AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	668	---	668	3,414
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,157	26,157	1,157	11,157
AEROMEDICAL/CHEMICAL DEFENSE SYSTEMS	5,929	5,929	5,929	5,929
LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	14,758	26,358	17,508	26,458
CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	2,746	2,746	2,746	---
JOINT STANDOFF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	1,498	1,498	1,498	1,498
COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	12,559	16,559	16,559	16,559
INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	214	---	5,014	8,014
INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	1,298	1,298	6,598	4,798
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	8,745	8,745	8,745	8,745
COMMON LOW OBSERVABLES VERIFICATION SYSTEM (CLOVERS)	11,621	11,621	11,621	11,621
JOINT INTEROPERABILITY OF TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL	5,825	5,825	5,825	5,825
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	299,540	149,540	---	101,275
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	19,851	19,851	19,851	19,851
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - EMD	18,325	18,325	18,325	18,325
EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	332,952	332,952	332,952	332,952
RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	14,204	29,204	21,204	25,704
PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS	3,965	3,965	3,965	3,965
COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	10,842	10,842	10,842	10,842
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	3,553,609	3,564,715	3,286,919	3,483,532
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	34,785	34,785	34,785	34,785
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	191	---	191	---

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	54,057	68,807	59,057	68,257
RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	24,080	24,080	20,080	22,080
RANCH HAND II EPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	28,238	33,238	20,238	33,238
TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	386,205	386,205	386,205	386,205
ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	7,906	7,906	7,906	7,906
SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	46,476	46,476	46,476	46,476
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,773	3,773	3,773	3,773
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	590,067	609,626	583,067	607,076
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT				
B-52 SQUADRONS	50,787	50,787	60,787	50,787
ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE	4,182	4,182	4,182	4,182
AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	6,457	6,457	6,457	6,457
REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION	992	992	992	992
AIR AND SPACE COMMAND AND CONTROL AGENCY (ASC2A)	24,769	24,769	24,769	24,769
A-10 SQUADRONS	8,615	8,615	10,615	9,715
F-16 SQUADRONS	124,903	133,903	125,903	123,903
F-15E SQUADRONS	61,260	68,860	66,260	68,860
MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,670	14,670	14,670	14,670
F-117A SQUADRONS	3,912	3,912	3,912	3,912
TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	21,706	21,706	21,706	21,706
ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	53,707	53,707	53,707	53,707
AF TENCAP	9,826	16,826	9,826	13,826
SPECIAL EVALUATION PROGRAM	75,443	75,443	75,443	75,443
COMPASS CALL	5,834	25,834	15,834	21,834

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	166,926	166,926	166,926	166,926
EXTENDED RANGE CRUISE MISSILE	---	---	20,000	40,000
JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	120,281	113,281	120,281	116,281
THEATER AIR CONTROL SYSTEMS	19,873	19,873	19,873	19,873
AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	35,653	35,653	35,653	35,653
ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	2,867	2,867	2,867	2,867
EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM	81,027	81,027	81,027	81,027
ADVANCED PROGRAM TECHNOLOGY	90,713	90,713	87,713	90,713
THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	41,068	41,068	46,068	44,568
JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM	144,118	151,318	151,318	149,118
SEEK EAGLE	19,472	19,472	19,472	19,472
ADVANCED PROGRAM EVALUATION	266,458	266,458	261,158	265,558
USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	17,624	18,624	17,624	18,024
WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	3,874	8,874	3,874	7,874
MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	20,755	20,755	20,755	20,755
INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	1	---	1	---
WAR RESERVE MATERIEL - EQUIPMENT/SECONDARY ITEMS	1,475	1,475	1,475	1,475
THEATER MISSILE DEFENSES	19,824	19,824	19,824	19,824
TECHNICAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	98,263	98,263	98,263	98,263
SPECIAL EVALUATION SYSTEM	74,240	74,240	74,240	74,240
E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	34,410	34,410	34,410	34,410
DEFENSE SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM (SPACE)	7,328	7,328	7,328	7,328
AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS (AIRCOM)	11,478	11,478	11,478	11,478
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	15,302	15,302	15,302	15,302
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	7,212	25,703	12,212	29,503

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	46,369	46,369	46,369	46,369
GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,743	3,743	3,743	3,743
COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	4,857	4,857	4,857	4,857
MILSATCOM TERMINALS	17,797	17,797	20,797	17,797
GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	8,508	8,508	8,508	8,508
SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	58,643	58,643	58,643	58,643
WEATHER SERVICE	19,942	19,942	19,942	19,942
AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM	18,093	58,093	18,093	48,093
SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	467	467	467	467
NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM (NAS) PLAN	200	---	200	---
TITAN SPACE LAUNCH VEHICLES (SPACE)	25,815	25,815	25,815	25,815
TACTICAL TERMINAL	238	---	238	---
DEFENSE RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT ACTIVITIES (SPACE)	45,149	38,049	45,149	41,599
DEFENSE METEOROLOGICAL SATELLITE PROGRAM (SPACE)	25,372	25,372	25,372	25,372
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SP	66,975	66,975	66,975	66,975
NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL S	260,980	261,097	260,897	260,980
SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	53,654	85,154	53,654	85,154
DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	27,546	31,546	33,546	32,546
ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	109,215	128,215	127,215	127,215
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	136,913	143,913	152,613	157,913
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	---	---	11,000	9,500
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	21,330	25,830	21,330	25,830
NCMC - TW/AA SYSTEM	19,309	19,309	19,309	19,309
SPACETRACK (SPACE)	2,553	2,553	2,553	2,553
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	9,462	9,462	9,462	9,462

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	17,088	12,088	17,088	12,088
MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	1,177	1,177	1,177	1,177
SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	4,219	4,219	4,219	4,219
C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	60,496	60,496	60,496	60,496
C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS	92,530	92,530	44,901	92,530
C-17 AIRCRAFT	176,439	176,439	176,439	176,439
KC-135S	487	487	487	487
KC-10S	19,526	19,526	19,526	19,526
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	1,109	3,109	1,109	2,859
DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,515	4,515	1,515	3,515
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	53,082	57,582	56,082	58,882
PRODUCTIVITY, RELIABILITY, AVAILABILITY, MAINTAIN. PRO	15,227	15,227	24,227	21,227
JOINT LOGISTICS PROGRAM - AMMUNITION STANDARD SYSTEM	11,238	11,238	11,238	11,238
SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	32,258	42,258	32,258	40,858
COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CRSIP)	2,356	7,356	2,356	3,356
CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	7,209	7,209	7,209	7,209
COBRA BALL (FLD)	---	---	6,000	6,000
NATO JOINT STARS	3,270	3,270	3,270	3,270
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,123,225	3,817,778	4,126,725	4,014,188
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	7,372,886	7,253,808	7,457,274	7,503,501
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	13,696,359	13,760,689	13,931,145	14,138,244

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	**206,149**	**216,149**	**208,149**	**213,649**
Sacramento Peak Observatory		(600)		(600)
Chabot Observatory		2,000		1,000
Astronomical Active Optics		4,000	2,000	3,500
Coal based advanced thermally stable jet fuel		4,000		3,000
MATERIALS	**72,815**	**83,515**	**97,415**	**97,315**
IR detectors, RF and power electronics		2,000		500
Special Aerospace Materials and Manufacturing Processes		5,200		4,500
Thermal Management for Space Structures		2,500		1,800
Advanced Physical Vapor Transport Growth Process for SiC		1,000	5,000	3,000
Aircraft Structural Integrity			3,000	2,200
Carbon Foam Development for Aircraft/Spacecraft			4,000	4,000
Ceramic Matrix Composites			3,600	2,000
Laser Processing Tools			4,000	3,200
Resin Transfer Molded High Temperature Materials for Engines			2,000	1,300
Thermal Protection System for Hypervelocity Vehicles			1,500	1,000
Weathering and Corrosion on Aircraft Surfaces and Parts			1,500	1,000
AEROSPACE FLIGHT DYNAMICS	**48,775**	**52,315**	**49,327**	**53,675**
Weapons systems logistics, deployed base systems technology, and force protection		3,540		2,900
Aeronautical Research			6,000	2,000
Control Techniques and Adaptive Flight Control Algorithms			-5,448	0
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	**62,619**	**63,019**	**68,619**	**67,019**
Altitude protection		400		400
Solid Electrolyte Oxygen Seperator			6,000	4,000
AEROSPACE PROPULSION	**116,262**	**118,262**	**128,362**	**124,762**
Lithium Ion Battery		2,000		1,000
Magnetic Bearing Cooling Turbine MBCT			6,000	3,800
PBO Membrane Fuel Cells			5,000	2,600
Fuels and Lubricants			1,100	800
Variable Displacement Vane Pump			3,000	1,800
Rocket Propulsion Technology			-5,000	-5,000
Hypersonic Electric Power System			2,000	3,500
HYPERSONIC TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM		**5,000**		**0**
Hypersonic electric power system (transfer to Aerospace Propulsion)		5,000		0
SPACE TECHNOLOGY	**57,687**	**61,687**	**68,287**	**69,487**
Terabit		4,000		4,000
HAARP			7,000	7,000
Advanced Aluminum Aerostructures			3,000	1,800
Composite Cryogenic Fuel Tanks			2,000	1,000
Science and Technology Space Survivability			5,600	3,000
Integrated Microsatellite Technology Concepts			-7,000	-5,000
CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	**45,223**	**45,223**	**57,223**	**53,223**
XSS-10 microsatellite technology			12,000	8,000
COMMAND CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS	**78,749**	**90,549**	**78,749**	**87,249**
Simulation Based Acquisition		11,800		8,500
ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	**21,678**	**48,928**	**25,178**	**43,978**
Aging aircraft		10,000		6,500
National Composite P4A Initiative		3,000		1,800
Advanced Low Observable Coatings		6,000		3,900
Special Aerospace Materials and Manufacturing Processes		5,250		4,500
National Center for Industrial Competitiveness		3,000		1,800
Handheld Holographic Radar Gun (H3G)				1,000
Next Generation Launch Vehicle Payload F & Shrouds			2,000	2,000
Vehicle Health Monitor			1,500	800
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	**28,311**	**44,811**	**40,311**	**46,811**
IDAL IR simulator and RF and IR integration		6,000	6,000	3,500
National Radar Signature Production and Research Capability		10,500		10,500
Hyperspectral System Development (High Altitude)			6,000	4,500
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	**2,445**	**7,645**	**6,272**	**11,045**
Weapons systems logistics, deployed base systems technology, and force protection		5,200		4,200
E-SMART Chem/Bio Sensors			4,000	3,000
Fiber Optics Control Technology			2,000	1,400
Control Techniques and Adaptive Flight Control Algorithms			-1,058	0

Autonomous Control			-1,115	0
AEROSPACE STRUCTURES	**12,961**	**12,961**	**19,161**	**18,461**
Polymetric Foam Core			4,000	4,000
Three Dimensional Bias Woven Platforms			2,200	1,500
AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	**41,964**	**45,464**	**41,964**	**43,814**
Next generation aerospace research initiative		3,000		1,500
Vectored Thrust Ducted Propeller Compound Helicopter demonstration for combat rescue		500		350
CREW SYSTEMS AND PERSONNEL PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY	**12,479**	**19,479**	**17,479**	**17,479**
High Brightness Helmet Display		7,000	5,000	5,000
FLIGHT VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION	**13,184**	**18,184**	**16,184**	**18,126**
Trans-Atmospheric Aerospace Plane (TAAP) study by ASC		5,000		4,000
Explosion Resistant Fuel Tank Lining Materials			3,000	2,000
Control Techniques and Adaptive Flight Control Algorithms (Candidate for UCAV technology initiative)				-1,058
ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	**97,327**	**50,087**	**117,742**	**63,602**
Discoverer II		-54,240		-54,240
Miniature Satellite Threat Reporting System (MSTRS)		3,000		1,500
Satellite survivability		4,000		3,000
Upper Stage Flight Experiment			5,000	5,000
Scorpius Low Cost Launcher		10,000	5,000	6,500
Solar Orbital Transfer Vehicle (SOTV)			5,000	2,600
Space Maneuver Vehicle (SMV)			10,000	6,500
Second Integrated Space Technology Demonstration			-4,585	-4,585
ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	**33,371**	**42,371**	**45,371**	**43,371**
High Resolution Space Object Imaging Program		9,000	5,000	8,000
FLD Upgrades			7,000	7,000
LaserSpark			(+5000)	3,000
Transfer to Joint High Energy Laser Program				-8,000
AEROSPACE INFO TECH SYS INTEGRATION	**7,429**	**7,429**	**8,029**	**7,429**
Simulation Based Acquisition (transfer to Command, Control, and Communications)			600	0
SPACE-BASED LASER	**63,216**	**35,000**	**73,216**	**73,216**
Program reduction		-28,216		0
Program increase			10,000	10,000
INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY	**991**		**991**	**0**
Transfer funds to 0303140F		-991		-991
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER	**129,538**	**204,538**	**325,632**	**243,050**
Risk reduction and flight testing		75,000		0
Flight Test Program Extension			10,000	0
Demonstration/Validation Program Extension			186,094	0
Air Vehicle Dem/Val Bridge Contracts				91,012
Engine Dem/Val Bridge Contract				22,500
INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE - DEM/VAL	**39,246**	**39,246**	**58,446**	**51,446**
Northern Edge Exercise Support			10,200	10,200
GPS Certification			6,000	2,000
Northern Edge Launch Range Communication Instrumentation (Transferred to Army)			3,000	0
WIDEBAND MILSATCOM (SPACE)	**134,029**	**134,029**	**101,029**	**121,029**
Program reduction			-18,000	-8,000
Global Broadcast System			-15,000	-5,000
B-2 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY BOMBER	**48,313**	**145,313**	**53,313**	**130,313**
500lb JDAM integration		56,000		56,000
Inflight replanning		11,000		11,000
EGBU-28		25,000		15,000
EHF risk reduction		5,000		0
EHF Preliminary Design and Risk Reduction Study			5,000	0
EW DEVELOPMENT	**58,198**	**56,298**	**66,198**	**53,098**
CMWS -- Air Force withdrawal from program. Prior year funds available to support joint program through FY 2001.		-19,800		-19,800
MALD		3,000		1,200
PLAID for ALR-69		14,900	8,000	10,000
Survivability enhancements (transferred from F-15)				3,500
MILSTAR LDR/MDR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	**236,841**	**241,841**	**232,841**	**237,341**
Integrated Satellite Communications Control		5,000		4,500
Program reduction			-4,000	-4,000

ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	**8,876**	**25,876**	**8,876**	**21,876**
Cast Ductile Bomb		2,000		1,000
Miniature Munitions Capability		15,000		12,000
AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	**668**		**668**	**3,414**
Program reduction		-668		0
Civil, fire, environmental, shelter engineering				2,746
JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	**1,157**	**26,157**	**1,157**	**11,157**
500lb JDAM		25,000		10,000
NOTE: The conferees hereby approve reprogramming FY 00-20 PA				
LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	**14,758**	**26,358**	**26,358**	**26,458**
K-36/3.5 ejection seat stand-alone program		-6,250	-6,250	-6,250
Joint Ejection Seat Program		13,850	5,000	10,250
Standardized cockpit and crew seats		4,000	4,000	3,700
ACES II ejection seat digital sequencer/structural mods for higher weight				4,000
CIVIL, FIRE, ENVIRONMENTAL, SHELTER ENGINEERING	**2,746**	**2,746**	**2,746**	**0**
Transfer to Agile Combat Support				-2,746
INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	**214**		**5,014**	**8,014**
Program reduction		-214		0
ASSET Procurement Automation & iGATM Technology			4,800	4,800
NPLACE (transfer)				2,000
Air Force Product Line Engineering Activity				1,000
JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER EMD	**299,540**	**149,540**	∅	**101,275**
Defer EMD		-150,000		-198,265
Extend DEM/VAL			-299,540	∅
RDT&E FOR AGING AIRCRAFT	**14,204**	**29,204**	**21,204**	**25,704**
Aging aircraft		3,000		1,500
Aging landing gear life extension		12,000	7,000	10,000
TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**191**		**191**	**0**
Program reduction		-191		-191
MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	**54,057**	**68,807**	**59,057**	**68,257**
Laser Induced Surface Improvement (LISI)		2,000		1,100
X-15 test stand at Edwards AFB		250		500
Multi-axis thrust stand at Edwards AFB		5,000		2,600
Eglin range improvements		7,500		6,500
MARIAH II Hypersonic Wind Tunnel Program			5,000	3,500
INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	**28,238**	**33,238**	**20,238**	**33,238**
AFOTEC		5,000		5,000
Delayed tests			-8,000	0
B-52 SQUADRONS	**50,787**	**50,787**	**60,787**	**50,787**
ALQ-172 Electronic Countermeasure Improvement Program (Transfer to procurement)			10,000	0
F-16 SQUADRONS	**124,903**	**133,903**	**125,903**	**123,903**
TARS podded reconnaissance system		9,000		0
OBOGS retrofit			6,000	4,000
Auto GCAS			-5,000	-5,000
F-15E SQUADRONS	**61,260**	**68,860**	**68,260**	**68,860**
BOL IR		7,600		7,600
Survivability Enhancements (Transferred to EW Development)			5,000	0
EXTENDED RANGE CONVENTIONAL CRUISE MISSILE			**43,000**	**40,000**
ERCCM			43,000	40,000
AF TENCAP	**9,826**	**16,826**	**9,826**	**13,826**
Hyperspectral research on Predator UAV		4,000		2,000
Hyperspectral research on high altitude reconnaissance platforms		3,000		2,000
COMPASS CALL	**5,834**	**25,834**	**15,834**	**21,834**
Signal analysis subsystem		10,000		8,000
SPEAR System Improvements		10,000	10,000	8,000
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	**7,212**	**25,703**	**12,212**	**29,503**
Transfer from 0603690F		991		991
System protection through exploration of adaptive information protection technology using and modifying COTS technology		2,000		2,000
Information Assurance: CDAD		10,000		10,000
Information Assurance: PKI		5,500		5,500
Lighthouse Cyber Security			5,000	3,800

NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTRO	**260,980**	**261,097**	**260,897**	**260,980**
GPS Modernization		117	-83	0
DRAGON U-2	27,546	31,546	33,546	32,546
U-2 SYERS polarization		+ 4,000	+ 6,000	+ 5,000
ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	**109,215**	**128,215**	**127,215**	**127,215**
Replacement of EO/IR sensors on existing Global Hawk UAV		12,000		0
Development of dual band sensor capabilities and precision targeting location		7,000		0
Global Hawk - Replacement of EO/IR sensors on existing Global Hawk UAV and development of dual band sensor capabilities and precision target location			18,000	18,000
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	**136,913**	**143,913**	**152,613**	**157,913**
Wideband integrated common data link		7,000		7,000
High Rate Laser Comms			5,700	4,000
JSAF LBSS			10,000	10,000
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS			**11,000**	**9,500**
ECARS			11,000	9,500
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	**21,330**	**25,830**	**21,330**	**25,830**
Eagle Vision IV		4,500		4,500
DEFENSE SUPPORT PROGRAM (SPACE)	**9,462**	**9,462**	**9,462**	**9,462**
HANDS			(2,000)	(2,000)
SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES	**1,109**	**2,109**	**1,109**	**2,859**
Universal Biological Sensor		1,000		900
AFSOC Aircrew Orientation and Screening		600		500
Develop methodology for approving medications for use by aircrew		400		350
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	**53,082**	**57,582**	**56,082**	**58,882**
Special Aerospace Materials and Manufacturing Processes		4,500		3,800
F-16 Battery Improvement			3,000	2,000
SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**32,258**	**42,258**	**32,258**	**40,858**
Advanced Engine Simulation and Optimization Program		2,500		1,800
Aircraft and Systems Support Infrastructure		2,500		1,800
IMDS		5,000		1,000
Air Force Center of Acquisition Reengineering				2,000
Air Force Knowledge Management Project				2,000
COMPUTER RESOURCES SUPPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (C	**2,356**	**7,356**	**2,356**	**3,356**
NPLACE (transferred to Integrated Command and Control Applications)		4,000		0
Air Resource Rapid Reapplication Tools		1,000		1,000

INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE (ISR) BATTLE MANAGEMENT

The conferees are aware that the Air Force desires to initiate a program called the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Battle Management. The ISR Battle Management is an effort to extend required ISR command and control functions now resident in the Distributed Common Ground System to the Air Operations Center. This program was not identified in the fiscal year 2001 budget request. However, the conferees believe this effort should be initiated and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations would expeditiously consider a reprogramming request of up to $7,500,000 for this effort.

DISCOVERER II

After careful consideration, the conferees direct that the Discoverer II program be terminated.

To move forward in a more cost-effective manner, the conferees have provided $30,000,000 to the National Reconnaissance Office to undertake steps to further develop and mature low cost electronically scanned array radar technologies for space applications. The conferees further directed the continued participation of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in these efforts.

The Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, shall submit a program plan for the development, testing and application of technologies funded under this revised initiative. The conferees direct that none of the funds provided may be used to develop a stand-alone satellite demonstrator.

JOINT EJECTION SEAT PROGRAM

The conferees are concerned about the Defense Department's management of the Joint Ejection Seat Program, including the failure to complete a memorandum of agreement between the Navy and the Air Force concerning operation of the joint program. The conferees have deleted all funds for DoD's separate program to develop the K–36 seat. The conferees have provided a total of $20,689,000 only for the Joint Ejection Seat Program. The conferees direct that the Department of Defense conduct a full and open competition among any and all candidate seats under this program, with no arbitrary restrictions applied by DoD to limit the competition.

The conferees direct that no contract award for the joint ejection seat program using funds provided in fiscal year 2000 be made until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense submits a program plan for the Joint Ejection Seat Program as required by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000. This program plan should address all specific applications for the ejection seat or ejection seat technology developed under the JESP. Further, the report should specifically address the cost and commonality benefits of using any JESP-developed seat in the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). None of the funds appropriated in fiscal years 2000 or 2001 may be obligated until the Secretaries of the Navy and Air Force certify to the congressional defense committees that a joint program office is in place to manage the program in a manner which fairly meets both services' requirements. The conferees reiterate that the objective of the Joint Ejection Seat Program is to completely qualify at least two modern and safe ejection seats for potential use in existing and future tactical aircraft.

LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The conferees have provided an increase of $4,000,000 only for the ACES II ejection seat. These funds are provided only to complete development and testing on discrete modifications of existing ACES II seats to provide digital sequencing capability and to accommodate higher weight individuals. It is not the conferees' intent to fund any activity in this program that would give an unfair advantage to a bidder for the Joint Ejection Seat program.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE				
BASIC RESEARCH				
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,007	2,007	2,007	2,007
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	90,415	100,415	102,015	109,815
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	253,627	289,627	263,627	292,077
GULF WAR ILLNESS	16,978	16,978	27,978	27,978
INFORMATION ASSURANCE	---	3,000	---	3,000
GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEAR	6,715	6,715	6,715	6,715
DEF EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESE	9,859	19,859	25,000	22,000
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	33,197	40,197	38,197	39,897
TOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	412,798	478,798	465,539	503,489
APPLIED RESEARCH				
NEXT GENERATION INTERNET	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	37,747	50,247	56,247	56,247
MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	15,029	25,029	15,029	20,029
HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU)	14,236	14,236	17,736	17,236
HISPANIC SERVING INSTITUTIONS	---	5,000	---	5,000
LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	18,602	18,602	20,702	20,102
COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	376,592	335,592	343,592	334,392
EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	69,282	49,282	54,319	52,282
BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	162,064	166,564	150,064	168,314
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,600	75,600	81,600	80,000
TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	121,051	121,051	320,394	219,894
INTEGRATED COMMAND AND CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	31,761	38,761	38,761	38,761
MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	249,812	259,312	255,812	264,312

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIE	230,928	225,428	219,528	221,928
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	8,680	8,680	8,680	8,680
HIGH ENERGY LASER LASER PROGRAM	---	---	---	30,000
TOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	1,424,384	1,408,384	1,597,464	1,552,177
ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT				
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,043	2,043	2,043	2,043
EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,964	23,164	19,664	30,164
SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,622	8,622	8,622	8,622
COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	41,307	48,307	51,307	49,307
COUNTERPROLIFERATION ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT TECHNOLOGIES	77,391	77,391	77,391	77,391
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMEN	93,249	123,249	134,449	132,049
SPACE BASED LASERS (SBL)	74,537	58,000	74,537	74,537
JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	16,670	16,670	16,670	16,670
AUTOMATIC TARGET RECOGNITION	7,534	7,534	7,534	7,534
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	26,821	26,821	30,936	34,821
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEV	46,594	49,344	55,694	57,894
SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,777	14,777	15,777	29,577
ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	52,930	69,930	52,930	67,930
GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,082	47,382	37,082	48,182
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,357	57,357	51,557	59,557
JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,607	7,607	7,607	7,607
COOPERATIVE DOD/VA MEDICAL RESEARCH	---	1,000	---	1,000
ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	191,800	211,800	198,300	221,500
ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,425	116,425	121,425	119,925
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	164,027	164,027	177,527	173,327

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	128,863	128,863	128,863	128,863
SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	182,225	149,125	176,225	138,125
MARINE TECHNOLOGY	30,304	30,304	30,304	30,304
LAND WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	134,249	134,249	133,249	133,249
CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	101,387	101,387	101,387	101,387
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	56,971	56,971	64,971	62,971
COUNTERPROLIFERATION SUPPORT	1,483	1,483	5,483	1,483
AGILE PORT DEMONSTRATION	---	---	5,000	7,500
TOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,657,219	1,733,832	1,786,534	1,823,519
DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION				
PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	35,108	26,107	33,808	26,107
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	10,294	10,294	15,294	13,794
ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,534	24,534	31,034	38,334
CALS INITIATIVE	1,585	1,585	8,585	8,585
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	24,906	24,906	25,406	29,256
NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	382,671	512,671	442,671	462,671
MEADS CONCEPTS - DEM/VAL	63,175	53,475	63,175	53,475
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE - DEM/VAL	1,740,238	1,740,238	1,879,238	1,875,238
FAMILY-OF SYSTEMS ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION (FOS E&I	231,248	231,248	231,248	231,248
BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	270,718	292,718	304,218	313,218
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	116,992	116,992	124,992	130,992
THREAT AND COUNTERMEASURES	22,621	22,621	22,621	22,621
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - DEM/VAL	83,800	83,800	88,800	89,800
HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	12,728	12,728	12,728	12,728
COALITION WARFARE	11,839	11,839	---	6,000

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
JOINT SERVICE EDUCATION AND TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPME	---	3,500	---	3,000
PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE (PFP) INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYS	1,932	1,932	1,932	1,932
PENTAGON RESERVATION	4,772	4,772	4,772	4,772
TOTAL, DEMONSTRATION & VALIDATION	3,030,161	3,175,960	3,290,522	3,323,771
ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL				
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - EMD	100,815	100,815	104,315	104,015
JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM - EMD	11,553	16,553	11,553	15,053
ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	14,685	14,685	14,685	14,685
JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,250	16,250	16,250	16,250
THEATER HIGH-ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE SYSTEM - TMD - EMD	549,945	549,945	549,945	549,945
PATRIOT PAC-3 THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE ACQUISITION - EM	81,016	81,016	81,016	81,016
NAVY AREA THEATER MISSILE DEFENSE - EMD	274,234	274,234	274,234	274,234
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,000	13,500	12,000	12,750
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,671	1,671	1,671	1,671
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (FIELD ACTIVITY)	26,797	26,797	26,797	26,797
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (STANDARD PROC	15,772	15,772	15,772	15,772
DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM	11,340	11,340	11,340	11,340
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	18,210	18,210	20,710	19,610
GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	22,287	22,287	22,287	22,287
ELECTRONIC COMMERCE	28,094	28,094	28,094	28,094
TOTAL, ENGINEERING & MANUFACTURING DEVEL	1,184,669	1,191,169	1,190,669	1,193,519
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE DETECTION AND CLEARANCE	1,204	1,204	1,204	1,204
THERMAL VICAR	4,882	4,882	4,882	4,882

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	30,597	30,597	30,597	30,597
CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	3,927	3,927	3,927	3,927
BLACK LIGHT	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	3,769	34,469	9,769	38,769
FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	32,173	32,173	80,273	72,173
AFCC ENGINEERING AND INSTALLATION	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	9,122	9,122	9,122	9,122
JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	21,200	21,200	21,200	21,200
CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)	---	8,923	---	8,923
FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	31,697	31,697	31,697	31,697
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	23,907	23,907	23,907	23,907
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS - C3I	641	641	641	641
SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION	1,728	1,728	1,728	1,728
DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	5,048	5,048	8,048	8,048
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES (DTIC)	45,350	45,350	45,350	45,350
R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATI	8,776	8,776	8,776	8,776
DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	43,915	43,915	43,915	43,915
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT)	34,679	31,000	34,679	32,679
TOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	313,615	349,559	370,715	398,538
OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT				
COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT SAVINGS INITIATIVE	9,629	9,629	9,629	9,629
C3 INTEROPERABILITY	37,072	37,072	37,072	37,072
JOINT ANALYTICAL MODEL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	11,941	11,941	11,941	11,941
NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	641	641	641	641
DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATIO	5,704	5,704	5,704	5,704

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS (DCS)	1,416	1,416	1,416	1,416
SUPPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM	5,019	5,019	5,019	5,019
MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK	7,099	7,099	7,099	7,099
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	290,771	322,771	292,571	310,571
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	5,486	5,486	5,486	5,486
C4I FOR THE WARRIOR	405	405	405	405
JOINT SPECTRUM CENTER	8,735	8,735	8,735	8,735
SPECIAL RECONNAISSANCE CAPABILITIES (SRC) PROGRAM	3,800	3,800	3,800	3,800
DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	74,975	103,975	78,975	102,975
FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	444	444	444	444
C3I INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS	25,182	25,182	25,182	25,182
DRAGON U-2 (JMIP)	4,379	4,379	4,379	4,379
AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,514	13,514	13,514	13,514
MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	4,543	4,543	4,543	4,543
DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND SYSTEMS	994	994	994	994
TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	95,671	95,671	95,671	95,671
INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,090	9,090	7,090	9,090
MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (OJCS)	12,540	12,540	12,540	12,540
JOINT SIMULATION SYSTEM	24,095	24,095	24,095	42,095
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,360	10,360	7,360	10,260
SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,778	7,778	7,778	7,778
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	133,520	156,620	134,820	143,470
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,022	9,022	3,022	8,022
SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	87,071	95,071	59,171	79,071
CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,323,435	1,586,234	1,379,435	1,372,751
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPEMENT	2,215,396	2,581,295	2,250,596	2,342,362
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CENTER	---	---	---	20,000
TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DEFWIDE	10,238,242	10,918,997	10,952,039	11,157,375

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	BUDGET	HOUSE	SENATE	CONFERENCE
DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	90,415	100,415	102,015	109,815
Spin Electronics [Note: The conferees have transferred $10,000,000 from PE 601103D8Z from the Nanotechnology Initiative. The conferees recommend $10,000,000 only to strengthen the spin electronics programs.]		10,000	----	10,000
Advanced Photonics Composites Research		----	3,000	3,000
Nanoelectronic Science and Technology for QCA		----	2,000	2,500
High Speed Bandwidth Research		----	2,600	1,500
Spectral Hole Burning Applications		----	3,000	1,800
Wireless Technology Research		----	1,000	600
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	253,627	289,627	263,627	292,077
Advanced Power and Energy Program		1,000	----	750
Advanced Materials Research		----	----	1,000
Multi-disciplinary atmospheric and hydrologic research		3,000	----	2,000
Computational Neuroscience		1,000	----	950
National Security Training [Note: $750,000 is only for an educational program to encourage non-traditional and minority students to enter national security and foreign policy careers through a new training partnership between the Department of Defense, a Hispanic Serving Institution located in an empowerment zone, and an institution of higher education that has expertise in international affairs. This program would be focused on a continuum of education and support for successful students at two-year colleges to continue their studies at higher levels in order to expand the pools of minority groups for leadership roles in the Department of Defense.]		1,000	----	750
Defense Commercialization Research Initiative		4,000	----	4,000
Electro-Magnetic Nanopulse		2,500	----	2,300
MEMS		1,500	----	1,000
MEMS for Rolling Element Bearings		1,500	----	1,000
MEMS sensors for Radionuclides Detection and Ordnance Monitoring [Note: The conferees recommend $9,500,000 only for Radionuclides Detection and Ordnance Monitoring.]		9,500	----	9,500
Quantum-Dot Cellular Automata Nanoscience and Technology Research		4,000	----	----
Remote Sensing		6,000	[5,000]	4,900
Technology Insertion Demonstration (SEI)		2,000	----	2,000

Desert Environmental Research: [Note: The conferees recommend an increase of $4,000,000 only for a University based GIS program using sensor technology, line distance sampling, and spatial analysis techniques to monitor desert tortoise population related to potential expansion of the Fort Irwin National Training Center.]		4,000	----	4,000
Spin Electronics [Note: The conferees transfer $10,000,000 from the Nanotechnology Initiative to PE 601103E for Spin electronics programs.]		-10,000	----	-10,000
Bioengineering/Nanotechnology Research [Note: Only to establish a program to develop interdisciplinary research and development for bioengineering in advanced medicine, based on nanotechnology and the new synthetic capabilities afforded by molecular self-assembly such as the synthesis of mushroom nanostructures and DNA-like ribbon nanostructures and the discovery of key features of the self-assembly of the cell's cytoskeleton, to address medical problems of concern for national security such as improved treatment for battlefield wounds and better defense against biological warfare.]		5,000	----	4,000
Active Hyperspectral Imaging Sensor Research		----	5,000	5,000
Anti-corrosion Studies		----	1,500	800
Military Personnel Research		----	2,000	4,000
Nuclear Test Verification Technology		----	1,500	1,000
Reduction for High Energy Laser		----	----	-500
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	33,197	40,197	38,197	39,897
Chemical Agent Detection		7,000	----	5,000
Chemical Agent Detection via Optical Computing		----	2,000	----
Next Generation Thin Film Sensor Technology		----	3,000	1,700
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - APPLIED RESEARCH	37,747	50,247	56,247	56,247
Wide band Gap Electronics [Amounts appropriated in Support Technology line.]		10,000	----	----
Bottom Anti-Reflective Coatings		2,500	2,500	2,500
Photoconduction on Active Pixel Sensors		----	7,000	7,000
Laser Communication Demonstration		----	5,000	5,000
Shipboard High Precision Lidar System		----	2,000	2,000
Wide Band Gap Electronics		----	2,000	2,000
MEDICAL FREE ELECTRON LASER	15,029	25,029	15,029	20,029
Program increase [Includes funding for programs funded in House bill under PE 603002A]		10,000	----	5,000
HISPANIC SERVING INSTITUTIONS		5,000	----	5,000

Hispanic Serving Institutions [Note: The conferees recommend $5,000,000 only for Hispanic Serving Institutions.]		5,000	----	5,000
COMPUTING SYSTEMS AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	376,592	335,592	343,592	334,392
Reuse Technology (RTAP)		4,000	2,000	2,800
Program reduction due to program growth		-45,000	----	-30,000
Intelligent Software for Multi-lingual and Coalition Environments			-15,000	----
Asymmetric Threat			-5,000	----
Mobile Autonomous Robot Software			-15,000	-15,000
EXTENSIBLE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	69,282	49,282	54,319	52,282
Program reduction due to program growth		-20,000	----	-17,000
Deeply Networked Systems		----	-5,000	----
Common Software for Autonomous Robotics		----	-4,963	----
Large Scale Network Sensors		----	-5,000	----
BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	162,064	166,564	150,064	168,314
Biological and Chemical Terrorism Response and Training [Note: The conferees recommend $6,000,000 only for the continuation of a joint biological and chemical terrorism response training program.]		10,000	----	6,000
Biological and Chemical Terrorism Response and Training [Note: The conferees recommend $7,000,000 only for the continuation of a joint biological and chemical terrorism response training program.]		7,000	----	7,000
Asymmetrical protocols for biological warfare defense		4,000	----	3,750
Desalination Research		3,500	----	3,000
Program reduction due to program growth		-20,000	-15,000	-15,000
DNA chip technology research		----	3,000	1,500
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	73,600	75,600	81,600	80,000
Improved Detection of WMD		2,000	----	1,600
CB Point Detectors using thin film technology		----	8,000	4,800
TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	121,051	121,051	320,394	219,894
CEROS		----	5,000	5,000
Remotely Controlled Combat Systems Initiative		----	200,000	100,000
Advanced Rotorcraft Technology		----	-5,657	-5,657
Compact Lasers		----	----	-500
MATERIALS AND ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	249,812	259,312	255,812	264,312
Materials in Sensors and Actuators Technology [Note: The conferees recommend $9,500,000 only for continuation of the Materials in Sensors and Actuators technology.]		9,500	----	9,500
Strategic Materials		----	3,000	3,000

Fabrication of Three-Dimensional Micro Structures		----	3,000	2,000
NUCLEAR SUSTAINMENT & COUNTERPROLIFERATION TECHNOLOGIES	230,928	225,428	219,528	221,928
Thermionics		5,000	----	2,500
Discrete Particle Methods		3,500	----	2,500
Program reduction due to program growth		-14,000	----	-10,000
Nuclear Weapons Effects [Computer Modeling of Nuclear Weapons Effects in Atmosphere and Space Environments.]		----	5,000	3,000
Program reduction		----	-16,400	-11,000
Center for Counterproliferation Studies, Monterey		----	----	4,000
HIGH ENERGY LASER PROGRAM	----	----	----	30,000
EXPLOSIVES DEMILITARIZATION TECHNOLOGY	8,964	23,164	19,664	30,164
Advanced Cutting Technology		1,200	1,200	800
Contained Detonation		10,000	----	7,000
Hydrothermal Oxidation [Note: The conferees recommend $3,000,000 only for Hydrothermal Oxidation of Energetics.]		3,000	----	3,000
Thin Layered Chromotography		----	4,000	4,000
Hot Gas Decontamination		----	1,500	1,500
Explosives Demilitarization Technology		----	3,000	1,500
Adams Process to Destroy Agents, Energetics, and Energetics Contaminated with Agent		----	1,000	600
Ammo Risk Analysis Capabilities			[5,000]	2,800
COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	41,307	48,307	51,307	49,307
Blast Mitigation [Note: Only for blast mitigation testing and development programs.]		4,000	3,000	3,000
Facial Recognition		3,000	2,000	2,000
Chem-bio detectors		----	5,000	3,000
SUPPORT TECHNOLOGIES - ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	93,249	123,249	134,449	132,049
Atmospheric Interceptor Technology		15,000	15,000	9,000
Excalibur		15,000	----	3,500
Silicon Thick Film Mirror Coatings		----	5,000	5,000
Comprehensive Advanced Radar Technology		----	5,000	3,500
Excalibur Target & Component Technologies Program		----	3,000	3,000
RF/IR Data Fusion Testbed		----	3,200	2,800
Wideband Gap Semiconductor		----	10,000	10,000
Lightweight X-band Antenna		----	----	2,000
ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	26,821	26,821	30,936	34,821
Supersonic Noise Mitigation		----	20,000	20,000
Orbital Express		----	-15,885	-12,000

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM - ADVANCED DEV	46,594	49,344	55,694	57,894
Chemical and Biological Defense Research		2,000	----	1,750
Small Unit Biological Detector [Note: The conferees recommend $750,000 only for the Marine Corps Small Unit Biological Detector program for continuation of an industry-based development program for microfluidic devices for chemical and biological agents detection and analysis.]		750	----	750
Anthrax Vaccine [Note: The conferees recommend $1,000,000 from within available funds only to accelerate the development of a second generation anthrax vaccine at the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases.]		[1,000]	----	[1,000]
Chemical and Biological Individual Sampler		----	2,700	2,000
Consequence Management Information System		----	6,400	4,000
Advanced Materials Research		----	[3,500]	2,800
SPECIAL TECHNICAL SUPPORT	10,777	14,777	15,777	29,577
Complex Systems Design/MULTI VIEW - Data Standards for Integrated Digital Environment (DSIDE)		4,000	5,000	4,000
Virtual Worlds Initiative		----	[2,000]	----
Gulf States Initiative [Transferred from Title VI]		----	----	14,800
ARMS CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	52,930	69,930	52,930	67,930
Basic and Applied Research to Support Nuclear Monitoring [Note: Of the amount provided ($6,000,000 in the request plus the increase of $5,000,000) for peer reviewed basic and applied research to support operational nuclear test monitoring requirements: $3,500,000 is only for applied explosion seismology research and $7,500,000 is only for basic research.]		6,000	----	5,000
Continuation of an Industry-Based Research Program [Note: The conferees recommend $6,000,000 only for innovative technologies and equipment, as part of the effort to ensure compliance with arms control treaties, which is only to be used for the continuation of an industry based research program for developing systems using advances in solid state nuclear detectors, processing electronics, analysis software, and chemical detection and identification technology.]		6,000	----	6,000
Nuclear Weapons Effects		5,000	----	4,000
[Note: The conferees support the President's request for the Center for Monitoring Research.]				
GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,082	47,382	37,082	48,182
Complementary Metal Oxide Semiconductor Retrofits (CMOS) (DMEA)		3,500	----	2,500
Computer Assisted Technology Transfer (CATT)		4,000	4,000	3,000
Air Logistics		300	[300]	300
Gate Array Reverse Engineering (DMEA)		3,000	----	2,000
Multiple Soft Core Integration (DMEA)		4,000	----	3,000

Si28 Super Lattice Research Project		3,000	[2,000]	----
Systems Simulation of Electronically Compressed Function (DMEA)		3,500	----	2,800
Competitive Sustainment Demonstration Program		3,000	6,000	3,000
Corrosion Prevention Control and Information Distribution		----	1,000	1,000
Silicon-Based Nanostructures		----	3,000	2,500
F-22 Digitial EW Product Improvement		----	----	5,000
STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,357	57,357	51,557	59,557
Toxic Chemical Cleanup Criteria		3,000	----	2,000
Environmental clean-up workers safety [Note: Only to continue the research and demonstration program devoted to health and safety issues of environmental clean-up and shipyard workers.]		3,000	----	3,000
DOD Pollution Prevention Control and Information Distribution		----	3,000	2,000
Invasive Species Program		----	-1,400	-1,400
Proposed Rules/Regulations		----	-3,400	-3,400
TRIES		----	2,000	2,000
Live Fire Pollutants		----	[5,000]	4,000
ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	191,800	211,800	198,300	221,500
Center for Advanced Microstructures (CAMD)		4,000	----	2,750
MEMS for Deep Silicon Etch Technology [Note: The conferees recommend an increase of $8,000,000 only for the completion of the deep silicon etch technology MEMS project at the Army Research Laboratory.]		8,000	----	8,000
Laser Plasma Point Source X-ray Lithography		5,000	----	5,000
Advanced Lithography Demonstration		3,000	----	5,000
Laser Plasma Source Stepper		----	5,000	3,700
Defense Technology Link		----	1,500	1,250
Navy Center of Excellence in Electro-optics Manufacturing [Note: Only for advanced development of IR technology through the Navy Center of Excellence in Electro-Optics Manufacturing, of which $.4 million is only for femptosecond laser technology.]		----	----	4,000
ADVANCED CONCEPT TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	116,425	116,425	121,425	119,925
WMD Consequence Management [Note: The conferees recommend $5,200,000 from within available funds only to prepare a WMD Consequence Management program for bases and stations in conjunction with the National Terrorism Preparedness Institute at the Southwest Public Safety Institute to include a pilot program at a base under the Commander in Chief, Pacific Command.]		[5,200]	----	[5,200]
Radar Vision 2000		----	5,000	3,500
HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	164,027	164,027	177,527	173,327
High Performance Visualization Center			3,000	3,000
MHPCC Operations			3,000	1,600
Multi-Threat Architecture (MTA) system			2,500	2,000

SMDC Simulation Center Upgrade			5,000	2,700
SENSOR AND GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY	182,225	149,125	176,225	138,125
Large Millimeter Telescope		4,000	2,000	4,000
Discoverer II		-40,100	----	-40,100
Radar Vision Technology		3,000	----	----
Surface Target Identification for Engagement		----	-8,000	-8,000
JOINT WARGAMING SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	56,971	56,971	64,971	62,971
Synthetic Range Study		----	3,000	3,000
WMD Simulation Capability		----	5,000	3,000
ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	15,534	24,534	31,034	38,334
Component Development for Active Sensors		5,000	----	4,000
Technology Integration of High Average Power, Mid Infrared Sources		4,000	----	3,000
Remote Ocean Sensing Program		----	3,000	3,000
HAARP		----	5,000	5,000
Innovative Solid State Laser Technology Development		----	4,500	3,000
Ultra/Hyperspectal Sensor for Detection of Pathogens		----	3,000	1,800
Solid State Dye Laser		----	[7,000]	3,000
ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	24,906	24,906	25,406	29,256
Badger Army Ammo Plant Clean-up		----	500	350
UXO Detection			[5,000]	4,000
NAVY THEATER WIDE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM	382,671	512,671	382,671	462,671
Navy Theater Wide TBM Program			60,000	----
Accelerate Program		80,000		----
Radar Competition		50,000	----	----
Program increase for accelerated program and radar competition		----	----	80,000
NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE	1,740,238	1,740,238	1,879,238	1,875,238
Risk Reduction		----	129,000	129,000
NMD C2 Radar Prototyping Program		----	10,000	6,000
BMD TECHNICAL OPERATIONS	270,718	292,718	304,218	313,218
Liquid Surrogate Targets		3,000	5,000	2,500
Optical Data/Sensor Fusion		4,000	----	3,000
Wide Bandwidth Technology		15,000	----	9,000
PMRF TMD Upgrades		----	11,500	11,500

Optical-Electro Sensors		----	5,000	5,000
Range Data Fusion Upgrade Project		----	2,000	2,000
ESPRIT		----	2,000	2,000
Advanced Multi-Sensor Fusion Testbed		----	1,500	1,500
Kauai Test Facility		----	[4,000]	[4,000]
Advanced Research Center/Simulation Center		----	6,500	6,000
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	116,992	116,992	124,992	130,992
Arrow System Improvement Program (ASIP)		----	8,000	8,000
Arrow Enhanced Interoperability			[6,000]	6,000
CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM DEM/VAL	83,800	83,800	88,800	89,800
FOX Chemical/Bio Training Simulation Suites			5,000	4,000
Bioadhesion Reseach to Combat Biological Warfare			[3,000]	[3,000]
CBMS II Upgrades		----	----	2,000
GENERAL SUPPORT TO C3I	3,769	34,469	9,769	38,769
Information Assurance:JCOATS-IO		9,700	----	5,000
ASD (C3I) Global Infrastructure Data Capture Initiative [Note: Only for the acquisition and digital conversion of critical engineering and infrastructure data.]		21,000	----	20,000
Pacific Disaster Center		----	6,000	10,000
INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	290,771	322,771	292,571	310,571
Information Assurance Project Condor		20,000	----	10,000
Protection of vital data		12,000	----	6,000
Trusted RUBIX		----	1,800	1,800
Computer Networks -- Centers for Excellence		----	3,000	2,000
DEFENSE IMAGERY AND MAPPING PROGRAM	74,975	103,975	78,975	102,975
Exploitation of moving targets		2,000	----	----
Visualization for Bomb Blast Protection for Force Protection		4,000	----	3,000
Commerical Mapping and Visualization Toolkit - upgrade		4,000	----	3,000
GEOSAR		15,000	----	15,000
Automated Document Conversion for NIMA libraries		4,000	----	----
Pacific Imagery Program for Exploitation		----	4,000	4,000
Spatio-temporal database research			[6,000]	3,000
SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	133,520	156,620	134,820	143,470
Tri-Band Antenna Signal Combiner [Note: Funds Appropriated in RDTE, A.]		5,100	----	----
Multi-Mode, Multi-band Personal Communications System and Remote Trunking System [Note: Funds Appropriated in RDTE,A.]		6,000	----	----
Leading Edge		5,000	----	3,000

Autonomous Landing Guidance System Technology		6,000	----	4,500
Littoral Warfare Craft/ Surface planing wet submersible boat		1,000	----	750
Advanced Lightweight Grenade Launcher		----	5,600	2,800
CV-22 Terrain Following Radar Development		----	9,200	6,000
SOPMOD II Grenade Launcher Mods		----	1,500	900
CV-22 Post Initial Operational Capability Block 10 changes		----	-10,000	-3,000
C-130 Engine Infrared Suppression		----	-5,000	-5,000
SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,022	9,022	3,022	8,022
Tactical Video System Development		2,000	----	1,000
Joint Threat Warning System		4,000	----	4,000
ALGL/STRIKER [Transferred to P,DW]	----	----	[6,000]	----
SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	87,071	95,071	59,171	79,071
Small Combatant Craft		8,000	----	5,500
Program Reduction		----	-27,900	-13,500

FOCUS PROGRAM

The conferees support the semiconductor Focus Center Program in university research as it moves into full-scale operation. The conferees urge the Department to include funding for this program as it is currently planned in the POM so that the Department may gain the benefits of this highly leveraged long-term research.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY CENTER

The conferees have provided $20,000,000 only for the Joint Information Technology Center Initiative. These funds shall be available only to establish two, Pacific-based Information Technology Centers (ITC's). These centers allow DoD to integrate and implement the many successful logistics and personnel initiatives underway throughout the Department of Defense. The centers will process the wide range and volume of information essential to the day-to-day operations of our military personnel and defense civilians. The centers will allow DoD to eliminate legacy systems and to upgrade to more capable and more flexible information technology tools. The conferees direct that the Secretary of Defense provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than May 1, 2001, which outlines DoD's plan for proceeding with the establishment of these centers.

COMMERCIAL MAPPING AND VISUALIZATION TOOLKIT

The conferees agree to provide a total of $6,000,000 over the request for the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) Commercial Mapping and Visualization Toolkit. Of these funds $3,000,000 is for upgrades and $3,000,000 is for visualization and bomb blast for force protection. The conferees anticipate that NIMA will pursue all avenues of fair and open competition for the acquisition of the Commercial Mapping and Visualization Toolkit.

NIMA OMNIBUS CONTRACT PROGRAM

The National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) has been required to begin using Architectural and Engineering contracting procedures for all production contracts. This has lead to the development of the ''Omnibus Contract'' program, allowing NIMA to replace 67 individual production contracts with one contract vehicle for all geospatial information and imagery intelligence requirements. The conferees agree that the omnibus contract program is a special congressional interest item.

The conferees understand that NIMA plans to continue efforts for the Shuttle Radar Topography data reduction program and the Feature Foundation DATA program. The conferees strongly support NIMA's efforts to fully fund these important projects in fiscal year 2001 and beyond.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

The conference agreement on items addressed by either the House or the Senate is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE				
RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT				
CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CT	121,401	147,401	136,901	135,401
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.....	17,172	22,172	17,172	21,172
LIVE FIRE TESTING.....	9,712	19,712	11,212	17,212
DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION.....	53,275	53,275	53,275	53,275
TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE.....	201,560	242,560	218,560	227,060

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS
[In thousands of dollars]

	BUDGET	HOUSE	SENATE	CONFERENCE
CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT	121,401	147,401	136,901	135,401
Magdalena Ridge		7,000	10,000	7,000
Roadway Simulator		12,000	13,500	12,000
Silent Sentry		7,000	----	3,500
Big Crow Operations [Transferred to RDTE,A]		----	7,000	----
Threat Simulators/Targets		----	-5,000	-5,000
Digital Video Laboratory		----	5,000	2,500
Program Delays		----	-15,000	-6,000
OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	17,172	22,172	17,172	21,172
Increase program for improvement of tests		5,000	----	4,000
LIVE FIRE TESTING	9,712	19,712	11,212	17,212
Live Fire Testing		10,000	----	6,000
Reality Fire-fighting Training		----	1,500	1,500

[Note: Of the funds appropriated for Live Fire Testing, $1,500,000 shall be used only for Reality Fire-fighting Training. The remaining funds appropriated for Live Fire Testing shall be used for those purposes delineated in the President's Budget request.]

TITLE V—REVOLVING AND MANAGEMENT FUNDS

The conferees agree to the following amounts for Revolving and Management Funds programs:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Defense Working Capital Funds	916,276	916,276	916,276	916,276
National Defense Sealift Fund	388,158	400,658	388,158	400,658
National Defense Airlift Fund	.....	.....	2,890,923	2,840,923
Total, Revolving and Management Funds	1,304,434	1,316,934	4,195,357	4,157,857

DEFENSE WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

The conferees agree to provide $916,276,000 for the Defense Working Capital Fund.

NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT AND AIRLIFT FUNDS

The appropriation for the 'National Defense Sealift Fund' provides funds for the lease, operation, and supply of prepositioning ships; operation of the Ready Reserve Force; acquisition of large medium speed roll-on/roll-off ships for the Military Sealift Command; and acquisition of ships for the Ready Reserve Force. The budget includes $258,000,000 for Ready Reserve Force and $130,158,000 for acquisition activities in fiscal year 2001.

The conferees have agreed to an expansion of this account to recognize the fact that sea and air mobility are essential ingredients in the Department of Defense's force projection capability. Thus, the conferees have recommended renaming this account to create the 'National Defense Mobility Fund' account. This new account will incorporate the existing 'National Defense Sealift Fund' account and establish the 'National Defense Airlift Fund' account.

In addition to providing an increase of $12,500,000 to the budget request amount for the 'National Defense Sealift Fund' the conference recommendation also provides an increase of $2,840,923,000 for the 'National Defense Airlift Fund.' This recommendation includes $2,428,723,000 for the acquisition of 12 C–17 aircraft and advance procurement for the fiscal year 2002 purchase of 15 DC–17 aircraft. Further, the increase includes $412,200,000 for the interim contractor support of the existing C–17 fleet. The conferees have directed that the C–17 procurement and fleet support programs continue without any interruption during fiscal year 2001. The conferees have included appropriate legislative authority to permit the transfer of these funds for the continuation of C–17 acquisition and support.

The conferees direct that the Department of Defense budget for all future C–17 procurement and support costs within the National Defense Airlift Fund. The conferees direct that future budget documents for the NDAF should conform to the requirements for other DoD procurement accounts including the content and format of budget exhibits, reprogramming thresholds among procurement, advanced procurement, and interim contractor support line items, application of the procurement full funding policy, and Congressional notification for changes in quantity.

TITLE VI—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS

The conference agreement is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Defense Health Program	11,600,429	12,143,029	12,130,179	12,117,779
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army	1,003,500	927,100	979,400	980,100
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	836,300	812,200	933,700	869,000
Office of the Inspector General	147,545	147,545	147,545	147,545
Total, Other Department of Defense Programs	13,587,774	14,029,874	14,190,824	14,114,424

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

[In thousands of dollars]

	BUDGET	HOUSE	SENATE	CONFERENCE
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE				
Government Computer-Based Patient Records	-	[10,000]	-	[6,000]
Comprehensive breast cancer clinical care project [Note: The conferees support continuation of a public/private effort, in coordination with a rural medical center and a not-for-profit medical foundation, to provide a program in breast care risk assessment, diagnosis, treatment, and research for the Department of Defense. The program shall be a coordinated effort among Walter Reed Army Medical Center, National Naval Medical Center, an appropriate non-profit medical foundation, and a rural primary health care center, with funding management accomplished by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.] [Transferred from RDT&E,A.]		7,000	-	7,000
Post-polio Syndrome [Transferred from RDT&E,N.]		3,000		3,000
Coronary/ Prostate Disease Reversal [Transferred from RDT&E, N.]		-	-	6,000
Community Hospital Telehealth Consortium		-	-	1,000
Medicare Eligible Health Options Study		2,000	-	2,000
Claims Processing Initiative		3,600	-	3,600
Military Treatment Facilities Optimization		134,000	-	-
Reimbursement for Travel Expenses		15,000	-	-
Reduced Catastrophic Cap		32,000	-	-
Senior Pharmacy Benefit		94,000	-	-
Military retiree pharmacy benefit		-	137,000	-
Senior Pharmacy Increase		-	-	100,000
Outcomes Management Demonstration at WRAMC		-	10,000	10,000
Pacific Island Health Care Referral Program		-	8,000	8,000
Automated Clinical Practice Guidelines		-	7,500	7,500
Hawaii Federal Health Care Network (PACMEDNET)		-	7,000	7,000
Clinical Coupler Demonstration Project		-	5,000	5,000
Center of Excellence for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance [Transferred to O&M, Navy.]		-	5,000	-
Tri-Service Nursing Research Program		-	4,000	4,000
Defense and Veterans Head Injury Program		-	3,500	-
Graduate School of Nursing		-	2,000	2,000
Alaska Federal Health Care Network		-	1,000	1,000
Biomedical Research Center Feasibility Study		-	1,000	1,000
Oxford House DoD Pilot Project		-	750	750
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences		-	[6,300]	[6,300]
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	65,880	327,880	402,880	413,380
Head Injury Program		2,000	-	3,000
Joint U.S. - Norwegian Telemedicine		4,000	-	2,000
Cancer Research [Note: Only for cancer research in the integrated areas of signal transduction, growth control and differentiation, molecular carcineogensis and DNA repair, cancer genetics and gene therapy, and cancer invasion and angiogensis.]		6,000	-	5,500
Army Peer-Reviewed Breast Cancer Research Program		175,000	175,000	175,000
Army Peer-Reviewed Prostate Cancer Research Program		75,000	100,000	100,000
Ovarian Cancer Research Program		-	12,000	12,000
Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program		-	50,000	50,000

THE DOD/DVA DISTANCE LEARNING PILOT PROJECT

The conferees are pleased with the progress report on the DoD/DVA Distance Learning pilot project to transition clinical nurse specialists to the role of nurse practitioners. It is noted that 27 students graduated from the first virtual advanced program and 35 new students have been admitted for the second class of distance learning. The conferees encourage further refinement of this program as requirements develop.

PEER REVIEWED MEDICAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

The conferees have provided $50,000,000 for a Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program. The conferees direct the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the service Surgeons General, to establish a process to select medical research projects of clear scientific merit and direct relevance to military health.

Such projects could include: acute lung injury research, arthropod transmitted infectious diseases, biological hazard detection system/bio-sensor microchip, CAT scan technology for lung cancer, childhood asthma, Dengue fever vaccine, digital mammography imaging, freeze dried platelets, Fungi Free (a topical anti-fungal agent effective in mitigating onychomycosis), Gulf War illness research, health system information technology, health care informatics, human imaging institute/magnetoencephalography laboratory, medical surgery technology, medical records management, microsurgery and robotic surgery research, molecular biology for cancer research, neural mechanisms of chronic fatigue syndrome, obesity related disease prevention especially for minorities, Padget's disease, quantum optics, remote emergency medicine ultrasound, smoking cessation, social work research, tissue regeneration for combat casualty care, Venus 3–D technology program, and vitamin D research.

The conferees direct the Department to provide a report to the Congressional Defense Committees by March 1, 2001, on the status of this Peer Reviewed Medical Research Program, to include the corresponding funds provided in previous fiscal years.

ADDITIONAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM FUNDING TO ADDRESS SHORTFALLS

In addition to recommending sizable funding increases for the Defense Health Program for fiscal year 2001 over current year levels, the conferees note that the recently enacted Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2000 (Public Law 106–246) included over $1.3 billion to address other critical shortfalls confronting the military health care system. Of this amount, $615,600,000 was provided explicitly to finance existing contract claims for fiscal years 1998–2000 against the Department's TRICARE managed care system. An additional $695,900,000 was provided in section 107 of P.L. 106–246 to address other known DHP funding difficulties. The conferees express their intent that the section 107 funds be used by the Secretary of Defense and the service Surgeons Generals, in conjunction with the funds provided in this conference agreement, to meet the most critical of the remaining outstanding DHP funding needs. These may include financing additional TRICARE contract claims (such as those forecast for fiscal year 2001), unfunded requirement associated with the operations of military treatment facilities, and other needs as identified by the Secretary of Defense and the service Surgeons General.

The conferees further note that in this conference agreement, they have with one exception deferred action on explicitly providing funds for any proposed expansion or modification of the medical benefit for service members and military retirees which would require changes in existing law through the congressional authorization process. The conference agreement does provide funding for an improved pharmacy benefit for military retirees, including those over 65, in recognition of the fact that both the House and Senate-passed versions of the fiscal year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act each provide for this initiative, albeit in differing fashions. The conferees have been advised by both the Secretary of Defense and the Office of Management and Budget that the potential fiscal year 2001 costs of this improved benefit, which was not requested in the President's budget, could be $200,000,000. The conferees recommend addressing this by providing a fiscal year 2001 appropriation of $100,000 for an improved pharmacy benefit in the Defense Health Program appropriation. Title IX of the conference agreement provides an additional $100,000,000 in contingent emergency appropriations, subject to release only if the President submits a budget request pursuant to existing law. The conferees believes this approach strikes the necessary balance needed to ensure that, if authorized, adequate funding has been made available for this important initiative.

CHEMICAL AGENTS AND MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY

The conference agreement is as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY				
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - O&M	607,200	607,200	600,000	600,000
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - PROC	121,900	105,700	105,000	105,700
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION - RDTE	274,400	214,200	274,400	274,400
TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION, ARMY	1,003,500	927,100	979,400	980,100

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE

EXPLANATION OF PROJECT LEVEL ADJUSTMENTS

	(In thousands of dollars)				
	Budget	House	Senate	Conference	
	836,300	812,200	933,700	869,000	
Increases to the budget:					
Caper Focus		6,000		6,000	
Puerto Rico ROTHR security		1,200		1,000	
Southwest Border Fence		6,000		5,000	
Southwest Border States Information System		6,000		6,000	
Multi-Jurisdictional Counter-drug Task Force		4,000		4,000	
Lake County HIDTA		1,000		1,000	
Marijuana Eradication					
Hawaii HIDTA			2,500	2,500	
Appalachian HIDTA		3,600	3,600	3,600	
National Interagency Civil-Military Institute		2,000		2,000	
Tethered Aerostat		10,000	10,000	10,000	
National Counternarcotics Training Center(Hammer)		4,000	10,000	7,500	
Young Marines		1,500		1,000	
National Guard Counter-drug Support			20,000	20,000	
Gulf States Initative			14,800	0	*
Regional Counterdrug Training Academy			2,000	2,000	
EO/IR sensors for Air National Guard OH-58 aircraft			5,000	4,000	
WV National Guard C-26 aircraft support			6,300	6,300	
WV National Guard counterdrug program			3,200	3,200	
Northeast Regional Counterdrug Training Center			5,000	3,000	
Source and transit zone interdiction operations			15,000	0	
Decreases to the budget:					
ANG fighter ops Support		-5,000		-5,000	
Special Operations Forces-Patrol Coastal Support		-3,000		-3,000	
GBEGO-Mexico		-3,000		-3,000	
Carribean Support		-3,000		-3,000	
T-AGOS Support		-14,000		0	
DoD Support to Plan Colombia		-41,400		-41,400	
*Funded in the Defense Intelligence Special Technologies Program					

T–AGOS SUPPORT

The conferees agree to provide $15,026,000 for T–AGOS support. The conferees are aware that changing drug trafficking patterns in the Transit Zone have altered the original operational concept of using T–AGOS ships to detect and monitor aircraft and ships smuggling illegal drugs into the United States and that other methods exist to accomplish this mission. The conferees direct the Department to analyze the operational effectiveness of the currently configured T–AGOS ships to determine if their contribution to the counter-drug mission is the most effective and cost efficient method to accomplish transit zone surveillance and to provide a summary of suggested alternative platforms or assets and their associated costs. The Department is directed to report their findings to the defense committees no later than March 30, 2001.

NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG SUPPORT

The conferees agree to provide an additional $20,000,000 to the budget request for National Guard Counter-drug Support and to concur with language contained in Senate report 106–298 regarding future budget submissions for this project.

Out of the funding provided in the ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense'' account, the conferees direct that $1,000,000 be provided above its state allocation to the Florida National Guard to support a Port Security prototype project and that $2,000,000 above its state allocation be provided to the Nevada National Guard to allow the Counter-Drug Reconnaissance and Interdiction Detachment unit in northern Nevada to expand operations into southern Nevada.

CAPER FOCUS

The conferees continue to receive reports on the positive contribution of Operation Caper Focus to drug interdiction efforts. Despite this, Caper Focus continues to be virtually ignored in the budget submission. The conferees direct the Department to provide sufficient funding for this initiative in the fiscal year 2002 budget submission.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

The conferees agree to provide $147,545,000 for the Office of the Inspector General. Of this amount, $144,245,000 shall be for operation and maintenance and $3,300,000 shall be for procurement.

TITLE VII—RELATED AGENCIES

The conference agreement is as follows:

[In thousands of dollars]

	Budget	House	Senate	Conference
Intelligence Community Management Account	137,631	224,181	177,331	148,631
Central Intelligence Agency Retirement & Disability System	216,000	216,000	216,000	216,000
Payment to Kaho'olawe Island Conveyance, Remediation, and Environmental Restoration Fund	25,000	25,000	60,000	60,000
National Security Education Trust Fund	6,950	6,950	6,950	6,950

INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT

Details of the adjustments to this account are addressed in the classified annex accompanying this report.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement incorporates general provisions of the House and Senate versions of the bill which were not amended. Those general provisions that were amended in conference follow:

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8008) which amends language authorizing multi-year procurements.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8022) which amends language that appropriates funds authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8053) which amends language authorizing intelligence activities.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8055) which amends language recommending rescissions. The rescissions agreed to are:

Revised Economic Estimates, Fiscal Year 2000

	Conference
Aircraft Procurement, Army: Inflation Savings	$7,000,000
Missile Procurement, Army: Inflation Savings	6,000,000
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army: Inflation Savings	7,000,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Army: Inflation Savings	5,000,000
Other Procurement, Army: Inflation Savings	16,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy: Inflation Savings	24,125,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy: Inflation Savings	3,853,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps: Inflation Savings	1,463,000
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy: Inflation Savings	19,644,000
Other Procurement, Navy: Inflation Savings	12,032,000
Procurement, Marine Corps: Inflation Savings	3,623,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force: Inflation Savings	32,743,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force: Inflation Savings	5,500,000
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force: Inflation Savings	1,232,000
Other Procurement, Air Force: Inflation Savings	19,902,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide: Inflation Savings	6,683,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army: Inflation Savings	20,592,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy: Inflation Savings	35,621,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force: Inflation Savings	53,467,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide: Inflation Savings	36,297,000
Defense Health Program: Inflation Savings	808,000
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Army: Inflation Savings	1,103,000
Program Specific Reductions, Fiscal Year 1999	
Other Procurement, Army: R2000 Engine Flush System	3,000,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force: JSTARS (Contract Savings)	12,300,000
Other Procurement, Air Force: RAPCON (Restructuring program)	8,000,000
Fiscal Year 2000	
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army:	
Command and Control Vehicle	4,000,000
Breacher System	19,000,000
Other Procurement, Army: SMART–T (Schedule Slip)	29,300,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy: F/A–18 E/F cost savings	6,500,000
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force: F–16 Advance Procurement	24,000,000
Missile Procurement, Air Force:	
ARMRAAM (Budget Error)	6,192,000
Titan Launch Vehicle	30,000,000
Other Procurement, Air Force:	
SMART-T (Schedule Slip)	12,000,000
RAPCON (Restructuring program)	2,000,000
DCGS Communications Segment Upgrade	6,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army:	
WRAP (Unobligated balance)	10,000,000
Stinger Block II	12,000,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force: C–130 (Schedule Slip)	30,000,000
Reserve Mobilization Income Insurance Fund: Unused Balance	13,000,000

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8064) which amends language governing the procurement of ball and roller bearings, and vessel propellers from domestic sources.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8075) which amends language allowing the transfer of funds for the purpose of Reserve peacetime support to community programs.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8086) which amends Senate language reducing funds available for titles III and IV of this Act.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8094) which amends language reducing amounts available for the military personnel and operation and maintenance accounts by $856,900,000 due to favorable foreign currency fluctuation.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8097) which amends Senate language requiring the Department of Defense to submit certain budget justification materials in support of the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8102) which amends House language requiring registration of mission critical or mission essential information technology systems with the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, and requiring certification of automated data systems; compliance with the Clinger-Cohen Act.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8112) which amends Senate language appropriating $7,500,000 for the United Services Organization.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8116) which amends Senate language earmarking funds for the Arrow Deployability Program.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8117) which amends Senate language requiring the Secretary of Defense to identify, report on, and adjudicate health care contract claims.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8123) which amends House language requiring certification that the Department of Defense program and budget for the Interim Brigade Combat Teams.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8126) which amends Senate language reducing funds for the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization for certain overhead functions.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8127) which amends Senate language requiring the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization to notify the congress prior to issuing any type of information or proposal solicitation.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8129) which amends Senate language appropriating funds for the Center for the Preservation of Democracy.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8139) which amends Senate language earmarking funds for the Middle East Regional Security Issues program.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8140) which amends Senate language earmarking funds for information security initiatives.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8141) which amends Senate language appropriating $5,000,000 for the American Red Cross.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8142) which amends Senate language earmarking funds for the Bosque Redondo Memorial.

The conferees included a general provision (Section 8145) which earmarks Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force funds for the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8146) which earmarks funds for the Airborne Laser program.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8147) which amends section 106 of title 38 U.S.C. concerning the service of the Alaska Territorial Guard.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8148) which appropriates $3,000,000 for the United States-China Security Review Commission.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8149) which amends the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8150) which modifies applicability of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8151) which designates the planned consolidated operations center at Redstone Arsenal as the Wernher von Braun Complex.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8152) which earmarks funs in support of the Pacific Disaster Center.

The conference agreement includes section 8153, which strikes a provision in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000, earmarking funds under the Small Business Administration, Business Loans Program Account, for the New Markets Venture Capital program, subject to authorization. By striking this provision, the conferees intend that the $6,000,000 originally earmarked for the New Markets Venture Capital program, which is not yet authorized, shall instead be used for the 7(a) General Business Loan program in fiscal year 2000.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8154) which authorizes a grant for the purpose of conducting research on health effects of low level exposure to hazardous chemicals.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8155) which appropriates $2,000,000 for the Oakland Military Institute.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8156) which provides $10,000,000 for Operation and Maintenance, Army contingent on resolution of the case City of San Bernardino vs. United States.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8157) which allows the transfer of alloying materials stored at the Brownfield site to Bethlehem Development Corporation.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8158) which appropriates $2,000,000 for the Defense Health Program for the purpose of making a grant to the Fisher House Foundation.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8159) which allows the office of Economic Adjustment to amend a grant for Industrial Modernization of the Philadelphia Shipyard.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8160) which extends the availability of funds appropriated under the heading Defense Reinvestment for Economic Growth in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–50).

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8161) which provides $2,000,000 for a proposed conceptual design study to examine the feasibility of a zero emissions, steam injection process that has very promising potential for increasing power generation efficiency, enhanced oil recovery and carbon sequestration. These funds shall be transferred not later than October 15, 2000, to the Fossil Energy Research and Development program within the Department of Energy, to pursue this study through its existing competitive process.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8162) which amends availability of funds provided in the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2000, for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army.

The conferees include a new general provision (Section 8163) which reduces funds available to several Operation and Maintenance accounts by $71,367,000 due to growth in costs associated with consulting and advisory services and other contracts.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8164) which reduces funds available to several Operation and Maintenance accounts by $92,700,000 due to excess funded carryover.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8165) which reduces funds available to several Operation and Maintenance accounts by $159,076,000 due to growth in the cost of headquarters and administrative activities.

The conferees included a new general provision (Section 8166) which reduces funds available for the Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund by $1,100,000,000.

The conferees included a new title IX which provides additional emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2000, for unmet military personnel and readiness requirements and potential military medical program costs and contingency operations expenses. Funding in this title has been provided as contingent emergency appropriations, subject to emergency designation by the President before any obligation of funds.

Title IX includes $1,100,000,000 in contingent emergency appropriations for overseas contingency operations, as discussed earlier in the statement of managers under title II, Operation and Maintenance.

Title IX also includes $50,000,000 in contingent emergency appropriations for ''Military Personnel, Navy'', to meet requirements in the recruiting and retention of personnel. The conferees direct that these funds shall be distributed as follows:

Enlistment Bonuses	$12,500,000
Selective Reenlistment Bonuses	24,000,000
Aviation Career Continuation Pay	13,500,000

Title IX includes $529,000,000 in contingent emergency appropriations for unfunded readiness requirements identified by the military services, as discussed earlier in this statement under Title II, Operation and Maintenance.

Title IX includes $100,000,000 in contingent emergency appropriations for the Defense Health Program, as discussed earlier in this statement under the Defense Health Program.

CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2001 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2000 amount, the 2001 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2001 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	$273,503,522
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	284,500,986
House bill, fiscal year 2001	288,512,800
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	287,630,500
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2001	287,806,054
Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2000	+20,253,694
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001	+3,305,069
House bill, fiscal year 2001	−706,746
Senate bill, fiscal year 2001	+175,554
Title IX—Fiscal Year 2000 Supplementary	1,779,000

JERRY LEWIS,
BILL YOUNG,
JOE SKEEN,
DAVE HOBSON,
HENRY BONILLA,
GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
ERNEST J. ISTOOK, Jr.,
RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
JAY DICKEY,
RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
NORMAN D. DICKS,
MARTIN OLAV SABO,
JULIAN C. DIXON,
PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
JAMES P. MORAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
JUDD GREGG,
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
DANIEL K. INOUYE,
ERNEST HOLLINGS,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
TOM HARKIN,
BYRON L. DORGAN,
RICHARD J. DURBIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SMITH of Washington (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal matters.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STRICKLAND) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. METCALF) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today, July 18, 19, and 20.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3544. An act to authorize a gold medal to be presented on behalf of the Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his many and enduring contributions to peace and religious understanding, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3591. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

H.R. 4391. An act to amend title 4 of the United States Code to establish sourcing requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services.

□ 2200

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 18, 2000, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8615. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noxious Weeds; Update of Weed and Seed Lists [Docket No. 99–064–2] received May 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8616. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Fees for Federal Meat Grading and Certification Services [Docket No. LS–98–12] (RIN: 0581–AB83) received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8617. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Tobacco Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tobacco Fees and Charges for Mandatory Inspection; Fee Increase [Docket No. TB–00–10] (RIN: 0581–AB87) received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8618. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Pet Food Facility Inspection and Approval Fees [Docket No. 98–045–2] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8619. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General and Pre-Loan Policies and Procedures Common to Insured and Guaranteed Loans (RIN: 0572–AB52) received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8620. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Specifications and Drawings for Underground Electric Distribution—received May 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8621. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hawaii Animal Import Center [Docket No. 98–013–2] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8622. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Gypsy Moth Host Material From Canada [Docket No. 98–110–2] (RIN: 0579–AB11) received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8623. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agriculture Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Appendices to the Dairy Tariff-Rate Import Quota Licensing Regulation for the 2000 Tariff-Rate Quota Year—received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8624. A letter from the Agricultural Marketing Service, Cotton Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of User Fees for 2000 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [Docket No. CN–99–003] (RIN: 0581–AB57) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8625. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Dairy Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fluid Milk Promotion Order; Amendments to the Order [DA–00–07] received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8626. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Cotton Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grade Standards and Classification for American Pima Cotton [Docket No. CN–00–003] (RIN: 0581–AB82) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8627. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Cotton Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Cotton Classification Procedures for Determining Upland Cotton Color Grade [Docket No. CN–00–001] (RIN: 0581–AB67) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8628. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement; Regulations for the 1999 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years; Group Risk Plan of Insurance Regulations for the 2000 and Succeeding Crop Years, and the Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Basic Provisions (RIN: 0563–AB81) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8629. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cyprodinil; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemption [OPP–301006; FRL–6590–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8630. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidaloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301004; FRL–6558–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8631. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pendimethalin; Re-establishment of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301020; FRL–6596–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8632. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Informtation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Azoxystrobin or Methyl (E)-2-[2-[6-(-cyanophenoxy) pyrimidin-4-yloxy]phenyl]-3-; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301012; FRL–6594–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8633. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Tebuconazole; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–301022; FRL–6596–7] (RIN: 2070–AB) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8634. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Humic Acid,

Sodium Salt, Exemption Tolerance [OPP–301017; FRL–6595–9] (RIN: 2070–AB) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8635. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the request and availability of the funds in accordance with provisions of Division B of the H.R. 4425, the Emergency Supplemental Act, 2000, and Division C of H.R. 4425, the Cerro Grande Fire Supplemental; (H. Doc. No. 106—267); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8636. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transactions Other than Contracts, Grants, or Cooperative Agreements for Prototype Projects (RIN: 0790–AG79) received May 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8637. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Housing—Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing transmitting the Department's final rule—Tenant Participation in Multifamily Housing Projects [Docket No. FR–4403–F–02] (RIN: 2502–AH32) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8638. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule— Minority and Women Outreach Program—Contracting (RIN: 3064–AB12) received May 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8639. A letter from the Managing Director, Office of General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Office of Finance; Authority of Federal Home Loan Banks to Issue Consolidated Obligations [No. 2000–24] (RIN: 3069–AA88) received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8640. A letter from the Secretary, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Division of Financial Practices, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Privacy of Consumer Financial Information—received June 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8641. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Share Insurance and Appendix—received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8642. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Privacy of Consumer Financial Information; Requirements for Insurance [12 CFR Parts 716 and 741] received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8643. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Investment Management; Division of Market Regulation, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Privacy of Consumer Finacial Information (Regulation S-P) [Release Nos. 34–42974, IC–24543, IA–1883; File No. S7–6–00] (RIN: 3235–AH90) received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8644. A letter from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Elementary and Secondary Education-Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs-Federal Activities Grants Program-The Challenge Newsletter—received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8645. A letter from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Elementry and Secondary Education—Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities National Programs—Federal Activities—Grant Competition to Prevent High-Risk Drinking and Violent Behavior Among College Students—received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8646. A letter from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Elementary and Secondary Education—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs—Federal Activities—Effective Alternative Strategies: Grant Competition to Reduce Student Suspensions and Expulsions and Ensure Educational Progress of Students Who Are Suspended or Expelled—received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8647. A letter from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Elementary and Secondary Education-Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs-Federal Activities-Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Models on College Campuses Grant Competition—received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8648. A letter from the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Office of Elementary and Secondary Education—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Programs-Federal Activities—Middle School Drug Prevention and School Safety Program Coordinators Grant Competition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8649. A letter from the General Attorney, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program: National Research and Development Center—June 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8650. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, ''College Completion Challenge Grant Act of 2000''; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8651. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nonreactor Nuclear Safety Design Criteria and Explosives Safety Criteria Guide for use with DOE O 420.1, Facility Safety—received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8652. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Department of Energy Badges [DOE N. 473.4] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8653. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Defense Procurement, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE Specification; Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS) Systems [DOE-SPEC–3021–97] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8654. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE STANDARD; Hazard Categorization and Accident Analysis Techniques for Compliance with DOE Order 5480.23 Nuclear Safety Analysis Reports [DOE-STD–1027–92] received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8655. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Guide for the Mitigation of Natural Phenomena Hazards for DOE Nuclear Facilities and Nonnuclear Facilities—received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8656. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE Standard; Stabilization, Packaging, and Storage of Plutonium-Bearing Materials (RIN: DOE-STD–3013–99) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8657. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE Standard; Content of System Design Descriptions (RIN: DOE-STD–3024–98) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8658. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 00F–0786] received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8659. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio and Kentucky [OH–132–2; KY–116–2; KY–84–2; FRL–6717–1] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8660. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Arizona; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [AZ025–MWIa; FRL–6717–7a] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8661. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Colorado, Montana, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming; Control of Emissions From Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [FRL–6717–3] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8662. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program;

Forsyth County (North Carolina) [NC-FORS-T5–2000–01a; FRL–6712–5] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8663. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Reopening of Comment Period and Delaying of Effective Date of Revisions to the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR), the Stage 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1 DBPR) and Revisions to State Primacy Requirements to Implement the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments [FRL–6715–4] received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8664. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Maintenance Plan and Designation of Area for Air Quality Planning Purposes for Carbon Monoxide; State of Arizona [AZ072–0085; FRL–6601–7] received June 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8665. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Nitrogen Oxides Allowance Requirements [PA 153–4100a; FRL–6702–3] received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8666. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Alabama; Correction [AL52–200014; FRL–6708–6] received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8667. A letter from the Director, Office of Regualtory Managment and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans [IN112–1a, FRL–6708–5] received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8668. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN117–1a, FRL–6708–2] received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8669. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; West Virginia; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [WV–6013a; FRL–6714–2] received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8670. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permit Program; State of Montana [MT–001a; FRL–6714–4] received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8671. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans—Alabama: Approval of Revisions to the Alabama State Implementation Plan; Transportation Conformity Interagency Memorandum of Agreement; Correction [AL53–200019(a); FRL–6735–6] received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8672. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Rescinding Findings that the 1–Hour Ozone Standard No Longer Applies in Certain Areas [FRL–6733–3] (RIN: 2060–ZA08) received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8673. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Control of Emissions From Hospital/Medical/ Infectious Waste Incinerators (HMIWI); State of Kansas [KS 105–1105a; FRL–6733–9] received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8674. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greeley and Bloomfield, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–279; RM–9716] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8675. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Saratoga, Green River, Big Piney and La Barge, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 98–130, MM Docket No. 99–56, RM–9297, RM–9655, RM–9459] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8676. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Douglas and Guernsey, Wyoming) [MM Docket No. 98–15; RM–9320; RM 9653] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8677. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Eldorado, Beeville, Colorado City, Cotulla , Cuero, Kerrville, Mason, McQueeney and San Angelo, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–357 RM–9780] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8678. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Whitefield and Northumberland, New Hampshire) [MM Docket No. 99–42; RM–9467; RM–9618] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8679. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Arnoldsburg, West Virginia) [MM Docket No. 98–216 RM–9381] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8680. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (CampWood and Rocksprings, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–214; RM–9546; RM–9699] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8681. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Carney, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 99–334 RM–9772] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8682. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Gwinn, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 99–341; RM–9776] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8683. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (North Tunica and Friars Point, Mississippi, Kennett, Missouri, Munford, Tennessee, and Marianna, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 99–140; MM Docket No. 99–146; RM–9490; RM–9724; RM–9725] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8684. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Everglades City, LaBelle, Estero and Key West, Florida) [MM Docket No. 97–116; RM–9050; RM–9123] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8685. A letter from the Associate Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Amendment of the Commission's Rules to Establish New Personal Communications Services, Narrowband PCS [GEN Docket No. 90–314 ET Docket No. 92–100] Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding, Narrowband PCS [PP Docket No. 93–253] received July 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8686. A letter from the Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Extending Wireless Telecommunications Service To Tribal Lands [WT Docket No. 99–266] received July 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8687. A letter from the Associate Managing Director, Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commision's final rule—Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2000, Report and Order [MD Docket No. 00–58, FCC 00–240] received July 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8688. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Offer and Sale of Securities to Canadian Tax-Deferred Retirement Savings Accounts [Release Nos. 33–7860, 34–42905, IC–24491; File No. S7–10–00 International Series Release No. 1226] (RIN: 3235–AH32) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8689. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–44), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

8690. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement with Turkey [Transmittal No. DTC 024–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8691. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement with Norway, Sweeden, Greece and Turkey (Transmittal No. DTC–022–00), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8692. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Sweden [Transmittal No. DTC 021–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8693. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed Technical Assistance Agreement with Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 058–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8694. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 29–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8695. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 047–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 044–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8697. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Australia and Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 053–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Egypt [Transmittal No. DTC 062–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8699. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed transfer of major defense equipment from the Government of the Canada and Sweden [Transmittal 35–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to France and the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 31–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Australia [Transmittal No. DTC 34–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

8702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with France and Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 63–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

8703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective June 4, 2000, the danger pay rate for Eritrea was designated at the 15% level, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

8704. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Restrictive Trade Practices or Boycotts [Docket No. 000424111–0111–01] (RIN: 0694–AA11) received May 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8705. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions and Clarifications to the Export Administration Regulations; Commerce Control List [Docket No. 990625176–0029–02] (RIN: 0694–AB86) received May 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8706. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fees for Exchange Visitor Program Designation Services [Public Notice 3284] received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

8707. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–359, ''Criminal Tax Reorganization Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8708. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–360, ''Tax Expenditure Budget Review Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8709. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–363, ''Gray Market Cigarette Prohibition Temporary Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8710. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–361, ''Retirement Incentive Temporary Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8711. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–362, ''Campaign Finance Disclosure and Enforcement Amendment Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8712. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–364, ''Underage Drinking Temporary Amendment Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8713. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–365, ''Supermarket Tax Exemption Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8714. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–366, ''Public Schools Free Textbook Temporary Amendment Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8715. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–367, ''New Motor Vehicle Inspection Sticker Renewal Temporary Amendment Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8716. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–373, ''Equal Opportunity for Local, Small, or Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Amendment Act of 2000'' received July 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8717. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–379, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 236, S.O. 00–49, Act of 2000'' received July 17, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8718. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–378, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 288, S.O. 98–163, Act of 2000'' received July 17, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8719. A letter from the Chairman, Amtrak, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8720. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions—received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8721. A letter from the Chair, Board of Directors, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, transmitting the report from the Acting Inspector General covering the activities of his office for the period of October 1, 1999—March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8722. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—The State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program (RIN: 1820–AB14) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8723. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Acquisition

Regulation [FRL–6712–2] received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8724. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8725. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8726. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999 through March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8727. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the the twenty-second Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8728. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting the report from the Acting Inspector General covering the activities of his office for the period of October 1, 1999—March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8729. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA–129–FOR] received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8730. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—''Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf—Production Measurement Document Incorporated by Reference'' (RIN: 1010–AC–73) received June 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8731. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft bill entitled the ''National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fees Act of 2000''; to the Committee on Resources.

8732. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alabama Regulatory Program [SPATS No. AL–069–FOR] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8733. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Final 2000 Fishing Quotas for Atlantic Surf Clams, Ocean Quahogs, and Maine Mahogany Quahogs [Docket No. 99128355–0140–02; I.D. 110999C] (RIN: 0648–AM50) received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8734. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Domestic Fisheries Division, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Black Sea Bass Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Quarter 2 Period [Docket No. 000119014–0137–02; I.D. 060200A] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8735. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report entitled, ''U.S. Government Debt Collection Activities of Federal Agencies,'' pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3716(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8736. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft bill designed to protect the Department of the Treasury's security printing and engraving program by amending the criminal code to more accurately define the value of items that are used in the manufacture of Bureau of Engraving and Printing (BEP) securities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8737. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Program (RIN: 0906–AA56) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8738. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Tort Claims Act [BOP–1098–F] (RIN: 1120–AA94) received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8739. A letter from the Treasurer, The Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, transmitting the annual financial report of the Society for calendar year 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(19) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8740. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification and Revocation of VOR and Colored Federal Airways and Jet Routes; AK [Airspace Docket No. 98–AAL–26] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8741. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Adminstration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Realignment of Jet Route; TX [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASW–33] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8742. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Correction to Class E Airspace; Unalaska, AK [Airspace Docket No. 99–AAL–18] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8743. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Time of Designation for Restricted Area R–7104 (R–7104), Vieques Island, PR [Airspace Docket No. 00–ASO–8] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8744. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace; Jackson, WY [Airspace Docket No. 99–ANM–11] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8745. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class D Airspace; Rapid City, SD; modification of Class D Airspace; Rapid City Ellsworth AFB, SD; and modification of Class E Airspace; Rapid City, SD [Airspace Docket No. 00–AGL–03] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8746. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Yankton, SD [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–78] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8747. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Ely, MN [Airspace Docket No. 00–AGL–04] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8748. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class D Airspace; establishment of Class E Airspace; and modification of Class E Airspace; Belleville, IL [Airspace Docket No. 00–AGL–01] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8749. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Hampton, IA [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–7] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8750. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace; Jackson, WY [Airspace Docket No. 99–ANM–11] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8751. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft LTd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–36–AD; Amendment 39–11762; AD 2000–11–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8752. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Air Tractor Incorporated Models AT–301, AT–401, and AT–501 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–CE–21–AD; Amendment 39–11753; AD 2000–11–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8753. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. (formerly AlliedSignal Inc.) ALF502R and LF507 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–36–AD; Amendment 39–11763; AD 2000–11–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8754. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777–200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–307–AD; Amendment 39–11759; AD 2000–11–11] (RIN:

2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8755. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–365N1, AS–365N2, and SA–366G1 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–45–AD; Amendment 39–11765; AD 2000–11–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8756. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Ayres Corporation S2R Series and Model 600 S2D Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–56–AD; Amendment 39–11764; AD 2000–11–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8757. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–311–AD; Amendment 39–11744; Ad 2000–10–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8758. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company AE 3007A and AE 3007C Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–07–AD; Amendment 39–1171; AD 2000–11–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8759. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–343–AD; Amendment 39–11757; AD 2000–11–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8760. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 and 767 Series Airplanes Powered by General Electric Model CF6–80C2 Series Engines [Docket No. 99–NM–228–AD; Amendment 39–11756; AD 2000–11–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8761. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–200, -300, and -400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–30–AD; Amendment 39–11755; AD 2000–11–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8762. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–316–AD; Amendment 39–11754; AD 2000–11–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8763. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 2000, Mystere-Falcon 900, Falcon 900EX, Fan Jet Falcon, Mystere-Falcon 20, and Mystere-Falcon 200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–109–AD; Amendment 39–11751; AD 2000–11–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8764. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–365C, C1, C2, N, and N1; AS–365N2 and N3; and SA–366G1 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–62–AD; Amendment 39–11766; AD 2000–11–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8765. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 1000, 2000, 3000, and 4000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–358–AD; Amendment 39–11761; AD 2000–11–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8766. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 94–ANE–16–AD; Amendment 39–11758; AD 2000–11–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8767. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–51–AD; Amendment 39–11785; AD 2000–12–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8768. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–64–AD; Amendment 39–11784; AD 2000–12–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8769. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–66–AD; Amendment 39–11780; AD 2000–12–02] (RIN:2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8770. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–351–AD; Amendment 39–11791; AD 2000–12–13](RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8771. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–164–AD; Amendment 39–11789; AD 2000–12–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8772. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–25–AD; Amendment 39–11792; AD 2000–12–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8773. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–78–AD; Amendment 39–11794; AD 2000–12–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8774. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–182–AD; Amendment 39–11795; AD 2000–12–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8775. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–365N, SA–365N1, AS–365N2 and AS–365N3 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–86–AD; Amendment 39–11737; AD 2000–10–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8776. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS–350B, BA, B1, B2, and D, and Model AS–355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–39–AD; Amendment 39–11734; AD 2000–10–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8777. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS350B, BA, B1, B2, B3, D, and AS355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–36–AD; Amendment 39–11733; AD 2000–10–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8778. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (BHTC) Model 222, 222B, 222U, and 230 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–43–AD; Amendment 39–11738; AD 2000–10–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8779. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model 1124 and 1124A Westwind Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–42–AD; Amendment 39–11728; AD 2000–10–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8780. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Model G–159 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–138–AD; Amendment 39–11735; AD 2000–10–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8781. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. Model MD900 Helicopters [Docket No. 2000–SW–04–AD; Amendment 39–11730; AD 2000–10–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8782. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–213–AD; Amendment 39–11727; AD 2000–10–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8783. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Ethiopia [Docket No. FAA–2000–7340; SFAR No. 87] (RIN: 2120–AH01) received May 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8784. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–365N1, AS–365N2, and SA–366G1 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–34–AD; Amendment 39–11732; AD 2000–10–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8785. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GmbH (Eurocopter) Model EC 135 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–05–AD; Amendment 39–11731; AD 2000–10–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8786. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–221–AD; Amendment 39–11706; AD 2000–08–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8787. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG V2500–A1/-A5/-D5 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–45–AD; Amendment 39–11783; AD 2000–12–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8788. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–362–AD; Amendment 39–11719; AD 2000–09–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8789. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400 and 767–200 and -300 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney Model PW4000 Series Engines [Docket No. 99–NM–208–AD; Amendment 39–11777; AD 2000–11–28] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8790. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, -200, 747SP, and 747SR Series Airplanes Equipped with Pratt & Whitney JT9D–7, -7A, -7F, and -7J Series Engines [Docket No. 99–NM–242–AD; Amendment 39–11717; AD 2000–09–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8791. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; EMBRAER Model EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–305–AD; Amendment 39–11718; AD 2000–09–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8792. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–10–10, -15, -30, -30F, and -40 Series Airplanes, and KC–10A (Military) Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–212–AD; Amendment 39–11716; AD 2000–09–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8793. A letter from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–230–AD; Amendment 39–11773; AD 2000–11–24] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8794. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon (Beech) Model 400A and 400T Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–372–AD; Amendment 39–11721; AD 2000–09–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8795. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2, A300–B2k, A300 B4–2C, A300 B4–100, and A300 B4–200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–56–AD; Amendment 39–11725; AD 2000–10–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8796. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airworthiness Directives; CFM International (CFMI) CFM56–2, -2A, -2B, -3, -3B, -3C, -5, -5B, -5C, and -7B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–38; Amendment 39–11779; AD 2000–12–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8797. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–75–AD; Amendment 39–11736; AD 2000–10–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8798. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321, A330, and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–103–AD; Amendment 39–11726; AD 2000–10–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8799. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767–200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–313–AD; Amendment 39–11767; AD 2000–11–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8800. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bristish Aerospace Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–72–AD; Amendment 39–11722; AD 2000–09–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8801. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–45/50 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–32–AD; Amendment 39–11760; AD 2000–11–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8802. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–138–AD; Amendment 39–11770; AD 2000–10–51] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8803. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS332L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–82–AD; Amendment 39–11781; AD 2000–12–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8804. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A320–232 and -233 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–22–AD; Amendment 39–11774; AD 2000–11–25] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8805. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Smoking Aboard Aircraft [Docket No. OST–2000;OST Docket No. 46783; Notice 90–5; OST Docket No. 44778; Notice 91–1] (RIN: 2105–AC85; 2105–AB58) received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8806. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–128–AD; Amendment 39–11772; AD 2000–11–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8807. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319,

A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–139–AD; Amendment 39–11776; AD 2000–11–27] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8808. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–53–AD; Amendment 39–11775; AD 2000–11–26] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8809. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–331–AD; Amendment 39–11769; AD 2000–11–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8810. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes to the International Aviation Safety Assessment (IASA) [14 CFR Part 129] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8811. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Parks Air Tour Management [14 CFR Part 91] received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8812. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program; Proposed Revisions [Docket No. FRA 1999–5663] (RIN: 2130–AB26) received June 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8813. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the San Francisco Class B Airspace Area; CA [Airspace Docket No. 97–AWA–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8814. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department Of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–8–100 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–380–AD; Amendment 39–11768; AD 2000–11–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received June 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8815. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Oil Pollution Prevention and Response; Non-Transportation-Related Facilities [FRL–6707–6] (RIN: 2050–AE64) received June 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8816. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information ', Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revocation of the Selenium Criterion Maximum Concentration for the Final Water Quality Guidance for the Great Lakes System [FRL–6707–7] (RIN: 2040–AC08) received May 30, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8817. A letter from the Chairman, Office of General Counsel, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Interpretations and Statements of Policy Regarding Ocean Transportation Intermediaries [Docket No. 00–06] received June 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8818. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rural Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities (RIN: 0503–AA20) received May 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8819. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 2000–32] received June 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8820. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Additional Guidance on Cash or Deferred Arrangements—received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8821. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous Reporting IRA Recharacterizations and Reconversions [Notice 2000–30] received June 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8822. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Deposits of Excise Tax [TD 8887] (RIN: 1545–AV02) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8823. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Medical and Other Evidance of Your Impairment (s) and Definition of Medical Consultant [Regulations Nos. 4 and 16] (RIN: 0960–AD91) received May 26, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8824. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the corrected draft bill, ''to establish police powers for Inspector General agents engaged in official duties . . . and an oversight mechanism for the exercise of those powers''; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and the Judiciary.

8825. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, CHPP, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Home Health Agencies [HCFA–1059–F] (RIN: 0938–AJ24) received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

8826. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Center For Health Plans and Providers, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Medicare Program; Medicare and Choice Program [HCFA 1030–FC] (RIN: 0938–AI29) received July 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

8827. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Office of Inspection General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Health Care Programs: Fraud and Abuse; Revised OIG Civil Money Penalities Resulting From Public Law 104–191 (RIN: 0991–AA90) received May 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

8828. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled the, ''Student Loan Improvement Act of 2000''; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, and the Budget.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 4437. A bill to grant to the United States Postal Service the authority to issue semipostals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–734 Pt. 1).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2671. A bill to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2435. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Wills House, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3468. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah (Rept. 106–737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3817. A bill to redesignate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado as the ''Jaryd Atadero Legacy Trail''; with amendments (Rept. 106–738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2773. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system; with amendments (Rept. 106–739). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2833. A bill to establish the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area; with an amendment (Rept. 106–740). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2919. A bill to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio; with an amendment (Rept. 106–741). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Utah, to use Weber Basin Project facilities for the impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; with an amendment (Rept.

106–742). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3291. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–743). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3657. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of public domain land in the San Bernardino National Forest in the State of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3999. A bill to clarify the process for the adoption of local constitutional self-government for the United States Virgin Islands and Guam, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 439. An act to amend the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988 to adjust the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada (Rept. 106–746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 1629. An act to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Oregon (Rept. 106–747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 1374. An act to authorize the development and maintenance of a multi-agency campus project in the town of Jackson, Wyoming (Rept. 106–748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 1705. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into land exchanges to acquire from the private owner and to convey to the State of Idaho approximately 1,240 acres of land near the City of Rocks National Reserve, Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3736. A bill to establish the Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Monument in the State of California; with an amendment (Rept. 106–750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4115. A bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution providing for consideration of a motion to go to conference on any Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001. (Rept. 106–752). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4843. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for retirement security and pension reform; with an amendment (Rept. 106–753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee of Conference. Conference report on H.R. 4576. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–754). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committees on Commerce and Armed Services discharged. H.R. 4437 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 4437. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than July 17, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GIBBONS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOBSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4864. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reaffirm and clarify the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself and Mr. SHAW):

H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLETCHER (for himself, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. KUYKENDALL):

H.R. 4866. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(b)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 to reduce the public debt and to decrease the statutory limit on the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. DEUTSCH):

H.R. 4867. A bill to revise and extend the programs of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAPUANO (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FORD, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LARSON, Mr. SABO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KING, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the historic significance of the 210th anniversary of the establishment of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 137: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 303: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 390: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 460: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 483: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 632: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 688: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 783: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 860: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1102: Mr, WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BAKER, Mr. COX, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. ROYCE, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1107: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1116: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 1227: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1495: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1525: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1824: Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 2121: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 2308: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2331: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2397: Mr. BERRY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 2594: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 2710: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 2892: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2969: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 3003: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3032: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3044: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3083: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. LARSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3161: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3192: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WEINER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. UDALL of Colordo, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 3193: Mr. KANJORSKI and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3463: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3540: Mr. SAWYER and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 3595: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 3661: Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 3875: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 3896: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 3928: Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 4033: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4042: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 4136: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 4184: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 4215: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 4219: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4237: Mr. GORDON and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 4239: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 4277: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HORN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 4390: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 4471: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 4493: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 4511: Mr. NEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 4543: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. HOUGHTON.
H.R. 4548: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 4566: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 4598: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 4613: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 4614: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 4651: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4659: Mr. COOK, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 4660: Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 4669: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 4710: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 4736: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BLUNT, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 4759: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BACA, and Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 4770: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 4793: Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 4802: Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 4807: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. COOKSEY.
H.R. 4820: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 4841: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 4848: Mr. DELAHUNT, MR. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BACA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.J. Res. 56: Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. DIXON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. BECERRA.
H. Con. Res. 100: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H. Con. Res. 159: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. CLEMENT.
H. Con. Res. 271: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H. Con. Res. 283: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H. Con. Res. 308: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Con. Res. 313: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Con. Res. 318: Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 340: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MATSUI.
H. Con. Res. 367: Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 370: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H. Res. 462: Mr. DEMINT.
H. Res. 486: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Res. 487: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H. Res. 531: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H. Res. 543: Mr. LANTOS.
H. Res. 549: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GILMAN.
H. Res. 551: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 17, 2000 No. 92

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

We praise You, dear God. You have promised never to leave or forsake us. Our confidence is in You and not ourselves. We come to You in prayer, not trusting our own goodness but solely in Your grace. You are our joy when we get down, our strength when we are weak, our courage when we vacillate. You are our security in a world of change and turmoil. Even when we forget You in the rush of life, You never forget us. Thank You for Your faithfulness.

At this moment we claim that faithfulness for our friend, Senator PAUL COVERDELL, as he undergoes surgery. Bless him, care for him, and heal him.

And now dear God, filled with wonder, love, and gratitude, we commit this week to live and work for You, inviting the indwelling power of Your spirit. Bless the Senators. Control their minds and give them Your discernment. Give them boldness to take stands for what You have revealed is the application of Your righteousness and justice for our Nation.

Thank You for the privilege of living this week for You. In Your all powerful name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PETER G. FITZGERALD, a Senator from the State of Illinois, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the Chair.

PRAYERS AND REFLECTIONS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I express my appreciation also once again to our Chaplain of the Senate, Lloyd John Ogilvie, and for his remembering our friend and my most trusted confidante, most reliable lieutenant, the Senator from Georgia, PAUL COVERDELL. I don't know of a Senator who works any harder or has a more indomitable spirit. I noticed particularly Friday afternoon how happy he was as he took leave of this Chamber because of the vote that we had just taken and realizing that he would have the opportunity to be home in Georgia on Friday afternoon and on Saturday. Our thoughts and our prayers are with him as he apparently undergoes a surgical procedure at this hour. I thank the Chaplain for his prayer.

Coincidentally, this weekend I also had a little more time than I anticipated and was able to spend some time thinking about our country and reading some books. One of those that I read was ''Going For The Max,'' by Senator MAX CLELAND, also of Georgia. It is a really inspirational book about his life and his experience as a Vietnam veteran and the recovery period he had to go through and the inspiration from things he had learned in his life—12 principles of life that he had learned and on which he relies. I talked to him this morning to tell him how much I enjoyed his book; that I was inspired by it. And he said he was at that very moment standing there looking at Piedmont Hospital where our friend, Senator COVERDELL, is, and he was saying a prayer for him. He offered to cover any meetings or appointments that needed to be done today or this week by Senator COVERDELL.

That is the kind of real love and appreciation and bipartisanship we need more of in this institution and in our lives. So I encourage my colleagues in the Senate, if you have not read it, get a copy of ''Going For The Max,'' and it will be an inspiration to you.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m. with Senators BYRD and THOMAS in control of the time.

Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill, and hopefully we will be able to complete our deliberations on that bill and get to final passage on all amendments and the bill itself tomorrow morning.

Under the previous agreement, there are up to 10 amendments remaining to the Interior bill that must be offered and debated during today's session. Hopefully, some of those amendments will be withdrawn, others will be accepted, and maybe we will not need to have more than a couple of them actually voted on, and then go to final passage tomorrow morning. I believe those votes will be stacked in the morning at 9:45 a.m.

At 6:15 this evening, the Senate will begin the final votes on the reconciliation bill which provides for the elimination of the marriage penalty tax. Senators should be aware that during the remainder of the afternoon on Friday, when all amendments were offered and/or debated, almost 40 potential votes could occur in regard to this legislation.

Again, I hope and I think that several of those amendments were just filed as a precaution and that not nearly that many will actually require a vote; some of them can be accepted. But I do expect there will be somewhere between 10 and 15, at least, that will require a recorded vote. We will try to do a major portion of those tonight, if not all of them. We may try to get a consent to finish the remainder of the votes on amendments and final passage tomorrow morning after we take a

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

look at exactly how many we are going to have to do, look at how many we would have to vote on tonight, how many we would have to vote on in the morning, and try to be reasonable in how we schedule those votes. But we do need to get both of them completed not later than tomorrow morning. So votes are expected into the night. We could have, I guess, conceivably 10, 15, or more votes tonight beginning at 6:15. Of course, we have stacked them and the votes will be limited to 10 minutes in length after the first vote. Senators will be encouraged to remain in the Chamber again during the votes.

We were able to record 10 votes in about 1½ hours I think on Friday, which probably is some kind of new record. A lot of the credit for that goes to Senator HARRY REID, the assistant minority leader, because he stayed in the Chamber and helped me make sure that we wrapped those votes up as quickly as was possible.

This will be an important week. After we complete those two very important issues, we will need to go to the Agriculture appropriations bill which has been awaiting action in the Senate now for probably a month. Senator COCHRAN has indicated he will be ready to go tomorrow morning or right after lunch, whichever is available to him, to begin debate on this very important legislation.

We also would like to have the opportunity to consider the energy and water appropriations bill this week also. It is ready and should not take a lot of time. But that will depend on how long it takes on the Agriculture appropriations bill.

I see smiles throughout the Chamber, the idea that we would complete these two bills I have already mentioned and then take up two appropriations bills, but with determination we can get it done.

We achieved more last week than most people thought we would be able to do. It took work and it took some time and it took cooperation between leaders on both sides of the aisle. We were able to get that. I hope we can do it this week. I thank my colleagues for their participation and their cooperation.

With that, I will yield the floor and I observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSERVATION REINVESTMENT ACT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, on the eve of marking up the Conservation Reinvestment Act—an act that can only be described as great politics but very bad policy—to enact a law that gives the Federal Government a blank check to buy land for the purpose of conservation, preservation, or any other so called environmental cause is ill-advised and ill-conceived, it appears, on the surface, the idea of putting land under Federal control for conservation purposes is a good idea and good policy for the nation. However, under the surface, hidden in the dark side of government ownership of lands, it is very bad policy.

Nobody has hunted or fished and appreciated it more than this Senator. Nobody enjoys the outdoors as much as I do—the cold crisp mornings in a hunting camp or a fishing camp is unequaled and one would not need a fishing rod or a rifle.

I would say that nobody in this body has fought harder for habitat and policies that promote the enjoyment of the outdoors, hunting, and fishing. As former cochairman of the sportman's caucus and still active in the foundation, we guard this privilege.

There is no way, Mr. President, this piece of legislation can be made to reflect or fulfill our role in the protection and improvement of our public lands. Just adding acres to the Federal estate does not get it done. Just no way. The supporters of this legislation has been blinded by the prospects of dollars, free dollars coming to their respective States. The money comes from royalties from off-shore drilling. I have no problem with that and, in fact, support such a scheme. It is the purchasing of land for the Federal estate that I cannot support.

I ask your patience to bear with me but I feel some facts should be made part of this record and my colleagues need reminding of some startling facts.

The Federal Government now controls one-third of the land in the United States. That is wrong and was never intended to be as envisioned by the Founders of our Nation nor the Framers of our Constitution.

However, the Federal Government has from its first day, a healthy appetite for land ownership and has never stopped acquiring more and more land. Some for good and solid reasons. In the last 40 years, however, land acquisition has been under the guise of conservation and preservation.

Do we have enough surplus of money to squander on the idea that the Federal Government needs more land.

Since 1960, major Federal land agencies have added 33.6 million acres of land. That is the area the size of Florida.

These agencies control more than 612 million acres or just over one-fourth of the land area of the United States.

True, the majority of Americans support land conservation and some acquisition, but few know or understand what it entails.

Most of those demanding public ownership of lands have come from groups who have little regard for private land ownership or property rights as provided by our Constitution. Land ownership is the cornerstone to individual freedom which most Americans hold very dear. Have you not seen the movie, ''The Patriot''?

> . . . A major increase in Federal funding for land acquisition has long been needed. There is a tremendous backlog in land purchases. . . .

So says Carl Pope, Ex. Director of the Sierra Club.

Ron Tipton, a vice president of the National Park Conservation Association echoes the same line.

I would suggest that both organizations have the money and the political will to buy land for conservation, preservation, or to heal some real or perceived environmental ill. The problem arises that they also would be responsible for the operation and management of the lands.

That being the case, why in the world does the Federal Government need more land? That is why I started to do some research some 3 or 4 years ago and using some information gathered by very credible organizations, I was startled what I found.

The Congressional Budget Office has gone so far as to suggest a freeze on Federal acquisitions. A 1999 report asserts:

> Land management agencies should improve their stewardship of the lands they already own before taking on additional acreage and management responsibilities.
>
> Environmental objectives might be best met by improving that they already own.

There is one glaring fact that throughout our history, private individuals and groups have offered the best and most sound resource conservation. Several organizations such as the Sierra Club has the funds and expertise to do and I suggest they proceed.

Here is CBO's concern. BLM, USF&W, and NPS have added 840,000 acres per year since 1960. That is the area the size of Rhode Island.

In the 1990's, 3.4 million acres and 25 new units for NPS; 2.7 million acres and 24 new units for USF&W; plus 18 million acres in military installations, 8.5 million acres in BOR, and 11.7 million acres in the Corps of Engineers. Even the conservation reserve ''CRP'' controls 33 million acres.

SPIRALING COSTS AND BALLOONING BUDGETS

Here are the reasons the Congressional Budget Office suggested a freeze in land acquisition:

Annual costs for land management have far outpaced the rate at which the Federal estate was expanding.

For the past 40 years, government's appetite for land ownership grew the total acres just over 6 percent, yet operating budgets have risen 262 percent above inflation.

From 1962 to 1998, land acquisition cost $10.5 billion. At that same timeframe, managing Federal lands cost $176 billion, $6.6 billion in 1999 alone.

It is a little easier to grasp when one looks at the cost of management in 1962 at $3 per acre. In 1997 the cost has grown to $10 per acre adjusted for inflation.

The NPS operating expenses have risen 2.6 percent per year above inflation since 1980. During the same time, the system grew only 1 percent per year in acreage and units. The system has always gotten more money to operate. Park visits, nationally, only grew 2.3 percent per year.

BLM generated .50 cents for every $1.00 invested and the NPS .08 cents for every $1.00. While operating budgets for day-to-day upkeep and services have grown faster than acreage, provisions for infrastructure and major maintenance have not followed a similar pattern.

In some instances, these capital budgets that provide for long-term facility maintenance have shrunk. Between 1980 and 1995, NPS declined to an annual rate of 1.5 percent when adjusted for inflation. As a result, the NPS has a $5.6 billion deficit for construction and maintenance and a $2 billion deficit for resource management.

The USFS has a $5 billion maintenance backlog. Throwing more money into the Federal trough is not getting us what we want. Eroding forest roads, deteriorating water quality, disappearing wildlife habitat, and loss of priceless artifacts are just the most obvious indicators that current policies are not providing quality management.

Buying more land only contributes to a situation that is not achieving the environmental objectives that we want.

Billions of dollars are spent each year to manage our Federal lands, and the public is not getting the benefits of multiple-use fiscal responsibility, or good resource stewardship.

A number of ecologists have also questioned the ability to fulfill its mission of resource protection. Biologist Charles Kay of Utah State University has documented the destruction of the Crown Jewel of national parks, Yellowstone. Overpopulation of elk and buffalo has taken its toll. The result is starvation of thousands of elk, and overgrazed range, the destruction of plant communities, the elimination of critical habitat, and a serious decline in biodiversity. Karl Hess reported the same in Rocky Mountain National Park.

Some 39 million acres of Federal forest land are, as we speak, at risk of catastrophic wildfire and disease according to a GAO report of last year.

BETTER TOOLS—BETTER RESULTS—SATISFIED CONSERVATIONISTS

It is clear that merely dipping into the Federal Treasury does not ensure land conservation for the future. Under the current system of command and control, politics plays a major role in Federal land management. Some pragmatic changes in our Federal land agencies, however, could help us get the incentives right.

RECREATIONAL LAND

Lands historically used for recreation, should pay or attempt to pay their own way and not rely entirely upon congressional appropriations.

There is no doubt that park managers can better care for the land that Federal overseers in Congress who fail to allocate funds for necessary maintenance. The Fee Demonstration Program is a step in the right direction.

As land managers generate revenues and decide how the money will be spent, they are allowed to be more responsive to visitors, more expedient with maintenance, and more protective of natural resources.

COMMODITY LANDS

Not all Federal lands are equally deserving of preservation. In a world of limited resources, it makes sense to sell lands with lesser conservation values to ensure adequate protection for those worthy of conservation.

HABITAT SET-ASIDES

There are some lands under Federal management that are not likely to ever pay their own way, but have ecological or cultural value. The land might be critical wildlife habitat, watershed for large, diversified users, or the site of some historical event. These should be placed under a trust or endowment board. A portion of revenues derived from user fees at more popular sites or the sale of other lands could be used as endowment funds to manage these valuable areas. I am very supportive of this idea.

NEW ACQUISITIONS

Current Federal land management permits land acquisitions without regard to operating and maintenance costs. Before adding more land to the Federal estate and obligating the American taxpayer, a detailed accounting of annual operating and maintenance costs should be prepared and, like private conservators, laws should require that funding for proper management be part of the appropriation. No O&M money, no deal. I will insist on it.

LAND EXCHANGES

There is no doubt in my mind that land exchanges are necessary. Small units of range should be either traded or sold to block up large units for management purposes. The funds derived from the sales should be placed in the trust or endowment for management of other public holdings.

PRIVATE SOLUTIONS

As an alternative to Federal land conservation, private conservation by individuals and groups is a viable option with a long history in the United States. The growing demand to protect land resources has created a new impetus for private conservation through ownership and other legal mechanisms. Whether the land is managed for profit or to fulfill a mission, these private conservators have the right incentives. They face the opportunity costs for alternative uses of the resources. The result is often better land management than that provided by our Federal land managers.

FEE SIMPLE

Private landownership is the oldest and simplest form of land conservation. It will continue to exist as long as property rights are well-defined and owners can profit from their investment in conservation or achieve their conservation goals.

LAND TRUSTS, CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

Tax benefits.

Perpetual easements.

Restructuring easements.

CONCLUSION

Changes that would improve land conservation and mitigate environmental damage without adding more land to the Federal estate include:

Lands for recreational use should pay their own way or generate some revenue to cover costs;

Land use rights on commodity producing lands should be sold for the highest value use. The winning bid could be commercial timber harvest, selective harvest to enhance wildlife habitat, wilderness, recreation, or some combination of uses;

Income from the sale of land and land use rights should be put into endowment funds to buy or manage lands with higher conservation values, such as those with critical wildlife habitat, scenic value, or historical significance; and

Barriers should be lowered to encourage private conservation and good stewardship.

At present our Federal land agencies are poor land stewards. Many times through no fault of their own, their budgets reach into the billions, yet damage to roads, sewers, buildings, forest, and rangelands remain and continue to worsen.

Only the lands that are under long-term lease arrangements with individuals or groups continue to improve.

Given the right incentives, we can protect areas like Yellowstone and Yosemite, preserve the Bob Marshall Wilderness of Montana, and the east front. But forests such as Clinch Valley, VA, are better left in private hands.

Again, I must iterate that the Conservation Reinvestment Act as written and presented this day, is ill-conceived and ill-advised. We can and must invest those dollars where the environmental objectives are clearly achievable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 3 o'clock with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: The Senator from

West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, from 12 p.m. to 2 p.m.; and the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee from 2 p.m. until 3 p.m.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, Alexander Hamilton spoke 6 hours at the Constitutional Convention. So I think I am in rather good company.

THE PLIGHT OF OUR NATION

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the great English novelist, Charles Dickens, began his epic novel, ''A Tale of Two Cities,'' with these words, ''It was the best of times, it was the worst of times. . . .''

Well over a century later, and a continent away from the writing of Dickens' story, those words could well describe the plight of our nation in the last year of the 20th century.

That is this century—the last year of the 20th century.

The United States has never been more affluent, in terms of material wealth and creature comforts, or more impoverished in terms of spiritual well-being. It is the best of times materially. It is the worst of times spiritually. Millions are made daily on Wall Street, American consumerism fuels booming international economic and trade markets, and our Nation's living standard is the envy of the world. We have eliminated our staggering deficits at home, at least on paper, and jobs are available for our people in abundance.

Yet, America is, in many ways, a hollow nation. We are a people on the edge of a precipice. Despite all of our economic prosperity, despite all of our fascination with the glittery toys that money can buy us, despite all of the accouterments of success and prosperity, so envied by the rest of the world, all of the material comforts we so enthusiastically chase, can never pacify the hunger beginning to emerge in our collective souls, nor even start to solve the endemic problems which crowd the dark corners of our national psyche.

Our children randomly slaughter each other in our schools, clothes are torn off of innocent women in a public park, smut crowds the airwaves, the traditional family structure continues to deteriorate, advertising reflects little but sexual innuendo and the desire for a mad rush to some materialistic nirvana, song lyrics are not fit for polite company, and even the barest mention of the existence of a Creator is castigated as inappropriate or viewed as the unbalanced ravings of the lunatic fringe.

We are a people seemingly in deep denial of our own humanity—in deep denial of our own unquenched inner need for meaning and purpose and direction in our lives. We have succumbed to the glossy promise of more, and more, and more, in a vain and pointless effort to deny the one essential element which is so glaringly missing from our aimless, restless pursuit of prosperity.

Religion has all but vanished from our national life. Worse than that, religion is discouraged; religion is frowned upon. Religion is suppressed, spurred by what I believe is a misguided attempt to ensure a completely secular society and a gross misreading of constitutional intent. Oh, what ills are born when we forget our history! What ills are born when we forget our history!

This Nation was founded, in part, so that religion could freely flourish. The Constitution was written and ratified by men who possessed a strong spiritual awareness. These were not Godless men who wrote the Constitution of the United States. They had a spiritual awareness. The universal principles espoused in the Declaration of Independence in 1776, and other early American documents reflect aspirations, which are, at their core, based on a belief in a Supreme Being and on the existence of a human soul. What are these if not religious principles? Such lofty and spiritual beliefs as the bedrock equality of all humans,—as the bedrock equality of all humans—and the endowment by a Creator of basic rights cannot be secularized out of existence in a nation so rooted in a deep spiritual consciousness as is ours. Every single value upon which this country was so painstakingly built—individual sacrifice for the greater good, fairness, charity, truthfulness, morality, personal responsibility, honesty—all of these are, at root, qualities derived from Judeo-Christian teachings. To try to separate this nation from the religious grounding which it so obviously exhibits in every aspect of its history, is like trying to bifurcate muscle from bone. Dysfunction is the result—sterile bone which cannot move, and useless tissue with no support. That is what happens when spiritual values become separated from our national life.

Nowhere are the results of such an unfortunate rending more obvious, more destructive or more heartbreaking than in the evident damage we have done to our most precious commodity, our children. Millions of our innocents are lost in a maze of drugs, cheap sex, violence, and materialism. They are starving—starving—for lessons by which to live their lives, and what do we offer them? We offer them only hedonistic baubles. Love of pleasure, greed, gratification of sex, deification of the crude and the outrageous, and the selfish culture of Me, me, me, and More, more, more, are no guidelines on which to build a life or a character whether it be a nation or the individual. These are only empty distractions that lead down roads previously reserved for misfits and criminals. We must look hard at ourselves in the mirror each morning and ask what in the name of God we are coming to if we continue on this course? We are all at fault, all of us—the clergy for not speaking out, the Church doesn't speak out like it used to when I was a boy.

The church took a strong stand on the great national issues. But the church, as so many of us, has been driven into a closet; so the clergy for not speaking out; the leaders of business in this country for looking only at profits; the leaders of both political parties for pandering—pandering. Most of the issues that plague us nationally—such as violence in our schools, inadequate health care for the weakest in our society, crime, greed in politics, all of these issues, all of them, are at their root—are issues of right and wrong, issues of morality.

Yet in order to avoid offending anyone—don't offend anyone; that is why so many of the colleges and schools have taken history out of the required courses, because history might offend somebody. It might offend some group—in order to avoid offending anyone or any group, we try to totally secularize our politics on the left and overly polarize our politics, with too much false piety, on the right. So both are in the wrong. The result is only endless power struggle and pandering to the various groups which keep us in power. As such, political power has become an end, not a means, and the leadership of this nation too often winds up pursuing solutions to the effects of our ills and ignoring their causes.

A prejudice against the influence of religious commitment and moral values upon political issues now characterizes almost every sector of American society from the media to law to academia. We have seen the Supreme Court rule, again and again, against allowing voluntary prayer in public school in this country. I believe that this ingrained predisposition against expressions of religious or spiritual beliefs is wrongheaded, destructive, and completely contrary to the intent of the Founders of this great nation. Instead of ensuring freedom of religion in a nation founded in part to guarantee that basic liberty, a literal suffocation of that freedom has been the result. The rights of those who do not believe in a Supreme Being have been zealously guarded, to the denigration, I repeat, denigration, of the rights of those who do so believe.

The American doctrine of separation of church and state—and you don't find that in the Constitution; it says nothing about separation of Church and State in the Constitution—forbids the establishment of any one religion by the state, but not, I repeat, not the influence of religious values in the life of the nation. Religious faith has always been an underpinning of American life.

One of the most perceptive of observers of the early American scene was Alexis de Tocqueville. Writing in the 1830's on his observations while traveling in America, de Tocqueville grasped the moral content of America. Coming from France where abuse of power by the clergy had made

anticlericalism endemic, he was amazed to find it virtually unknown in America.

De Tocqueville writes:

> In France, I had almost always seen the spirit of religion and the spirit of freedom marching in opposite directions, but in America, I found they were intimately united, and that they reigned in common over the same country. . . . Religion . . . must be regarded as the first of their political institutions . . . .

He is talking about Americans in the 1830s. Let me say that again—DeTocqueville:

> Religion . . . must be regarded as the first of their political institutions; for if it does not impart a taste for freedom, it facilitates the use of it.

He concluded that most Americans held religion,

> to be indispensable to the maintenance of Republican institutions.

John Adams was the second President of the United States. He served as Vice President for 8 years under George Washington. He was a member of the Continental Congress, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He greatly influenced the States to ratify the new Constitution by writing a three-volume work, entitled, ''A Defense of the Constitutions of the Government of the United States.''

I like to go back to John Adams' work from time to time and just read it again. I recommend it to our people who are listening in this Chamber. One might say that, when it came to building the governmental structure of these United States, John Adams was in on the ground floor. In his diary entry dated February 22, 1756, John Adams wrote—listen to John Adams now:

> Suppose a nation in some distant region should take the Bible for their only law book, and every member should regulate his conduct by the precepts there exhibited! Every member would be obliged in conscience to temperance, frugality, and industry; to justice, kindness, and charity towards his fellow men; and to piety, love, and reverence toward Almighty God . . . . What a Utopia, what a Paradise would this region be.

That was John Adams. Obviously, John Adams believed that moral precepts and Biblical teachings would be an ideal foundation on which to lay the government of a great nation.

On July 8, 1776, the Declaration of Independence was read publicly at the Continental Congress while the famous ''Liberty Bell'' was rung. Wouldn't you have liked to have been there? Congress then established a three-man Committee consisting of Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, for the purpose of designing a great seal for the United States. What were Franklin's suggestions? Franklin's suggestions for a seal and motto characterizing the spirit of this new nation were—this is Franklin talking, not ROBERT C. BYRD:

> Moses lifting up his wand, and dividing the red sea, and pharaoh in his chariot overwhelmed with the waters. This motto: ''Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.''

What did Thomas Jefferson propose? This is Thomas Jefferson talking, not ROBERT C. BYRD. Thomas Jefferson proposed:

> The children of Israel in the wilderness, led by a cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night.

Try as I may, I sense no hypersensitivity about absolute separation of religion and the government of the new country in these suggestions for symbols of our new nation. Would such men as Jefferson and Franklin have suggested such symbols if they intended for an absolute wall of separation to be erected between government and any sort of religious expression? I think not.

When it comes to current attitudes about the proper role of religion in America, the apple has fallen very far from the tree. In fact, our greatest leaders have shown no trepidation about God's proper place in the American panorama. I am talking about our greatest leaders. Every session of the U.S. House of Representatives and the United States Senate begins with a prayer. I heard the Chaplin pray today, and so did you. And each House, from the Nation's beginning, has had its Chaplain paid with Federal tax dollars. The Supreme Court of the United States begins each session only after a solemn pronouncement that concludes with ''God save the United States and this Honorable Court.''

So it is then, with almost total incredulity, that I read the continued pronouncements on the subject of prayer in school by our Supreme Court, which since 1962, has steadily chipped away at any connection between religion and the governmental sphere. How could such rulings be handed down time after time by learned men and women who are obviously familiar with the history of this nation, and with the faith-based grounding of our entire governmental structure? And recently we have this latest decision by the Supreme Court, involving voluntary student-led prayer at a Texas high school football game.

I don't attend football games. I have attended one in the 48 years that I have been in Washington, and I attended that only at halftime to crown the Queen; West Virginia and Maryland were playing. But even if I don't attend football games, there are people who do attend. And if it is their wish to have prayers, if the students in the band or on the football teams want to have prayer, more power to them.

On June 19, the highest court in our land ruled in a 6–3 decision that somehow this voluntary student-led prayer violated the Constitution's establishment clause.

Justice Stevens, writing for the majority opinion, said that even when attendance was voluntary and the decision to pray was made by students:

> the delivery of a pregame prayer has the improper effect of coercing those present to participate in an act of religious worship.

What nonsense—nonsense. Such a pronouncement ignores a separate First Amendment problem, in that it amounts to the censorship of religious speech in a governmental forum. What about the rights of those students who wish to pray, perhaps for the safety of their classmates? Such a ruling tramples on the Constitutional rights of those students in favor of some mythical possibility that coercement might be felt by someone.

In a dissenting opinion, Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist summed up the matter pretty nicely, I think, when he stated that the majority opinion ''bristles''—bristles—''with hostility to all things religious in public life.''

Mr. Chief Justice Rehnquist said it right: The majority opinion ''bristles with hostility to all things religious in public life.''

For that statement, the Chief Justice will always have my gratitude. He is eminently correct, and, of course, it took courage to say what he did. As everyone knows, I am no fan of amending the U.S. Constitution, and I believe it should be done only rarely and with great care. Certainly this year, an election year, is no year to try to pass a constitutional amendment on school prayer.

But I intend to implore the two major party candidates—and I do implore the two major party candidates—to seriously consider including a constitutional amendment in the nature of clarifying the intent of the framers in the area of prayer in school as part of both party platforms.

I have yet to read a party platform. Never read one. I have never read a Democratic Party platform or any other party platform, but there are many who do, and it is only natural the parties should have platforms. People expect them to have a platform to indicate where they stand on the great issues of the day. So I urge Mr. Bush and Mr. GORE to work to put the words in the party platforms urging that there be an amendment to clarify the intent of the framers in the area of prayer in school.

The intent of the framers was clearly only to keep the new government from endorsing or favoring one religion over another, but not from favoring a free exercise of religion over nonreligion. Certainly, it was never to prohibit voluntary expressions of a religious nature by our citizens.

Just what do we teach our children? Upon what do we base the most fundamental codes of society if we are not to base them on moral precepts and spiritual precepts? How can we lead our own people, how can we grapple with issues of right and wrong, or how can we continue to inspire downtrodden peoples from around the globe if we continue to deny and to sever our basic ties to faith-based principles?

Alarmingly, we are crafting a political secularism which does not reflect the views or practices of most Americans, the overwhelming majority of Americans. Consider these facts:

> Nine Americans in 10 say they have never doubted the existence of God. Eight Americans in 10 say they believe they will be called

before God on Judgment Day to answer for their actions, their words, their deeds. Eight Americans in 10 say they believe God still works miracles, and he does.

One sits right over there in the chair. Here sits some up here. These are miracles. There are literally millions of things that could have happened to each of us, and we would never have been born or in being born we would have been confronted with many health problems. There are miracles every day.

Seven Americans in 10 believe in life after death. I do, and I daresay most, if not all, of the people in this Chamber do believe there is a life after death. What would there be to live for otherwise? Oh, you may laugh now, but wait until you are 82, as I am, and well on your way to 83. To what do you have to look forward to each day of your life which is fast ebbing? Yes, you will change your mind then.

How can the beliefs of such sizable sections of the American population totally escape the attention of politicians and educators? They are all going to die, too. Every one of them, and they are going to have to go out and meet God in eternity, which is a long, long, long time.

How could these statistics escape the nine members of the Supreme Court of the United States? Does the answer lie in the elitism that so permeates this arrogant capital city? Does theology tend to thin out as one gravitates toward the top of the socioeconomic scale, rather like the thinner air at the top of some elevated peak? Are we, indeed, witnessing the writing of a new ''Tale of Two Cities'' as we watch public policy diverge ever more dramatically from the views of the people and the plain-as-day record of our own documented history?

Power unchecked by moral insight, teaching untempered by spiritual values, government unenlightened by faith in a Creator—no city and no nation can sustain such a course. While we may distract ourselves for a time with the affluence that a booming economy provides, eventually there is a kind of nihilism in a society whose God is materialism—whose only God is materialism.

Look carefully around you at the culture of America today. Just stop and think for a moment. You do not even have to look around you. Stop and think for a moment about the culture of this country today. Note the banality of most public discourse, the lack of respect for authority, the absence of common civility, the crudeness of popular entertainment, the glorification of violence.

There is no map, there is no compass, there is no vision, and ''Where there is no vision, the people perish.''

Mr. President, the very first sentence of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States—here is the Constitution; so small that it fits into a shirt pocket—the very first sentence of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States reads as follows: ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . .'' It seems to me that the U.S. Supreme Court, over the years, in its rulings on school prayer over the last 40 years has bent over backwards to enforce the first clause in that amendment dealing with an establishment of religion, but the Court has seemingly exhibited a strong bias against the equally important—the equally important—second part of the sentence. That sentence has two parts. And the second part is, I quote: ''. . . or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . .''

In ruling after ruling, over the past 40 years the Court seems to be going farther and farther in the direction of prohibiting the free exercise of religion. In precedent after precedent, the Court, often by slim majorities, has seemed bent upon totally eradicating any semblance whatsoever of religious speech in our public schools, even when such speech is not in any way, shape, or form connected with an ''establishment'' of religion.

When I read the first amendment clause dealing with freedom of religion, the words of the amendment seem to strike a balance between an establishment of religion, on the one hand, and the free exercise of religion, on the other. But the Court seems determined to completely ignore, and thus obliterate, any right to a free exercise of religion in the public schools. No wonder many people take their children out of the public schools. I believe that the framers of the United States Constitution—yea, the founders of this Republic itself—would be appalled. Can you imagine what the founders—the framers, the people who framed the Constitution, the people who voted on the ratification of the Constitution—how they would feel? I believe they would be appalled at the Court's apparent drift over the last 40 years toward total secularism and away from any modicum of voluntary religious expression in the public schools of this country.

Now let us briefly reflect upon the impact of religion on the development of American constitutionalism. Let's go back. Let's go back over the decades, yea, even over the centuries, and reflect upon the impact of religion on the development of American constitutionalism. We will find that the roots of religion run deep. As one scholar, Donald S. Lutz, has noted—this is what he says—''The political covenants written by English colonists in America lead us to the church covenants written by Protestants in the late 1500's and early 1600's and these, in turn, lead us back to the Covenant tradition of the Old Testament.'' That is what he said. The American constitutional tradition derives in much of its form and content from the Judeo-Christian tradition—we can't avoid it; it is there; nothing can erase it; you can take all the history books out of the schools that you want, but the fact remains that it is still there—the Judeo-Christian tradition as interpreted by the radical Protestant sects to which belonged so many of the original European settlers in British North America.

Lutz, in his work, entitled, ''The Origins of American Constitutionalism,'' says this: ''The tribes of Israel shared a covenant that made them a nation. American federalism originated at least in part in the dissenting Protestants' familiarity with the Bible''.

The early Calvinist settlers who came to this country from the Old World brought with them a familiarity with the Old Testament Covenants that made them especially apt in the formation of colonial documents and State constitutions.

Now, let me refer to Winton U. Solberg. He tells us that in 17th century colonial thought, divine law—a fusion of the law of nature in the Old and New Testaments—usually stood as fundamental law. The Mayflower Compact—how many of us like to claim that our forebearers were on the Mayflower? ''Oh, they were there. They were on the Mayflower.'' Well, there was such a thing written as the Mayflower Compact.

The Mayflower Compact exemplifies the doctrine of covenant or contract. Puritanism exalted the biblical component and drew on certain scriptural passages for a theological outlook. Called the Covenant or Federal Theology, this was a theory of contract regarding man's relations with God and the nature of church and state.

If we examine the public political literature written between 1760 and 1805, the book most frequently cited in that literature is the Bible.

Let me say that again. If we examine the public political literature written between 1760 and 1805, the book most frequently cited in that literature is the Bible.

Saint Paul, the great apostle, is cited about as frequently as Montesquieu and Blackstone, the two most cited secular authors. Deuteronomy is cited almost twice as often as all of Locke's writings put together.

Many of the references to the Bible came from reprinted sermons, while other citations came from secular works. Saint Paul was the favorite in the New Testament, especially his Epistle to the Romans, in which he discusses the basis for, and limits on, obedience to political authorities. From the Old Testament, Deuteronomy was the most cited book, followed by Isaiah, Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus. The authors most frequently referred to the sections about covenants and God's promises to Israel.

The movement towards independence found the clergy out in front—the movement toward independence in this country found the clergy out in front, not back in the closet; out in front—and the clergy were also most vigorous in maintaining morale during the Revolutionary War. When reading comprehensively in the political literature

of the war years, one cannot but be struck by the extent to which biblical sources used by ministers and traditional Whigs undergirded the justification for the break with Great Britain, the rationale for continuing the war, and the basic principles of Americans writing their own Constitutions at the State level.

Let us look at the Mayflower Compact, of November 11, 1620. Here is what they wrote:

> In the name of God, Amen. We, whose names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign Lord, King James, by the grace of God, . . . having undertaken, for the glory of God, and advancement of the Christian faith, . . . by these presents solemnly and mutually in the presence of God, and of one another, covenant and combine ourselves together into a civil body politick, for our better ordering and preservation and furtherance of the ends aforesaid; and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, Constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most . . . convenient for the general good of the colony unto which we promise all due submission and obedience. . . .

That was the Mayflower Compact. The authors of the Mayflower Compact had no hesitation about mentioning God, no hesitation about placing their lives in his hands and saying so. Now let us examine briefly ''The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut.'' Here we will find many references to the Deity, in these orders which were adopted by a popular Convention of the three towns of Windsor, Hartford, and Wethersfield, on January 14, 1639, 361 years ago. The form, according to historians, was ''the first written Constitution, in the modern sense of the term, as a permanent limitation on governmental power, known in history, and certainly the first American Constitution of government to embody the Democratic idea.''

I shall quote the following references to the Deity from The Fundamental Orders of Connecticut: Forasmuch as it hath pleased the Almighty God by the wise disposition of his divine providence . . .''; ''and well knowing where a people are gathered together the word of God requires that to maintain the peace and union of such a people, there should be an orderly and decent government established according to God, . . .''; ''. . . to maintain and preserve the liberty and purity of the Gospel of our Lord Jesus which we now profess, . . .''; ''. . . do swear by the great and dreadful name of the everlasting God, . . .''; ''. . . so help me God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ . . .''; ''. . . according to the righteous rule of God's word; so help me God, and so forth.''

Now let us look at the opening words of the treaty with Great Britain in 1783, 217 years ago, providing for the complete independence of the American states and acknowledgment by Great Britain: ''In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity. It having pleased the Divine Providence to dispose the hearts of the most serene and most potent Prince George III, by the grace of God. . . .''

The foregoing extracts, and others, from American historical documents are sufficient to impress us with the fact that religious conviction permeated the blood stream of American Constitutionalism and American statecraft as far back as 200 years prior to the writing of the Constitution in 1787.

Now let us examine the first inaugural address of George Washington, 1789, who had been chairman of the convention which framed the Constitution. Here is the greatest President we have ever had. A few extracts therefrom will leave no doubt as to where the Nation's first President stood when it came to religious expression in matters pertaining to Government: ''. . . it would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the Universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to His charge. In tendering this homage to the great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own; nor those of my fellow citizens at large less than either. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than the people of the United States. Every step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency.''

That is George Washington, the father of our country, the commander in chief at Valley Forge, the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention, first President of the United States and the best by any measure, by any standard. He had no hesitancy in speaking of that invisible hand that guides the Nation. If he were alive today and a Member of this Senate or a Member of the Supreme Court or President of the United States again. How clear, how incisive, and how powerful were these allusions to God by our first and greatest President!

Further expressions by George Washington in that same inaugural address were indicative of an unabashed religious faith:

> Since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which heaven itself has ordained; . . .; I shall take my present leave, but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the human race, in humble supplication, that, since He has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquility . . . .; . . . so His divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperament consultations and the wise measures, on which the success of this government must depend.

There you have it.

Having quoted from Washington's first inaugural address, now let me quote briefly from Lincoln's first inaugural address—no hesitation here about calling upon—no hesitancy here about calling upon the Creator: ''If the Almighty Ruler of Nations—he is not talking about King George III—with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people . . . .; Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty.''

Issuing the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863, Lincoln closed his remarks with these words: ''And upon this act, sincerely believed to be an act of justice, warranted by the Constitution, upon military necessity, I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.'' That is Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln, in his second inaugural address, rises to a rare pitch of eloquence, marked by a singular combination of tenderness and determination:

> If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which, in the providence of God, must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove, and that He gives to both North and South this terrible war, as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him? Fondly do we hope—fervently do we pray—that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet, if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk, and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with a sword, as was said three thousand years ago, so still it must be said: ''The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether.''

Now hear that, Supreme Court of the United States. Hear those words by Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln then went on to say those words with which we all are so familiar: ''With malice towards none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.''

How can one read and reflect upon these clear and unrestrained references to Almighty God expressed by our nation's two greatest Presidents—Washington and Lincoln—and hold any doubt whatsoever as to the impact of religion upon the thoughts, the character, and the lives of the two greatest statesmen America has ever produced?

And yet, the Supreme Court in recent years, in majority opinions, has not scrupled to bow to materialism in the Court's rulings concerning voluntary prayer in public school settings!

A further examination of the inaugural addresses of the Presidents finds John Adams, the second President, closing his inaugural address with the following invocation:

And may that Being who is supreme over all, the Patron of Order, the Fountain of Justice, and the Protector in all ages of the world of virtuous liberty, continue His blessing upon this nation and its government and give it all possible success and duration consistent with the ends of His providence.

Thomas Jefferson's closing words in his second inaugural address were these:

I shall need, too, the favor of that Being in whose hands we are, who led our fathers, as Israel of old, from their native land and planted them in a country flowing with all the necessaries and comforts of life; who has covered our infancy with His providence and our riper years with His wisdom and power, and to whose goodness I ask you to join in supplications with me that He will so enlighten the minds of your servants, guide their councils, and prosper their measures that whatsoever they do shall result in your good, and shall secure to you the peace, friendship, and approbation of all nations.

James Madison, the chief author of our Constitution, showed no hesitancy in expressing his dependence upon Providence:

My confidence will under every difficulty be best placed, next to that which we have all been encouraged to feel in the guardianship and guidance of that Almighty Being whose power regulates the destiny of nations, whose blessings have been so conspicuously dispensed to this rising Republic, and to whom we are bound to address our devout gratitude for the past, as well as our fervent supplications and best hopes for the future.

Having quoted from the inaugural addresses of our country's first four Presidents, I shall now recall to my fellow Senators references to God in the inaugural addresses of four Presidents in the current 20th century. I begin with William Howard Taft who, subsequent to having served as President, fulfilled a lifelong dream in 1921 when he was sworn in as Chief Justice of the United States. He ended his inaugural address with these words:

I invoke the considerate sympathy and support of my fellow citizens and the aid of the Almighty God in the discharge of my responsible duties.

Franklin D. Roosevelt refers to the Supreme Being in each of his inaugural addresses, but I shall quote only from the fourth and last:

The Almighty God has blessed our land in many ways. He has given our people stout hearts and strong arms with which to strike mighty blows for freedom and truth. He has given to our country a faith which has become the hope of all peoples in an anguished world.

So we pray to Him now for the vision to see our way clearly—to see the way that leads to a better life for ourselves and for all our fellow men—to the achievement of His will, to peace on earth.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had been Supreme Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during World War II, and had served as Supreme Commander of NATO, took the oath of office as President using both George Washington's Bible and one given to him by his mother at his graduation from the Military Academy at West Point.

Many of us remember his prayer at the beginning of his first inaugural address:

Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment my future associates in the executive branch of government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng, and their fellow citizens everywhere.

Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby, and by the laws of this land. Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people regardless of station, race, or calling.

May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political faiths; so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and Thy glory. Amen.

Dwight D. Eisenhower led the Nation in prayer himself.

Eisenhower's was the first prayer to be uttered by a President in his inaugural address to the nation, but it was not to be the last. President Reagan, in his second inaugural address, began his inaugural address with a silent prayer:

I wonder if we could all join in a moment of silent prayer. [Moment of silent prayer.] Amen.

George Bush, after taking the oath with his hand placed on George Washington's Bible, began his presidency with a prayer:

And my first act as President is a prayer. I ask you to bow your heads:

Heavenly father, we bow our heads and thank You for Your love. Accept our thanks for the peace that yields this day and the shared faith that makes its continuance likely. Make us strong to do Your work, willing to heed and hear Your will, and write on our hearts these words: 'Use power to help people.' For we are given power not to advance our own purposes, nor to make a great show in the world, nor a name. There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people. Help us to remember it, Lord. Amen.

That was George Bush.

I have a reason for quoting from these great American documents and for these inaugural and other addresses by some of our Presidents. There have been other Presidents whom I could have quoted.

All of these references to religious faith that I have quoted from early American documents and from inaugural addresses by Presidents bear witness to the fact that a strong spiritual consciousness has pervaded the fabric of American statecraft and American Constitutionalism for two centuries prior to the writing of the U.S. Constitution and for these two centuries following that event.

Mr. President, the Framers of the Constitution, the voters who ratified that Constitution, the members of the First Congress who supported the first amendment to the Constitution, and the people in the states who ratified the First Amendment, would be aghast at the interpretations of the First Amendment clause by U.S. Supreme Court rulings concerning prayer in the public schools of America. I say that those rulings are having the effect of ''prohibiting the free exercise'' of religion. The court has drifted too far from the shore.

I lauded the six members of the Supreme Court whose votes declared the Line Item Veto Act of 1995 to be unconstitutional. But the Court's majority has adopted a dangerous trend in case after case concerning the free exercise of religion in the public schools. The situation has become so bad that most school boards frown upon the use of God's name by teachers or students for fear of being hit with a costly law suit. I have had that happen right in West Virginia, and just within the last year. Consequently, God is being driven out of the public schools completely. I shudder to think that what we put into the schools will, in a generation, dominate the nation, and what we drop from the schools will, in a generation, leave the nation. Can it be said, therefore, that the U.S. Supreme Court is heading us down the road to becoming a godless nation?

The opponents of voluntary prayer in schools are quick to say that the place for prayer is in the home—and it is—and not in the schoolroom. This argument portrays an amazing ignorance of the religious awareness that has been the underpinning of our Republic from its earliest beginnings. Prayer in the public schools was prevalent in our country until the courts began to whittle away at this tradition in recent years. So, we are told that there is no place for God in the schoolroom.

It must be confusing to the child who is taught by parents at bedtime to repeat the words: ''Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep; if I should die before I wake, I pray the Lord my soul to take'', but if the same child mentions the Lord's name in school, the teacher feels it necessary to say ''shuh, we must not mention the Lord's name in school.''

At home and at the breakfast table, America's children are taught to say: ''God is great, God is good, and we thank Him for this food; by His goodness all are fed, give us Lord our daily bread,'' but in the schoolroom at lunchtime, the children must not say grace over the food. That might offend someone. Hence, the home and the school are at war with each other today.

I wonder if the high court is aware of the chaos that it is creating in the schools of the country? School administrators are caught in a bind. I wonder if the court is aware of the harm that it is doing to the nation when it strongly enforces the first half of the religious clause while it shows a dangerous bias against the second half of the same clause? Isn't it about time that the Supreme Court demonstrates an equal balance in its interpretation of the first sentence of the First

Amendment to the Constitution? It seems to me that the court is drifting farther and farther to the left of center in its drift towards materialism and radical secularism as its opinions serve more and more to inhibit any display of religious belief by the nation's school children. In an effort to ensure a tolerance for all beliefs, the courts are bending too far, in effect, establishing an environment of intolerance rather than tolerance.

Mr. President, we rail, and moan, and gnash our teeth, and wring our hands as we see more and more violence in our schools and a general decline in morals throughout the nation. Is it any wonder? Our nation's leaders are no longer paragons of rectitude. Don't point to them as being the idols of our youth. The institution of marriage is crumbling; the church, more and more, refrains from speaking out boldly on the great moral issues of the day; and God is being driven from the classrooms of our nation's schools by the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions that favor secularism, materialism, and the stifling of any voluntary and free exercise of religion in the public schools. Is it any wonder that more and more parents are determined to send their children to private schools and to religious schools?

Mr. President, George Washington, the Father of our country, our first President, bequeathed to us a clear vision of the importance of religion to morality in our national life, when he said, in his farewell address to the nation in September, 1796: ''Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, George Washington said, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigations in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. It can't be done. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.'' I hope the Supreme Court will review those words by our first president, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

Mr. President, it is not an idle reflection if, while discussing the issue of prayer in the public schools, we contemplate the profundity of Benjamin Franklin's words to the Constitutional Convention on June 28, 1787, when he made a sobering suggestion that brought the assembly of doubting minds ''to a realization that destiny herself sat as guest and witness in this room.'' The weather had been hot, and the delegates to the Convention were tired and edgy. The debates were seemingly getting nowhere and a melancholy cloud seemed to hover over the Convention. Little progress was being made, and the prevailing winds were those of discouragement, dissension, and despair, when old Dr. Franklin, sitting with the famous double spectacles low on his nose, broke silence; he had said little during these past days. Addressing himself to George Washington in the chair, Franklin, according to Catherine Drinker Bowen, in her book, ''Miracle at Philadelphia,'' reminded the Convention how, at the beginning of the war with England, the Continental Congress had had prayers for Divine protection, and in this very room. ''Our prayers, Sir, were heard,'' said Franklin, ''and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a Superintending providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men.''

Bowen, in her magnificent story of the Constitutional Convention, goes on to say that on Dr. Franklin's manuscript of his little speech, ''the word God is twice underscored, perhaps as indication to the printer. But whether or no Franklin looked upon the Deity as worthy of three capital letters, his speech was timely.'' You will read this same speech in Madison's notes.

''If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground unseen by Him,'' Franklin continued, ''was it probable that an empire could arise without his aid? 'I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel.''' Franklin proposed that ''henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service.''

Roger Sherman at once seconded Franklin's motion. Incidentally, on yesterday, July 16, 1787, the convention adopted the great compromise, without which none of us would be here today. That compromise established two bodies in the legislative branch and provided that each State would be equal in this branch, that we would have votes in this branch. I won't go further, but you might recall it was only yesterday.

But Hamilton and several others, wrote Madison, feared that calling in a clergymen at so late a stage might lead the public to suspect dissensions in the Convention. Williamson of North Carolina made the frank statement that everyone knew the real reason for not engaging a chaplain: the Convention had no funds. Franklin's motion failed, though Randolph proposed that on the approaching Fourth of July, a sermon be preached at the request of the Convention and that thenceforth prayers be used. In any event, we can all learn a lesson from this episode: God was very much a part of national life at a time when the greatest document of its kind—the Constitution of the United States—was ever written, a time when it was being formed.

Mr. President, I close with words from the Bible, which Franklin aptly used in his speech: ''Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.''

It would be well, Mr. President, if this Biblical admonition were kept in mind as future cases concerning school prayer come before the courts of the land.

As a matter of fact, this admonition is one on which all three branches of government should reflect. We here in the legislative branch bear some responsibility. Here is where laws are made, and here is where some positive steps could originate on a path toward correcting a court imposed imbalance. The executive branch, too, could play some useful role in that regard. This being an election year, I urge that the Democratic and Republican political Conventions adopt planks—why not—in their respective platforms advocating a Constitutional amendment concerning prayer in schools. Both the Democratic and Republican nominees for President should be urged to support such an amendment.

Both nominees should be urged to speak out on this subject during the campaigns. I intend to urge that both nominees do that.

I thank all Senators and I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I see the distinguished Senator from Colorado is supposed to take over the time. I ask unanimous consent to be yielded 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee, has from 2 o'clock until 3 p.m.

Does the Senator from Colorado wish to respond to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLARD. I am willing to grant the Senator from South Carolina 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

THE DEBT AND TAX CUTS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in response to my amendment relative to eliminating the tax cut, I ask unanimous consent that my comments of

February 10, this year, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRAUD

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, if people back home only knew. This whole town is engaged in the biggest fraud. Tom Brokaw has written that the greatest generation suffered the Depression, won the war, and then came back to lead. They not only won the war but were conscientious about paying for that war and Korea and Vietnam. Lyndon Johnson balanced the budget in 1969.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the record of all the Presidents, since President Truman down through President Clinton, of the deficit and debt, the national debt, and interest costs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLLING'S BUDGET REALITIES

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays) (In billions)	Borrowed trust funds (billions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (billions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (billions)	National debt (billions)	Annual increases in spending for interest (billions)
Truman:						
1946	55.2	−5.0	−15.9	−10.9	271.0	.....
1947	34.5	−9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	.....
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	.....
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	−0.6	252.6	.....
1950	42.6	1.2	−3.1	−4.3	256.9	.....
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	.....
1952	67.7	2.3	−1.5	−3.8	259.1	.....
1953	76.1	0.4	−6.5	−6.9	266.0	.....
1954	70.9	3.6	−1.2	−4.8	270.8	.....
Eisenhower:						
1955	68.4	0.6	−3.0	−3.6	274.4	.....
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	.....
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	.....
1958	82.4	4.6	−2.8	−7.4	279.7	.....
1959	92.1	−5.0	−12.8	−7.8	287.5	.....
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	−3.0	290.5	.....
1961	97.7	−1.2	−3.3	−2.1	292.6	.....
1962	106.8	3.2	−7.1	−10.3	302.9	9.1
Kennedy:						
1963	111.3	2.6	−4.8	−7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	−0.1	−5.9	−5.8	316.1	10.7
Johnson:						
1965	118.2	4.8	−1.4	−6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	−3.7	−6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	−8.6	−11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	−25.2	−28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
1970	195.6	12.3	−2.8	−15.1	380.9	19.3
Nixon:						
1971	210.2	4.3	−23.0	−27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	−23.4	−27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	−14.9	−30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	−6.1	−17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	−53.2	−58.0	541.9	32.7
Ford:						
1976	371.8	13.4	−73.7	−87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	−53.7	−77.4	706.4	41.9
Carter:						
1978	458.7	11.0	−59.2	−70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	−40.7	−52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	−73.8	−79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	−79.0	−85.7	994.8	95.5
Reagan:						
1982	745.8	14.5	−128.0	−142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	−207.8	−234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	−185.4	−193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	−212.3	−252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.3	81.9	−221.2	−303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	−149.8	−225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	−155.2	−255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.2	114.2	−152.5	−266.7	2,868.3	240.9
Bush:						
1990	1,252.7	117.4	−221.2	−338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.5	−269.4	−391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	−290.4	−403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,408.2	94.3	−255.0	−349.3	4,351.4	292.5
Clinton:						
1994	1,460.6	89.2	−203.1	−292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,514.6	113.4	−163.9	−277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,453.1	153.5	−107.4	−260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.2	165.9	−21.9	−187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,651.4	179.0	70.0	−109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,704.5	250.5	122.7	−127.8	5,606.5	353.5
2000	1,769.0	234.5	176.0	−58.5	5,665.0	362.0
2001	1,839.0	262.0	177.0	−85.0	5,750.0	371.0

*Historical Tables, Budget of the US Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO'S 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, Lyndon Johnson balanced the budget in 1969. At that time, the national debt was $365 billion with an interest cost of only $16 billion. Now, under a new generation without the cost of a war, the debt has soared to $5.6 trillion with annual interest costs of $365 billion. That is right. We spend $1 billion a day for nothing. It does not buy any defense, any education, any health care, or highways. Astoundingly, since President Johnson balanced the budget, we have increased spending $349 billion for nothing.

Early each morning, the Federal Government goes down to the bank and borrows $1 billion and adds it to the national debt. We have not had a surplus for 30 years. Senator TRENT LOTT, commenting on President Clinton's State of the Union Address, said the talk cost $1 billion a minute. For an hour-and-a-half talk, that would be $90 billion a year. Governor George W. Bush's tax cut costs $90 billion a year. Together, that is $180 billion. Just think, we can pay for both the Democratic and Republican programs with the money we are spending on interest and still have $185 billion to pay down the national debt. Instead, the debt increases, interest costs increase, while all in town, all in the Congress, shout: Surplus, surplus, surplus.

Understand the game. Ever since President Johnson's balanced budget, the Government has spent more each year than it has taken in—a deficit. The average deficit for the past 30 years was $175 billion a year. This is with both Democratic and Republican Presidents and Democratic and Republican Congresses. Somebody wants to know why the economy is good? If you infuse $175 billion a year for some 30 years and do not pay for it, it ought to be good.

The trick to calling a deficit a surplus is to have the Government borrow from itself. The Federal Government, like an insurance company, has various funds held in reserve to pay benefits of the program—Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, civilian retirement, unemployment compensation,

highway funds, airport funds, railroad retirement funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a list of trust funds looted to balance this budget.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	1998	1999	2000
Social Security	730	855	1,009
Medicare:			
HI	118	154	176
SMI	40	27	34
Military Retirement	134	141	149
Civilian Retirement	461	492	522
Unemployment	71	77	85
Highway	18	28	31
Airport	9	12	13
Railroad Retirement	22	24	25
Other	53	59	62
Total	1,656	1,869	2,106

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, these funds are held in trust for the specific purpose for which the taxes are collected.

Under corporate law, it is a felony to pay off the company debt with the pension fund. But in Washington we pay down the public debt with trust funds, call it a surplus, and they give us the ''Good Government'' award.

To make it sound correct, we divide the debt in two: The public debt and the private debt. Of course, our Government is public, and the law treats the debt as public without separation. The separation allows Washington politicians to say: We have paid down the public debt and have a surplus. There is no mention, of course, that the Government debt is increased by the same amount that the public debt is decreased. It is like paying off your MasterCard with your Visa card and saying you do not owe anything. Dr. Dan Crippen, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, describes this as ''taking from one pocket and putting it in the other.''

For years we have been using the trust funds to report a unified budget and a unified deficit. This has led people to believe the Government was reporting net figures. It sounded authentic. But as the unified deficit appeared less and less, the national debt continued to increase. While the unified deficit in 1997 was $21.9 billion, the actual deficit was $187.8 billion. In 1998 the unified budget reported a surplus of $70 billion, but actually there was a deficit of $109 billion. In 1999 the ''unified surplus'' was $124 billion, but the actual deficit was $127.8 billion.

Now comes the Presidential campaign. Social Security is a hot topic. Both parties are shouting: Save Social Security. Social Security lockbox. The economy is humming, booming. With high employment, the Social Security revenues have increased. It appears that, separate from Social Security, there will be enough trust fund money to compute a surplus. We have reached the millennium—Utopia—enough money to report a surplus without spending Social Security.

Washington jargon now changes. Instead of a ''unified budget,'' the Government now reports an ''on-budget'' and an ''off-budget.'' This is so we can all call it an on-budget surplus, meaning without Social Security. But to call it an on-budget surplus, the Government spends $96 billion from the other trust funds.

We ended last year with a deficit of $128 billion—not a surplus. The President's budget just submitted shows an actual deficit each year for the next 5 years. Instead of paying down the debt, the President shows, on page 420 of his budget, the debt increasing from the year 2000 to the year 2013—$5.686 trillion to $6.815 trillion, an increase of $1.129 trillion.

They are all talking about paying off the debt by 2013, and the actual document they submit shows the debt increasing each year, and over that period an increase of over $1 trillion.

Each year, Congress spends more than the President's budgets. There is no chance of a surplus with both sides proposing to reduce revenues with a tax cut. But we have a sweetheart deal: The Republicans will call a deficit a surplus, so they can buy the vote with tax cuts; the Democrats will call the deficit a surplus, so they can buy the vote with increased spending. The worst abuse of campaign finance is using the Federal budget to buy votes.

Alan Greenspan could stop this. He could call a deficit a deficit. Instead, appearing before Congress in his confirmation hearing, Greenspan, talking of the Federal budget, stated: ''I would fear very much that these huge surpluses . . .'' and on and on. We are in real trouble when Greenspan calls huge deficits ''huge surpluses.'' Greenspan thinks his sole role is to protect the financial markets. He does not want the U.S. Government coming into the market borrowing billions to pay its deficit, crowding out private capital, and running up interest costs.

But Congress' job is to not only protect the financial markets but the overall economy. Our job, as the board of directors for the Federal Government, is to make sure the Government pays its bills. In short, our responsibility is to eliminate waste.

The biggest waste of all is to continue to run up the debt with devastating interest costs for nothing. In good times, the least we can do is put this Government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Greenspan's limp admonition to ''pay down the debt'' is just to cover his backside. He knows better. He should issue a clarion call to stop increasing the debt. While he is raising interest rates to cool the economy, he should categorically oppose tax cuts to stimulate it.

Our only hope is the free press. In the earliest days, Thomas Jefferson observed, given a choice between a free government and a free press, he would choose the latter. Jefferson believed strongly that with the press reporting the truth to the American people, the Government would stay free.

Our problem is that the press and media have joined the conspiracy to defraud. They complain lamely that the Federal budget process is too complicated, so they report ''surplus.'' Complicated it is. But as to being a deficit or a surplus is clear cut; it is not complicated at all. All you need to do is go to the Department of the Treasury's report on public debt. They report the growth in the national debt every day, every minute, on the Internet at ''www.publicdebt.treas.gov.''

In fact, there is a big illuminated billboard on Sixth Avenue in New York that reports the increase in the debt by the minute. At present, it shows that we are increasing the debt every minute by $894,000. Think of that—$894,000 a minute. Of course, increase the debt, and interest costs rise. Already, interest costs exceed the defense budget. Interest costs, like taxes, must be paid. Worse, while regular taxes support defense, and other programs, interest taxes support waste. Running a deficit of over $100 billion today, any tax cut amounts to an interest tax increase—an increase in waste.

If the American people realized what was going on, they would run us all out of town.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent the Public Debt to the Penny, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, dated as of last Friday, July 14, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUBLIC DEBT TO THE PENNY

Current:	
07/14/2000	$5,666,749,557,909.16
Current month:	Amount
07/13/2000	$5,666,740,403,750.26
07/12/2000	5,664,141,886,637.91
07/11/2000	5,665,065,032,353.04
07/10/2000	5,662,949,608,628.38
07/07/2000	5,664,950,120,488.65
07/06/2000	5,665,885,115,450.41
07/05/2000	5,663,895,163,292.22
07/03/2000	5,656,715,920,235.71
Prior months:	
06/30/2000	5,685,938,087,296.66
05/31/2000	5,647,169,888,532.25
04/28/2000	5,685,108,228,594.76
03/31/2000	5,773,391,634,682.91
02/29/2000	5,735,333,348,132.58
01/31/2000	5,711,285,168,951.46
12/31/1999	5,776,091,314,225.33
11/30/1999	5,693,600,157,029.08
10/29/1999	5,679,726,662,904.06
Prior fiscal years:	
09/30/1999	5,656,270,901,615.43
09/30/1998	5,526,193,008,897.62
09/30/1997	5,413,146,011,397.34
09/30/1996	5,224,810,939,135.73
09/29/1995	4,973,982,900,709.39
09/30/1994	4,692,749,910,013.32
09/30/1993	4,411,488,883,139.38
09/30/1992	4,064,620,655,521.66
09/30/1991	3,665,303,351,697.03
09/28/1990	3,233,313,451,777.25
09/29/1989	2,857,430,960,187.32
09/30/1988	2,602,337,712,041.16
09/30/1987	2,350,276,890,953.00

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I also ask unanimous consent that the public Interest Expense on the Public Debt Outstanding, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST EXPENSE ON THE PUBLIC DEBT OUTSTANDING

The monthly Interest Expense represents the interest expense on the *Public Debt Outstanding* as of each month end. The interest expense on the Public Debt includes interest for *Treasury notes and bonds*; foreign and domestic series certificates of indebtedness, notes and bonds; *Savings Bonds*; as well as Government Account Series (GAS), *State and Local Government series (SLGs)*, and other special purpose securities. Amortized discount or premium on bills, notes and bonds is also included in interest expense.

The fiscal year Interest Expense represents the total interest expense on the Public Debt Outstanding for a given fiscal year. This includes the months of October through September.

Fiscal year 2000:	Interest expense
June	$75,884,057,388.85
May	26,802,350,934.54
April	19,878,902,328.72
March	20,889,017,596.95
February	20,778,646,308.19
January	19,689,955,250.71
December	73,267,794,917.58
November	25,690,033,589.51
October	19,373,192,333.69
Fiscal year total	302,253,950,648.74
Available historical data—fiscal year end:	
1999	353,511,471,722.87
1998	363,823,722,920.26
1997	355,795,834,214.66
1996	343,955,076,695.15

1995	332,413,555,030.62
1994	296,277,764,246.26
1993	292,502,219,484.25
1992	292,361,073,070.74
1991	286,021,921,181.04
1990	264,852,544,615.90
1989	240,863,231,535.71
1988	214,145,028,847.73

E-mail your questions and comments about this page.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that table 23 of the midsession review by the President of the United States, dated June 26, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 23.—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND DEBT

[In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Financing:													
Unified surplus or deficit (−)	211	228	224	236	255	268	286	304	332	364	416	500	547
Off-budget surplus:													
Social Security solvency lock-box:													
Social Security solvency transfers	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	123	147
Other Social Security surplus (including Postal)	148	160	176	191	204	226	239	256	273	288	306	316	335
Medicare HI solvency lock-box:													
Medicare solvency transfers	.....	31	14	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9	21	40	2	4
Other Medicare HI surplus	24	29	33	39	40	41	47	46	48	51	57	58	60
On-budget surplus	39	9	1	6	10	1	1	1	2	4	14	1	1
Means of financing other than borrowing from the public:													
Premiums paid (−) on buybacks of Treasury securities	−5	−2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Changes in:													
Treasury operating cash balance	6	10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Checks outstanding, deposit funds, etc.	−4	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Seigniorage on coins	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Less: Equity purchases by Social Security trust fund	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	−63	−82
Less: Net financing disbursements:													
Direct loan financing accounts	−27	−14	−18	−17	−16	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15
Guaranteed loan financing accounts	.....	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
Total, means of financing other than borrowing from the public	−27	−3	−14	−14	−12	−11	−12	−11	−11	−11	−11	−74	−93
Total, repayment of debt held by the public	185	225	210	222	243	257	274	293	321	353	406	426	454
Change in debt held by the public	−184	−225	−210	−222	−243	−257	−274	−293	−321	−353	−406	−426	−454
Debt Subject to Statutory Limitation, End of Year:													
Debt issued by Treasury	5,529	5,683	5,748	5,809	5,861	5,921	5,982	6,040	6,094	6,146	6,189	6,240	6,525
Adjustment for Treasury debt not subject to limitation and agency debt subject to limitation	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15
Adjustment for discount and premium	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	2
Total, debt subject to statutory limitation	5,519	5,673	5,737	5,798	5,850	5,910	5,971	6,028	6,082	6,134	6,176	6,227	6,511
Debt Outstanding, End of Year:													
Gross Federal debt:													
Debt issued by Treasury	5,529	5,683	5,748	5,809	5,861	5,921	5,982	6,040	6,094	6,146	6,189	6,240	6,525
Debt issued by other agencies	28	28	27	26	24	22	21	19	19	19	18	18	18
Total, gross Federal debt	5,557	5,711	5,774	5,834	5,885	5,943	6,003	6,060	6,113	6,165	6,208	6,259	6,543
Held by:													
Debt securities held as assets by Government accounts	2,108	2,487	2,760	3,042	3,335	3,651	3,985	4,334	4,708	5,113	5,561	6,038	6,543
Social Security	1,005	1,165	1,341	1,532	1,737	1,963	2,201	2,457	2,729	3,014	3,318	3,692	4,090
Federal employee retirement	681	718	756	792	828	864	899	932	965	997	1,027	1,056	1,085
Other	422	604	663	718	770	823	885	944	1,014	1,102	1,216	1,290	1,368
Debt securities held as assets by the public	3,449	3,224	3,014	2,792	2,550	2,293	2,018	1,726	1,405	1,052	646	220	.....

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, right to the point. Surplus, surplus, everywhere man cries surplus—paraphrasing Patrick Henry. But there is no surplus.

I know not, of course, what others may say, but as for me, I want to pay down the debt rather than engage in this shabby charade. As a result, the only way to do that and pay down the debt is stop this sweetheart deal of giving a little on spending increases and giving a little again, of course, on tax cuts. We do not have a surplus to divide. That is the point of my particular amendment.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Colorado giving me these few moments, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Colorado.

ELIMINATING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to support eliminating the marriage penalty. I think it is timely that we have some votes scheduled this evening, I understand about 6:15 p.m. By eliminating the marriage penalty, we eliminate one of the most egregious examples of unfairness and complexity in the Tax Code to date. Another example of that would be the death tax or the inheritance tax. We dealt with that issue last week. I am extremely excited that it has passed the House, passed the Senate, and is now going on to the President for his signature.

Both these taxes are prominent concerns of my constituents, at a time when the tax burden is at record high levels in this country. When we are talking about eliminating the death tax, we are talking about the family business and what happens to a family business after an unexpected death without any estate planning, and how much the Government takes of that estate, forcing the sale. Many times it is a farm or a ranch that has been in the family for many, many generations.

When we talk about the marriage penalty—we are eliminating that unfair burden—we are talking about the family. We are talking about reducing the tax burden. We are talking about fairness and Tax Code simplification.

Just a brief description needs to be made of the marriage penalty. The marriage penalty exists when a married couple, filing a joint tax return, pays higher taxes than if the same couple were not married and were filing as individuals. The penalty varies, depending on the tax bracket in which the couple may find themselves. The example that has been used before is based on an assumption that both spouses are each holding down separate jobs, each earning about $30,000, in 1999. It is determined they would pay about $7,655 in Federal income taxes. If these two individuals were not married and both earned the same amount of money, and had each filed a single tax return, they would pay only $6,892 in combined tax liability. There is a $763 difference in tax liability. This is what we refer to when we talk about the marriage tax penalty.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, almost half of all married couples—it figures out to about 22 million—suffered from the marriage tax penalty last year. The average penalty paid by these couples was around $1,500. In the previous example, the marriage penalty was the result of a higher combined standard deduction for two workers filing as singles than for married couples, and the income tax bracket thresholds for married couples are less than twice the threshold for single taxpayers. We are trying to eliminate this problem.

The best illustration of the real tax burden faced by families is to compare today's tax burden of an average family with the tax burden of a family with average income of four decades ago. The total tax burden for the family today is 39 percent of its income. That is up from 18 percent in 1955. The Federal payroll taxes and State and local taxes have literally doubled the total tax burden faced by families. As a result, the middle-income family today has 25 percent less disposable income than a similar family in 1955.

The bill we have been working on in the Senate, and which many of us support, addresses the standard deduction problem I alluded to, and it increases the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly to twice the standard deduction for single taxpayers. According to the Subcommittee on Taxation, this provision provides tax relief to approximately 25 million couples filing joint returns. Hopefully, it can be made effective after December 31, 2000. That is what we are talking about in this particular marriage penalty relief bill.

It also raises the tax brackets. The bill expands, over a 6-year period—this is not happening all at once, it is gradually happening over a 6-year period—the 15-percent and 28-percent income tax brackets for a married couple filing a joint return to twice the size of the corresponding brackets for an individual filing a single return. This is a phase-in provision, ultimately providing relief to 21 million married couples, including 3 million senior citizens.

We also try to address the earned-income credit. This bill increases the beginning and the end of the phase out of the earned-income credit for couples filing a joint return. Currently, for a couple with two or more children, the earned-income credit begins phasing out at $12,690 and is eliminated for couples earning more than $31,152. Under this bill, the new range would be $2,500 higher. The maximum increase in the earned-income tax credit in this provision for an eligible couple is $526. As you recall, the earned-income tax credit was put in place to try to help low-income individuals so they would be encouraged to go out and get a job and to stay off welfare. Also, there is a provision preserving the family tax credits.

The bill permanently extends the current temporary exemption from the individual alternative minimum tax for family-related tax credits. This is so that, once you grant tax deductions and credits, the alternative minimum tax doesn't come in and take that all away.

One of the complaints I hear from my constituents is it seems as if Congress has been working on tax cuts, they pass tax cuts, they get signed by the President, but we don't seem to feel it when we are paying our taxes on April 15. One of the reasons that you do not feel it is because, in some cases, the alternative minimum tax kicks in, it takes effect, and that means the previous tax cuts that were applied to a particular taxpayer did not take effect because of the alternative minimum tax.

Members of the Democratic Party have thwarted passage of any kind of relief for marriage, as far as the Tax Code is concerned, since 1995. In 1995, we had the marriage tax penalty bill passed by the Congress, sent to the President, a Democratic President. He vetoed it. In 1999, we sent a bill to the Democratic President and he vetoed it. Earlier this year, in April, there was a Democratic filibuster that prevented a marriage penalty bill from moving forward. We need to pass and the President needs to sign a marriage tax penalty provision to give relief to married couples.

This year I have held town meetings in all 63 of Colorado's counties. At those meetings I heard from many of my constituents about how strongly they feel about tax relief. In Colorado, over 400,000 couples incur an additional tax burden simply because they are married.

I have some numbers here, numbers from the Congressional Budget Office. I find them very disturbing. Almost half of all married couples, the 22 million couples I mentioned earlier, suffered from the marriage penalty provisions last year.

Again, as in the rest of the country, many of these couples on average have suffered a $1,500 penalty where, if they had not been married, they would not have had to pay this amount.

Cumulatively, the marriage tax penalty increases the taxes on affected couples throughout the United States by about $32 billion per year. That is money that families could use toward their own needs, rather than Washington trying to set the priorities for American families.

This penalty is not a tax on the rich. The marriage tax penalty exists because of multiple tax brackets and the fact that the standard deductions for married couples are not twice those given to single people. This tax can be incurred by folks in every tax bracket. In fact, families with two wage earners are the hardest hit by the marriage penalty. There are more and more of these families in today's workforce. Many of these folks are in the lower to middle class—people working hard to provide for their children. Taxing these folks for being married is plain wrong.

Another one of the groups implicitly taxed under the marriage penalty is the working poor. The earned-income tax credit is an effective tool in helping these low-income workers, but the EITC is phased out more quickly for married couples than for individuals. So the families incur a greater tax burden simply for being married.

Some colleagues of mine call for more Government spending for education, health care, and housing. I believe if we simply allow the American family to keep more of their money, we permit them to better afford the things they need.

In this time of a historic budget surplus, we still have nearly record high taxation. Hard-working American families deserve to keep some of this money. It is theirs in the first place, and I see it as the responsibility of Congress to return some of this money to the people.

To permit the marriage tax penalty to continue is wrong. Allowing American families to keep this money is the right thing to do, and I believe it is time to do away with the marriage tax penalty.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act of 2000. This much-needed bill has had a long and difficult journey in getting to this point where we can pass it in the Senate. Passage will occur today; and, as we did in 1999, the Congress will send legislation to help married couples being hurt by marriage tax penalties to the President.

I congratulate my colleague, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH, for his very effective leadership on this issue. I realize that this matter has not been an easy one for Chairman ROTH this year, because he has been unfairly criticized by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for taking the approach on marriage tax penalty relief that is reflected in this bill. Let me explain.

The Senate last year, led by Chairman ROTH, passed a marriage penalty relief provision in the Taxpayer Refund Act, which used a different solution to the marriage penalty problem than the one included in the bill before us today. Last year's bill would have solved the marriage penalty problem by allowing married couples the option of filing as single taxpayers on a combined joint return. I supported that bill as did a majority of our colleagues. It was a good approach to solving a major tax problem for American families.

Last year's bill was effective in relieving the marriage penalty. However, it left untouched another glaring family tax problem that I will call the single-earner penalty. I would like to illustrate this with a hypothetical example of three Utah families.

Let's suppose we have three families, all neighbors living on the same street in Ogden, UT. These families are nearly identical, in that they each have three children and household incomes of $80,000 per year. The only differences in these three families are in the marital status of the parents and in who earns the income. In the first family, the Allen family, the parents are married and both work outside the home and earn $40,000 each for a total of $80,000. The second family, the Brown family, are also married but only the husband works outside the home, earning $80,000 per year. The third family, the Campbell-Clark family, are unmarried parents and each of them earns $40,000 per year for a total of $80,000.

As you can see from this chart, under current law, the Allen and the Brown families each pay about $9,200 in income tax each year. The Campbell-Clark family, however, because they can file as single taxpayers, pay only a combined $7,900. Because the Allens each earn one-half the family income, if they were to divorce and file as singles, they could reduce their combined

tax bill down to $7,900, the same as the Campbell-Clarks. Therefore, the Allens suffer a marriage penalty of about $1,300 each year.

The marriage penalty relief provision included in last year's tax bill would have eliminated this marriage penalty and reduced the tax bill of the Allen family down to the same level paid by the Campbell-Clarks. However, by doing so it would have left behind the Brown family, who would still be paying income taxes of $9,200 per year.

This is not fair. We must not, in the name of fairness, fix the marriage tax problems of one category of families, but not another category. It is true that the Browns do not suffer a marriage penalty, but why should they pay higher taxes simply because their family income is earned by one spouse and not two?

There are approximately 210,000 couples in my home state of Utah, who, like the Allens, suffer a marriage penalty. However, there are also about 108,000 couples in Utah who are like the Browns, and would be left behind by marriage tax relief like we passed in 1999.

This is why this year's marriage penalty bill is superior to last year's. The bill before us today lowers the tax burden of both the Allen family and the Brown family. It alleviates the marriage penalty and the one-earner penalty. It does not leave any family behind.

In essence, the Internal Revenue Code results in marriage tax penalties and bonuses because it pursues three conflicting ideals or principles—marriage neutrality, equal treatment of married couples with the same household income, and progressive taxation.

The ideal of marriage neutrality states that a couple's tax liability should not be determined based on their marital status. In other words, there should not be a tax incentive either to marry, to remain single, or to divorce. Under our example, current law does penalize the Allen family, because they would pay about $1,300 per year less if they were to divorce and live together. That is ridiculous. We want to encourage people to live together in marriage.

The equally important principle of equal treatment holds that married couples with equal incomes should pay the same amount in taxes without regard to how much each spouse contributes to the couple's income. Under this principle, the Allens and the Browns should pay the same tax since they are both married with identical family incomes. Currently, they do pay the same, but this principle would be violated if we did not also lower the Browns' tax while fixing the Allens' marriage penalty.

Progressive taxation is the principle that those with higher incomes should pay a higher percentage of their incomes in taxes than is required of those with lower incomes.

It is mathematically impossible for the Tax Code to achieve all three of these tax policy ideals simultaneously.

One of the three objectives must be sacrificed. If we continue to insist on a progressive tax system, we cannot solve both the marriage penalty and the one-earner penalty. Simply put, last year's marriage penalty relief provision did solve the marriage penalty, but it violated the one-earner penalty. The bill before us today does not totally solve the marriage penalty, but it greatly alleviates it for most families. And, it does not create a one-earner penalty. All in all, it represents the fairest approach for the most families in our country.

As long as we have a progressive tax system, we will never achieve total family tax fairness. Therefore, no marriage tax penalty bill will be perfect. While making tremendous progress toward marriage penalty relief for most families, the bill before us leaves some serious marriage penalties in place.

For example, the current-law student loan interest deduction provision penalizes married couples struggling to pay off student loans. In February, the Senate passed an amendment to the education tax bill that Senator MACK and I offered that would have eliminated this problem. I had hoped to add that provision to this bill, but it would not be germane under the reconciliation rules. I hope we can take care of that problem in another tax bill later this year.

President Clinton has given strong indications he will veto this bill because it gives tax relief to families who do not suffer from marriage penalties. This is a shortsighted point of view that ignores the structure of our tax system and the needs of American families.

In fact, it kind of makes me wonder whether President Clinton's real concern is the idea of cutting taxes. He has made no secret of his opposition to tax cuts. He has fought us every step of the way in our efforts to return a portion of the budget surplus to those hard-working Americans who produced it.

But, I will be very sorry if a Presidential veto denies American families even this tax cut which is not being made for its own sake, but rather to correct a longstanding inequity in the Tax Code.

I implore the President to reconsider that all American families need fair and substantial tax relief—those where both spouses work outside the home as well as those where one parent stays home. I hope he will sign this bill into law.

And, allow me to say just a word about parents who forego outside income to remain at home. Everyone in this body knows that I believe we must have adequate child care for those families who need it. I have worked with my Republican colleagues and my Democratic colleagues across the aisle on child care legislation. But, I cannot say emphatically enough that the best child care is still provided by a parent. I have yet to hear a single Senator disagree with that. Yet, our Tax Code penalizes a family in which one parent makes this choice to stay at home with their children.

I am glad that my wife stayed home with our children. She did work in the early years of our marriage as a grade school teacher, but she stayed home virtually all of the time our children were growing up, and I think it shows.

It is high time we fix this problem. It is high time we correct the marriage penalty for both the Allens and the Browns in Utah, and families like them all over the country. Today, we have the means to do it. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: There are no more excuses.

Again, I thank Chairman ROTH for his insight and leadership on this important issue, and I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this bill. I urge President Clinton to sign it.

One last thing, and that is, when you have a $4.3 trillion surplus in the budget, you know darn well somebody is being taxed too much. Why can't we at least solve these inequities that are literally calling out to us for a solution? Why can't we make it clear that being married should not be a disadvantage to couples? Why don't we make it clear that we are going to treat married couples just as well as those who live together and are not married, who don't pay as much in taxes today?

These three families illustrate this as well as I think we can illustrate it. Why should the Allen family and the Brown family pay $9,222, while the Campbell-Clark family, just because they live together—each of them single, and each of them earning $40,000—why should they get a tax bill of $1,300 less than the other two families?

I urge the President to sign this bill. I think it is the right thing to do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

PRAYERS AND THOUGHTS FOR SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before I deliver my remarks on the marriage tax penalty, for just a moment, let me say that our colleague, PAUL COVERDELL, is struggling at this moment. Our prayers and thoughts are with him and his wife Nancy as he struggles with his health in an Atlanta hospital. He is a champion of the issue of the marriage penalty tax relief.

MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX RELIEF

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, certainly, KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, our colleague from Texas, has led us on the issue of the marriage penalty tax. I think probably she has sensitized all of us to it as only a woman can. I mean that in the sense of understanding the true balance that ought to be in this Tax Code that isn't in the Tax Code. She has

been persistent with the Congress and with this Senate to assure that we develop a sense of equity and balance in the Tax Code that our marriage penalty tax relief legislation will offer.

Who pays the marriage penalty? In our country, about 22 million married couples do. They are not wealthy. They are modest- and middle-income families. In my State of Idaho, that is 129,710 families.

To really bring this home, if, from the time a couple marries, they were to put away, with interest, the difference in the disparity of taxes between $1,000 and $1,400 per year, on the average, for their first child, they could afford to pay 3 years of his or her education at a State institution in my State of Idaho. So it is significant. It is important. There is no question it would help, and can help, the American family.

The usual suspects out there who are opposed to this, I think, are using the most tired and sad arguments against tax relief. They simply are arguing from a position of the wrong facts. We have heard them whining about tax cuts and saying the tax cuts are for the rich and somehow you ought not give the rich any opportunity. Of course, in this instance they have simply missed the mark, and they know it. They know they are on the wrong side of this issue.

Tax relief, in the area of the marriage penalty tax, helps working families. It ends discrimination against married couples. It reduces the Tax Code's antifamily bias that no tax code should have in it. We have always said that the very foundation of our culture and our country is the family, and yet we take advantage of that union in the Tax Code by causing them to pay more in taxes.

Low- and middle-income married couples are the ones who truly are hurt by this penalty. On average, a married couple hit by the marriage penalty will pay about $1,400 more a year in taxes than two single persons at the same combined income. That is where the penalty rests.

In total, the marriage penalty overcharges couples in this country $32 billion a year, according to the Congressional Budget Office—that is right, $32 billion a year—that could stay out there with those young couples.

I use the example in my State of Idaho that if they simply put it in a bank, with interest, by the time their first child is old enough to go to college, they can afford his first or her first 3 years at a State institution in my State.

I think those who oppose marriage tax penalty relief oppose, frankly, all tax relief. The more they can get to spend on Government programs and Government solutions—and go home to their constituents and talk about what wonderful things Government is doing for them—somehow they think that most of our citizens are either undertaxed, and not giving enough to Government for all those wonderful solutions to their problems, or the current Tax Code is fair.

They are not worried about a Tax Code that charges a family an extra $1,400 or more, when a family certainly needs that additional income as they become a family unit. They are opposed to all tax relief. If you pay taxes, somehow, in this argument, you are rich; and the rich do not need the relief.

How many times have we heard that? At least I have heard it in the good number of years I have been in the Senate. Every time we talk about tax relief, somebody over there on the other side of the aisle says: Gee, those darn Republicans want to give that money back to the rich, and the rich don't need tax relief.

Low- and middle-income families do need tax relief. So the opposition on the other side always ponies up some kind of what I call tax-relief ''lite'' amendments to offer, so they can show some degree of compassion. Yet at the same time they offer nothing except a new Government program.

Let me break it down into the three most significant ways that the Tax Code extracts the marriage penalty for us to understand.

First of all, it is discrimination in the standard deduction area. About two-thirds of the taxpayers take the standard deduction. For a married couple, the standard deduction this year is $7,200. For two single taxpayers with the same combined income, it is $8,600. This is the first $392 of the marriage penalty. Lower and middle-income taxpayers are more likely to take the standard deduction than upper-income persons. Many middle-income families who itemize are still hurt by standard deduction discrimination because the amount of the standard deduction determines whether they itemize. In other words, one element triggers the other element in our Tax Code.

The Senate bill would provide relief to 25 million couples by making the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly equal to the standard deduction for two singles with the same combined income. That is a little complicated, but it is easy to understand that for those who take the standard deduction—and those tend to be the lower and middle-income families—the benefit is immediate and, as we have said, is approximately $1,400 a year.

The second area deals with discrimination in the earned-income tax credit area, the EITC. We are all familiar with the EITC. It is supposed to reward work, ease income tax and other tax burdens, and supplement incomes for low-income working families with children. It is astonishing, in a program designed to help lower income families, the phaseout schedule for EITC benefits again imposes an antimarriage, antifamily penalty. This is the very program Congress designed to help low-income families. Yet when we look inside the code, the way the IRS has interpreted it and administers it, there is an antimarriage, antifamily penalty. The Senate bill would begin addressing marriage penalty inequity in the EITC by first increasing the maximum credit by $526, starting the phaseout range $2,500 higher than it was at an income level just above $15,000.

The third area of discrimination is in the tax brackets. For the average couple paying a marriage penalty, bracket discrimination charges them another $1,000. Bracket discrimination usually takes the lower income earned by one spouse, which would be taxed in the 15-percent bracket if he or she were single, and taxes it at the other spouse's 28-percent rate. This devalues the spouse and the spouse's work that provides the second income for the family. Of course, in some instances, both spouses are professional and choose to seek their profession in the marketplace. In other marriages, one spouse simply wants to supplement the overall family income to broaden the ability of that family to earn, to save, to invest, and to provide for its children. In this instance, this particular structure of the Tax Code actually devalues the value of the income of that spouse who goes into the marketplace to earn additional income for the family.

For folks with modest means, this adds what we could easily call insult to the very injury that the Tax Code levees to the taxpayer. Time after time on this floor, we hear how many families are forced to earn a second income to make ends meet. Currently, the heavy hand of Government has the first claim on the second income. For anybody who would choose to vote against this particular provision, shame on them. Especially shame on them if they then turn around and argue that circumstances are so tough out there that every family needs two incomes. Let us work today to lessen that burden, to make it less tough, to give that family unit greater choices as to whether they both want to work in the marketplace or one would choose to stay home.

The Senate bill provides help for 21 million couples, including 3 million senior citizens, by expanding the 15-to-28 percent bracket for one couple to a range equal to that for two singles. In addition, this bill preserves the full effect of the family tax credits enacted in the 1997 Taxpayers Relief Act. We now find that particular provision taking effect. More and more middle-income families are slipping into the alternative minimum tax or the AMT. In fact, even some EITC families are now being affected by this. The AMT is already a dubious tax. It requires thousands of taxpayers to figure their returns according to two different tax systems. I don't think anyone really intended the AMT to apply and wipe out the family tax credits we enacted in 1997, including the $500-per-child tax credit, the HOPE education credit, the lifetime earnings credit, and the ongoing dependency care credit. It is time to cut back on the antifamily AMT, and that is exactly what this provision will do.

In conclusion, we want a Government that is truly profamily. Certainly all of us—and in a sincere way—want to make sure our laws are profamily. Yet those who will vote against the marriage tax penalty are talking about two different systems. They are being very inconsistent with honesty and integrity in debating this kind of an issue. You cannot talk profamily on one side of the issue and turn around and vote against this provision that we will be voting on on the floor this evening.

Our Tax Code says, unless we change it tonight, don't get married. And if you do, you are going to pay higher taxes. We say it is time we create equity in this equation. Our Tax Code says you will pay a penalty if both spouses work and you will be the most heavily taxed if your incomes are about equal. We say the best antipoverty program is a family and a job in America, or two jobs in America taxable at a lower rate, leaving more money inside the family unit to provide for that family and those portions of the American dream they seek to secure. We encourage our citizens to dream a better dream, of a fairer and freer society. Our Tax Code has a great deal to say about the size and the scope of their dreams.

I hope we will vote tonight to strike a blow for a profamily, pro-American, American-dream approach, not have the Tax Code constantly confusing the message and sending a negative signal. We are going to pass it, I do believe, and seize the opportunity.

In closing, I say to the President: Come on. Quit playing the political games you are playing right now. You have to have this new spending program and this new spending program with a multitrillion-dollar surplus. Give the highest taxed generation in history just a little break. When this bill gets to your desk, sign it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic side be permitted to reclaim the 15 minutes accorded to the other side of the aisle earlier today so that I may speak at this particular moment.

Mr. CRAIG. Reserving the right to object, and I will not, I ask unanimous consent that Senator COLLINS retain 15 minutes in morning business prior to the Interior bill following the comments of the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AMENDMENT ON THE MARRIAGE PENALTY RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment that I submitted on Friday to the marriage penalty bill, which the Senate will take up and vote on later today. My amendment, which is cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY, GRAHAM and BRYAN, follows up on a similar proposal I offered in April to the Senate budget resolution that would have required Congress to enact a new Medicare prescription drug benefit before considering any massive tax cuts. While a procedural hurdle prevented that amendment from passing, fifty-one senators voted to waive a budget point of order, indicating they favored it, and sending the American people a strong signal that a majority of the U.S. Senate thought we should put the needs of our nation's seniors before excessive tax cuts.

The majority, however, has moved in the opposite direction since then. This past Friday, we passed a large tax bill that would phase out the tax on the estates of those seniors who die, but did nothing to provide needed prescription drugs that can preserve the lives of those seniors who are living. Because I had cosponsored earlier legislation to ease the estate tax burden in order to preserve family farms and small businesses, I voted for this bill. Even though all of our Democratic amendments were defeated—and look forward to crafting more equitable legislation to address these same concerns after the President vetoes the bill we passed Friday.

The bill before the Senate now, however, is very different. Under the guise of eliminating the ''marriage penalty,'' the majority has brought a bill to the floor that would devote over half of its benefits to people who either aren't married, or who are actually receiving right now a tax benefit, or ''bonus,'' for being married. As I have stated previously, Mr. President, this takes a lot of chutzpah.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to eliminate the marriage penalty for those who actually suffer the marriage penalty and need the relief most. With all the rhetoric from the other side of the aisle about eliminating the marriage penalty, one might think that they'd share my view, and want to pass a bill that would actually focus on the penalty.

But a closer examination of the Republican bill reveals that it isn't quite what it's described to be. Mr. President, there are in fact 65 provisions in the current tax code that contain a marriage penalty, including Social Security. The bill reported from the Finance Committee on a straight party-line vote takes care of one marriage penalty provision completely and two others partially, and leaves the other 62 marriage penalties untouched. The Democratic bill addresses all 65 provisions, and takes care of the entire penalty for almost everyone.

Mr. President, it's time that we set our priorities straight. We ought not to be devoting billions of dollars of the surplus to individuals who currently suffer no marriage penalty whatever when we've done nothing to help those that suffer from the ''senior citizens' drug penalty''—the high prices our nation's seniors are forced to pay for prescription drugs.

The amendment that I've offered would force Congress to address these priorities. It simply says that the tax bill before the Senate today won't take effect until Congress has also fulfilled its responsibility to enact a meaningful Medicare prescription drug benefit. My amendment won't prevent Congress from enacting marriage penalty relief this year, nor will it keep a single married couple from enjoying the tax benefits in this bill. What it will do is ensure that we don't backtrack from the Senate's vote to enact a prescription drug benefit before we do major tax cuts.

Let me say, Mr. President, that this isn't just rhetoric. The problems faced by our nation's seniors in affording prescription drugs are immediate and real. I'd like to remind the Senate of a story I heard from a physician in my state recently about a patient who was splitting her doses of Tamoxifin—a breast cancer drug—with two of her friends who also had breast cancer, but couldn't afford the medication. As a result, all three women had inadequate doses of the medication.

Or consider the story of a disabled father of three from Pennington Gap, Virginia, who broke his neck several years ago, and went from making $50,000 a year to $800 a month in disability benefits. While he qualifies for Medicare, he's forced to choose each month between spending nearly half of his disability benefit on prescription drugs, or helping out his family, because Medicare offers no coverage for his medications.

These Virginians are not alone in their troubles. The average Medicare beneficiary will spend $1100 on prescription drugs this year. Most of them won't have adequate prescription drug coverage to help them cover these crushing costs. And the numbers of those that do have coverage are dropping rapidly.

Despite the suggestions of some of my colleagues, this problem isn't limited solely to the poor. One in four Medicare beneficiaries with a high income—defined as $45,000 a year for a couple—has no coverage for prescription drugs. And while some seniors do have coverage, nearly half of them lack coverage for the entire year, making them extremely vulnerable to catastrophic drug costs.

Complicating this matter for the elderly is the ''senior citizens' drug penalty'' that seniors without drug coverage are forced to pay. Most working Americans who are insured through the private sector pay less than the full retail price for prescription drugs. This is because insurers generally contract with private sector entities that negotiate better prices for drugs, and pass on the power of group purchasing to their customers.

Seniors lack this option, however, and must still pay full price for their drugs. One recent study showed that seniors without drug coverage typically pay 15 percent more than people

with coverage. And the percentage of Medicare beneficiaries without drug coverage who report not being able to afford a needed drug is about 5 times higher than those with coverage.

This ''senior citizens' drug penalty,'' in my view, is unconscionable. Senior citizens are more reliant on drugs, and have higher drug costs, than any other segment of the population. They deserve to have the same bargaining power that benefits other Americans.

Mr. President, in April, the other side spoke against my budget amendment, claiming that there was already adequate language in the Republican budget resolution to ensure that we pass a prescription drug benefit this year. At the time, they pointed to the $40 billion reserve fund which was included in the budget resolution that the Committee had reported, arguing that this would provide ample money to enact a prescription drug benefit and offer tax relief.

Republicans asked, in essence, that we trust them that the Senate won't put tax cuts before our nation's seniors. Let me say that I do trust my good friends on the other side of the aisle. But to borrow a line from Ronald Reagan, I believe we should trust—but verify. That requires deeds as well as words.

Mr. President, our nation's seniors deserve better than this. In April, at least fifty-one senators felt the same way. I urge every one of them, as well as senators who opposed my amendment then because they thought the $40 billion reserve fund would guarantee a prescription drug benefit, to support my amendment now. With its passage, we'll be able to eliminate both the true ''marriage penalty'' and the ''senior citizens' drug penalty.''

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. I believe under the previous order I will be recognized to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONCERN FOR SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to express the sorrow that is in my heart, and I know in the hearts of all of my colleagues and, indeed, everybody who works in the Senate, about the sad news of the unexpected ill health of our friend and colleague, Senator PAUL COVERDELL of Georgia. My heart and my prayers go out to him, his family, his staff, his constituents, and all of the many people who care so much about our good friend. He will be in our hearts and in our prayers. I know I speak for all of my colleagues when I wish him a speedy recovery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. CRAIG pertaining to the introduction of S. 2879 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4578, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we are now back for the final 3 and one-quarter hours of debate on amendments to the Interior appropriations bill. Any Member who reserved an amendment to that bill may present it between now and 6:15 this evening, at which time, by unanimous consent, we go to the marriage penalty bill for what may be an extended series of votes. Any of the amendments reserved on the Interior bill will be voted on, if, in fact, the vote is necessary, tomorrow morning.

I list 12 amendments that were reserved for debate during this period of time. I am informed by staff that we have settled 4 of them. That leaves eight amendments: two by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN; one by the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER; one by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. BRYAN; one by the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN; one by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. NICKLES; one by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED; one by the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

Curiously enough, most of these Senators who have said they will be here from between 5 o'clock and 6 o'clock p.m., which takes a considerable portion of the debate time, are away. I think some of those eight amendments I have listed will themselves be settled without debate or by agreement. If any of the seven Senators whose names I have just mentioned are within hearing and sight of this debate, I urge that Senator to reach the Senate floor promptly. At this point they have a real opportunity to present their amendments. Later on, they are likely to be very constricted as to time.

Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, as we debate this bill to provide funding for the Department of the Interior in the next fiscal year, I would like to discuss an issue that is of increasing concern to me: our underinvestment in our national parks.

There are 379 national parks in the United States and U.S. territories, covering over 80 million acres. These parks provide Americans with an opportunity to enjoy activities such as hiking, camping, white water rafting, or horseback riding in some of the most beautiful sites in the world. The Great Smoky Mountains National Park in my home State of Tennessee is often referred to as the crown jewel of the national park system, and for good reason.

But one can't help but be concerned about what is happening in our parks today. I have seen first hand the problems associated with air pollution, traffic congestion, and invasive species in our parks. Folks come to the Smokies to escape the big city and breathe the clean mountain air. Unfortunately, there are too many days now when the air quality in the Smokies is worse than in major cities. Already this year, the park has recorded 13 days with unhealthy ozone levels. Who would believe that visiting a national park could be hazardous to your health?

Air pollution is also diminishing the experience of visitors in the park. People visit the Smokies for the magnificent mountain vistas. Unfortunately, the pollution reduces their visibility not only by affecting how far they can see from a scenic overlook, but also how well they can see. Ground level ozone washes out the bright colors of the leaves in the fall and the flowers in the spring. These air quality problems have landed the Great Smoky Mountains National Park on the list of 10 most endangered national parks compiled by the National Parks and Conservation Association.

Another major threat facing many of our national parks, including the Smokies, is damage from invasive species. Organisms that are not native to parks are finding their way in and are killing wildlife. Virtually all of the frasier firs on top of Klingman's Dome in the Smokies are dead. At first glance, it would appear that they were killed by fire, but that is not the case. These trees were killed by the balsam woolly adelgid which is not native to the Smokies and has no natural predator there.

These and similar problems afflict our entire national park system. That is why I'm pleased that the appropriations bill before us today recognizes these serious threats by providing $11 million for the National Park Service's Natural Resource Challenge. This money will help fund air and water quality studies in our parks. It will also fund efforts to address the problems caused by non-native invasive

species. I thank the Senators from Washington and West Virginia for their attention to these needs. I especially thank Senator GORTON for his leadership as chairman of this very important subcommittee.

I am also growing increasingly concerned that our national parks are showing the wear and tear of neglect. Each year our parks are host to more and more visitors. In 1998, almost 300 million people visited our national parks. Ten million of those visitors went to the Smokies, making it the most visited national park in the country. That is more visitors than the Grand Canyon and Yosemite combined—which rank second and third in terms of park visitation.

We in Tennessee and North Carolina welcome these visitors to our beautiful mountains. National parks are here to be used and enjoyed. But our parks are laboring under their popularity. One might say our parks are being loved to death. We must face up to the stresses to infrastructure that result from increased visitation. More visitors cause more wear and tear on the trails, campgrounds, and roads. Growing visitation also requires higher staffing levels in the parks since more visitors mean more stranded hikers that need to be rescued, more comfort stations that need to be cleaned, and more trash that needs to be picked up.

Unfortuantely, park budgets have not kept pace with increases in visitation. The National Park Service estimates that there is currently a $4.3 million maintenance backlog. Park Service staff are struggling to do more with fewer resources.

Fortunately, they have been able to rely on a number of organizations for help such as friends groups, the National Park Foundation and other cooperating associations. These organizations raise money to fund maintenance and educational projects within the parks.

I am proud that the Friends of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park is held up as the model friends group for the country. Over the last 7 years, the Friends of the Smokies has raised $6 million—$1.5 million last year alone. This money has come from donation boxes in the park, license plate sales, telethons and direct contributions. And, it is used for a variety of projects. For example, the Friends just produced a new orientation film to welcome park visitors. The Friends funded the restoration of the historic Mount Cammerer Fire Tower. And, the Friends help organize and manage volunteer projects in the park. When a team of volunteers goes out to work on a trail, it's the Friends of the Smokies that buys the materials needed to do the job. The hard work and generosity on the part of the Friends of the Smokies is critical to assisting the Park Service officials maintain our valuable natural resource.

Just as important as the financial contributions to our national parks are the generous donations of time. This year alone, volunteers will donate almost 75,000 hours valued at $1.1 million to run the visitor centers and help maintain trails and campgrounds in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Because the Smokies was a gift from the residents of Tennessee and North Carolina to the Federal Government, citizens living near the park have a strong sense of ownership. They want to volunteer to take care of their park.

Several years ago, Congress also recognized the need to increase resources to our national park system, and we passed legislation to provide the Park Service with new sources of funding for maintenance projects. This new law allows national parks to retain most of the entrance and other fees they may charge, and use that money for visitor services. Fee revenue can be used to fund maintenance projects or to pay seasonal employees, but it cannot be used to fund basic operations. This year, Smokies' fees will generate $1.9 million over and above the park's $13.2 million annual appropriated budget.

Fee revenue, volunteer hours, and donations are critical to keeping our parks running, but they are just not enough. Without an adequate operations budget and enough permanent full-time staff, the Park Service lacks the capability to handle the generosity of groups like the Friends of the Smokies.

Again, I compliment my colleagues from Washington and West Virginia for recognizing the most pressing needs of our national park system by providing a substantial increase in the Park Service's basic operations budget in this bill. The bill before us includes over $1.4 billion for the National Park Service. That's an increase of more than $80 million over FY 2000.

But as impressive a job as the managers have done here today, I'm sure they would both agree with me when I say that Congress still must do better for our national parks. I believe that the Federal Government has a fundamental responsibility to ensure the protection of these natural resources for the enjoyment of both the current and future generations. But we are not meeting that responsibility fully. We must provide our park officials with adequate resources to maintain the trails and campgrounds. We must give them better tools to combat threats like air pollution.

As Congress debates what to do with the projected budget surplus, I think we should start by determining whether government is meeting its fundamental responsibilities now. If we see that we are neglecting certain responsibilities, then we need to make fulfilling those obligations a priority.

I believe that increasing our investment in our national parks is a priority. I intend to work closely with my colleagues in the years to come to ensure that Congress provides the funding necessary to protect our precious natural resources for the enjoyment of my grandchildren and their grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Madam President, before my friend leaves the floor, I want to tell him how very much I appreciate his statement. In years past, I offered amendments when we did not have a budget surplus to increase funding for our park system. I hope next year we can work together in a bipartisan fashion to increase significantly the funding for our National Park System.

I have not had the good fortune to be in the park to which the Senator referred, the Great Smoky Mountain National Park, but I have been to a number of national parks. For example, the living conditions our park rangers have to put up with in our national parks is a disgrace. My colleague should see what park rangers live in at the Grand Canyon National Park. They are from World War II. They look like icehouses; they are square. It is disgraceful.

We only have one national park in Nevada. It is one of the newer ones, so I really do not have the right to complain as many do, but we have so many things that need to be done there. We do not have a visitors center. Interpretive trails have not been built. There are parts of our great National Park System that we have closed as a result of dangerous conditions. The Park Service simply does not have the resources to keep up.

I commend and applaud my friend from Tennessee. He has given a great statement. I look forward to next year. Perhaps we can work together to come up with a funding formula that would be permanent in nature to take care of the $5 billion backlog in our National Park System.

Mr. THOMPSON. Madam President, I thank my friend from Nevada for those comments. This is something upon which I believe we can all agree. Even those who view the role of Government to be a limited one must agree that there are certain basic obligations and functions the Federal Government has. Of course, national defense is one of them; infrastructure is one of them. Our national parks are a precious resource that we must all protect.

They are, as the Senator indicates, being attacked from so many different directions right now. We are taking them for granted and slowly, but surely, they are falling into disrepair, and they are being damaged environmentally. We in the Smokies have a particular problem with the weather patterns, for example. Not only do we have some old coal-fired plants in the area, but we have a weather pattern that brings the pollution in from other parts of the country that just seems to hover over that particular area. We have days where there is more pollution on top of the Smoky Mountains than there is in downtown New York City. It is an increasing problem. Hopefully, as my colleague suggests, we can

join together and do even more next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, first, I thank our distinguished assistant Democratic leader for his graciousness once again in providing me the opportunity to say a couple of words this evening.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, the Senate will be voting on two competing marriage penalty relief proposals. The choice really could not be more clear. I want to talk a little bit about that choice this afternoon. The Republican bill has very little to do with the marriage penalty.

In fact, I was just commenting that if the Republicans were trying to treat an illness, they would be sued for malpractice—given the bill they are proposing this afternoon—malpractice because they are not curing the disease. In fact, in some ways they are causing the disease, this marriage penalty disease, to be even more problematic, more difficult. They are actually creating another disease—a singles penalty. We need to be aware of the repercussions of what the Republicans are attempting to do with their legislation this afternoon. The singles penalty is something I will talk a little bit more about.

To begin, I don't think there is any doubt that if you asked all 100 Senators: should we fix the marriage penalty, the answer would be emphatically yes. The question is, How do we fix it, and are we really intent on fixing it?

Our Republican colleagues only deal with three of the marriage penalty provisions incorporated in the law today. If you were going to completely eliminate the entire marriage penalty, you would have to deal not with 3 but with 65 of the provisions incorporated in the tax law that have caused the imbalance or the inequity to exist today. The Republicans have only dealt with three. Yet the cost to the Treasury of their plan—the one we will vote on today—is $248 billion overall.

I don't know what it would cost if you were going to try to fix all 65 under the Republican plan. Republican amendments were filed addressing six additional provisions, totaling $81 billion, in the Finance Committee. The remaining 56 provisions, untouched in the Republican bill, not addressed at all, have yet to be calculated in terms of what the cost might be with regard to the approach our Republican colleagues use.

The second chart spells out what that means. If you only deal with 3 of the 65 provisions, this is what happens. Take a married couple with a joint income of $70,000. Under current law, if the couple were single and they each paid their share of the tax, their tax total would be $8,407, depicted on the chart. Yet because they are kicked into a higher tax bracket when they reach that $70,000 joint income level, their tax is not $8,407; their tax is $9,532. So the marriage penalty is $1,125 under current tax law.

Here is what the Republicans do. The Republicans will provide, under their bill, 39-percent relief. That is all you get. Here they are, spending $248 billion, and they can't even do it right. They can't even fix all 65 provisions. They fix three. So you leave the balance, under the Republican bill, for another day, apparently.

We don't believe that ought to be the way to fix the marriage penalty. We think you ought to fix the marriage penalty, if you are saying you are going to fix it. We provide 100-percent relief, $1,125 in relief for that couple making $70,000 a year. That is what we do. That is why we believe it is important for people to know there is a clear choice tonight when we vote on those plans: You can vote for the $248 billion Republican plan that fixes 3 or you can vote for the Democratic plan that provides for 100-percent relief and fixes all 65.

I think it is very important for us to understand that not only is there a choice in trying to address the marriage penalty, but there is also another problem.

We know how doctors try to fix one disease and sometimes create another side effect they had not anticipated because they prescribed the wrong medicine. We have a true illustration of prescription drugs as we know it in this country today, with a $248 billion fix when you could do it for a fraction of the cost. Not only that, their prescription doesn't cure the disease. Not only does it not cure the disease, it actually creates a new one.

I guarantee my colleagues, within the next few years, you will have somebody come to the floor and say: Now we have to fix the singles penalty. It is broken. We may need another $248 billion tax plan to fix the singles penalty.

This is what happens under the Republican plan. You have a joint income for that couple of $70,000. Current law requires their tax liability of $10,274. The Republican plan would provide $8,743, leaving the $443 relief I mentioned a moment ago.

Let's take a widow, a widow who is making that $70,000 income—not a couple but a widow. She has a tax liability under current law of $14,172. Yet her penalty, a singles penalty, would go from $3,898 under current law to $5,429 under the Republican plan.

What happens with this tax plan for a single person under certain circumstances—take a widow, a widow who is already probably faced with all kinds of serious financial pressures. Her tax burden goes up by $1,531, a new singles penalty created—I assume inadvertently—because our Republican colleagues are rushing to try to fix a marriage penalty, and they can't do it right. That is why this vote this afternoon is so important.

The Democrats will be offering a plan that recognizes another inequity in the Republican plan. I have already talked about two: First, the importance of recognizing that out of the 65 provisions, the Republican plan only deals with 3; and then secondly, how we now have created—I assume inadvertently—this singles penalty.

Look at the third problem with the Republican plan that has caused us to want to come to the floor to offer the alternative we will tonight. If you are making $20,000, the amount of tax relief you get under the Republican plan is $567. That is all you get. But if you are making $20,000, under the Democratic plan, your tax reduction, the amount of relief, is $2,164. If you are making $30,000 a year, according to the Joint Committee on Taxation, which has analyzed this, under the Republican plan you get $800. Under the Democratic plan, you get $4,191. Why? Because we fix the marriage penalty. We provide entire relief, all 65 provisions.

Look at what happens if you are making $50,000. I don't know what the Republicans have as a problem with those who are making $50,000, but they are sure penalizing them here. You only get $240 under the Republican plan in relief. Why you would want to penalize somebody making $50,000, I don't know. Under the Democratic plan, you get $1,913 in relief.

Let us skip all the way over to the other end of the spectrum. This probably tells it best.

If you are providing real relief, you are going to go to those people who need the relief the most, those people in the $30,000 to $50,000 category. Under the Republican plan, if you are making more than $200,000, that is when you start kicking in to real money. You get $1,335 in relief there. But if you make $50,000 in income, you get $240. That is the third reason we are so concerned about this Republican plan.

Under the Republican plan, you get $1,335 in relief if you are making tons of money. If you are making $50,000, as are most people in the country—couples—you are going to get $240.

We are concerned for those three problems. That is why we are offering our alternative tonight. The Democratic marriage penalty relief plan allows married couples to file separately or jointly—another very important aspect: Give them the flexibility. Let them decide what is most helpful to them.

That is how we avoid the so-called singles penalty, not the Republican plan. It eliminates all marriage tax penalties for taxpayers earning $100,000 or less, 100 percent. It reduces all marriage tax penalties for those taxpayers earning up to $150,000 and does not expand the so-called marriage bonus or the singles penalty that we are actually creating inadvertently today.

I want to show one last chart that probably makes the case as well as I can. The marriage penalty bill proposed by the Republican plan deals

with three. The Democratic alternative deals with the standard deduction and the problem we have with the marriage penalty and the standard deduction; earned income tax credits; child tax credits; Social Security benefits; rate brackets; IRA deductions, student loan interest deductions, and the 56 other marriage penalty provisions that exacerbate the marriage penalty today. We do them all. The Republican's do three.

There is one other nonsubstantive but procedural concern I have, which I am compelled to bring up. The regular order in the Senate right now is the marriage penalty. We ought to be taking this bill up under the regular order, but we are not doing that. I think everyone here in the Chamber knows why. We are not doing that because the Republicans don't want to vote on tax amendments. That is why we are not doing it. They are using the brick wall they built around their marriage penalty, this impenetrable wall. So this is an up-or-down vote, a take-it-or-leave-it vote. You either like it or don't; you either take it or leave it. That is the way it is going to be. We are not going to give the Democrats an amendable vehicle. We are going to give them a vehicle they can't amend, a vehicle that will allow the one alternative; and we are not going to debate tax policy, even though this goes to the heart of tax policy.

So for the second time in less than a week we are going to be voting on a bill that I think deserves to be defeated. We should have defeated the estate tax bill. I will offer to Senator LOTT that I am willing to sit down today and negotiate with him and the Finance Committee Democrats and Republicans to come up with a bill the President will sign. That isn't going to happen with the bill they passed last week. This bill is going to get vetoed, too. This bill will be vetoed, and it will be vetoed for good reason. It doesn't fix the marriage penalty. It costs $248 billion. It helps those at the high end and leaves everyone else in the lurch. It creates a singles penalty. That isn't the way to legislate. That is why we normally have amendments—to try to fix problems that were caused on purpose or inadvertently.

I am hopeful the majority will take great care before they pass the bill that they are going to be pressing this evening. I hope they will work with us to come up with an alternative that the President will sign. We can do things the right way and we can enact them into law and provide meaningful accomplishment and meaningful relief and meaningful help to victims of the marriage penalty. Or we can simply make more statements about how some in this Senate prefer simply to help those at the very top of the income scale, once again, whether they need it or not. That is our choice. I hope Senators will take great care in making their choice, and I look forward to the debate and vote later this evening. Again, I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair.

A SMASHING SUCCESS

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, a noted sports figure in American sports history once commented that ''Bragging ain't bragging if you can prove it.''

On that basis, I want to brag a little bit about North Carolina which has had its share of top sports figures—perhaps more than our share when you consider such outstanding sports figures, past and present, as Arnold Palmer, Catfish Hunter, Charlie ''Choo-Choo'' Justice, Michael Jordan, Richard Petty, David Thompson, Sonny Jurgensen, Dean Smith, Everett Case, Joe Gibbs, Enos Slaughter, and Wallace Wade, who by the way took two teams from Duke University to the Rose Bowl. But he didn't have to go very far for the second one because it was held in Durham, NC, right after Pearl Harbor. It was feared that the Japanese might try to bomb the stadium out in California, so they moved the whole thing across the country to North Carolina—the only time the Rose Bowl was not played in Pasadena.

But I don't recall any previous teenager—from anywhere—who has been described as a ''tennis phenomenon who walks in Chris Evert's footsteps''. But that's the accolade handed 14-year-old Alli Baker of Raleigh my hometown—in the May edition of Metromagazine in a sparkling and detailed piece by Patrik Jonsson, writing from Boca Raton, Florida.

As I read the tribute to Alli Baker, I was reminded that this young lady is a great granddaughter of the late Lenox Dial Baker, one of America's leading orthopedic surgeons. Dr. Baker almost single-handedly founded a children's hospital, later named for him, at Duke University Medical Center in Durham, where hundreds of crippled children's lives have brightened and their lives improved because of Dr. Baker's selfless and loving interest in them.

I am going to let the article about Alli Baker speak for itself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the tribute to the amazing 14-year-old Alli Baker by Patrik Jonsson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEENAGE TENNIS PHENOMENON WALKS IN CHRIS EVERT'S FOOTSTEPS

[From Metro Magazine, May 2000]

BOCA RATON, FLA.—Alli Baker is fuming. Frustrated during a drill at the Evert Tennis Academy, the 14-year-old tennis phenomenon from Raleigh huffs and puffs as if she's about to blow somebody's house down. Then a few easy ground strokes go into the net. That's it. Baker's Volkl racket goes flying into a patch of grass. Conversations hush. Eyes glance sideways at the lithe, freckled Southern girl whom everybody knows as the number one ranked 14-year-old in the country, and the highest-ranked female player yet to come out of North Carolina. The court mood tenses the way it used to when John McEnroe yelled at refs, or when the young German Boris Becker pumped his fists in defiance. This is just practice. Still, being Alli Baker's rival right now seems like a very, very bad idea.

''It's true, I get very competitive,'' says Baker, who is also the seventh-ranked 16-and-under player in the country, an hour before the brief blow-up on the court. ''I love to win. It's my greatest strength.''

Tennis my not be a gritty contact sport, but it is, above all, a game of mind over body. Anger and other unchecked emotions are widely known top scatter the concentrations of even the most experienced players in clutch situations. But the coaches here already know that North Carolina's newest sports star hones her on-court emotions, polishes them like treasure, and beams them into that fuzzy yellow ball, straight back at her opponents on the other side of the net at center court. Indeed, she's beaten some of the world's best tennis players in her age group by funneling her competitive angst into devastating trickery.

''She's a very mature player,'' says her coach, John Evert, the brother of Wimbledon champ Chris Evert, and a 17-year coach in his own right. ''Her strength is that she figures out how to play exactly to her opponents' weaknesses, and she doesn't let herself get into the dumps.''

Last year, Baker won five tournament tie breakers in a row, an almost unheard of feat that epitomizes her unwillingness to lose. ''I've yet to see her play in a tournament,'' one of the other Evert Academy coaches confides. ''But they say she is very, very hungry.''

Don't get the wrong idea, though. Off the court, Alli Baker is about as sweet as strawberry pie, as humble as corn pone. Freckled, tan and every bit the exuberant teenager, she talks about fashion, missing home, seeing the world (Paris is her favorite city), bonding with tennis stars Monica Seles and Martina Hingis, how she loves her mentor, Chris Evert, and the life-affirming step she's getting ready to take into professional tennis. She's making ''a million new friends'' while coaxing her Raleigh confidantes to hurry down to where it's nice and warm and where the beaches stretch on and on.

So far, it's been a whirlwind tour from the halls of Raleigh's Daniels Middle School to the star-studded tennis courts of SoFla.

HANGING IN WEST BOCA

It's here—to the Evert Tennis Academy, near some of the world's largest country clubs, where the average annual income is $65,000 and where the warm prevailing winds collect tall afternoon thunder clouds over the coast—that Alli decided to come this spring after it became clear that to follow her dream, she had to follow it right out of North Carolina.

Although the family will stay in Raleigh, where dad Bill Baker is a vice president for a major construction firm, the family just bought a house across Glades Avenue in west

Boca as a permanent base here. Baker and her family made the decision after acknowledging the lack of a steady stream of crack practice partners and full-time coaches in Raleigh. While Bill works and helps shuttle their second daughter, 11-year-old Lenox, to her soccer games, mom Leigh Baker has found a permanent seat on the red-eye to Boca.

Of course, there were some questions among family friends: How could the Bakers send a 13-year-old (her birthday is in April) off to fend for herself in such a competitive, cutthroat world? Bill Baker has an easy answer: ''She called yesterday from a hotel room overlooking Key Biscayne. She said, 'Dad, I'm here looking our over the bay and the blue water. It's so beautiful here.' I think she's going to be all right.''

If Baker has what it takes to be an international tennis star, Evert Academy is where the transformation from sharpshooting local kid to Grand Slam winning hardball player will likely take place. It's a place where the phrase, ''Yeah, Agassi decided not to come down today,'' seems rote. Don't be surprised to see top-ranked players such as France's Sebastian Grosjean and Vince Spadea sweating through a four-hour practice. Tiny, but fiery Amanda Coetzer shows up here from time to time to practice—and to show the reverent young ones how it's done.

On these finely groomed courts nestled amidst swaying coconut palms is also where Chris Evert practices with students three times a week, and where there's a lyrical constant of English, French, Spanish and even Czech spoken over the grunts of determined players returning smashes. Bordered by dozens of clay and hard courts, flanked by a beige dormitory hall, this tucked-away facility is what the doorstep to the big time now looks like for Alli Baker.

''Her dream is to be the top-ranked tennis player in the world,'' says Bill Baker at his Raleigh office overlooking Falls of the Neuse Road. ''We knew that wouldn't happen if she stayed here. She's doing all this herself. All that we're doing is making the sacrifices to provide her with the opportunities to pursue this dream. Sometimes it's hard as a parent to not get emotionally involved. But in the end, the fire to do it has to come from within her.''

STYLE POINTS

Naturally athletic, Baker picked tennis over other sports for reasons perhaps girls can best understand. First, it's not so—she searches for the word—''tomboy-ish.'' The outfits, in other words, look great. Plus, there's no physical contact, only the physicality of pressurized felt ball against tight catgut, the action crashing back and forth across the net in an elaborate joust. It is a game you can win by using your mind to imbue the body with the power of wit, intensity and strategy.

''I think it's the best game out there for girls,'' she says. ''You can play hard and be super-competitive—and you can look good doing it.''

Indeed, Baker already has the fresh, jaunty look that has potential sponsors swooning. With the exception of Adidas (clothes) and Volkl (racket), Baker has so far turned down major sponsorships. In April, she unofficially entered the pro circuit at a minor qualifying event. This spring, she will play pro tourneys in Little Rock and Hilton Head. But she's still an amateur, meaning she can't take any winnings home yet. Still, it's at those tournaments, as well as at her new home base here in Boca, where she's getting the first real taste of her new life and where she is, as Bill Baker says, ''meeting a lot of people who have been where she wants to go—including some who made it and some who didn't.''

Impressed with Baker's natural talent, intense competitiveness and impressive number of wins against tough players, the United States Tennis Association and John Evert, now Baker's development coach, ''recruited'' her into the program.

''She has shown great skill and promise, but this is the time for her to get on the court and work hard, because this is where it's going to get tougher now,'' says Ricardo Acuna, USTA's Southeast region coach, who oversees Baker's overall training program.

For coaches like Evert and Acuna, right now is when the ball meets the clay for the great-granddaughter of the late Sports Hall of Famer Lenox Baker, the famed Duke orthopedic surgeon and sports medicine pioneer, and the granddaughter of single-handicappers Robert F. Baker and Robert M. Hines of Raleigh, the five-time Carolina Country Club Senior Championship winner. Wedged between childhood and the muscular 16- and 17-year-olds playing above her, this is when this next generation Baker has to concentrate more on fundamentals than winning—a difficult task for someone who has gotten used to eating victories for lunch. She says she still lags behind some of her key competitors as far as skills go. ''Ground strokes are about the only part of my game I'm really good at,'' she admits.

''She's had a pretty easy time with practices up to this point, where she's been able to turn it up and win matches,'' says Evert. ''But now I'm trying to figure out how she can match that intensity during practice. At this point, I'm even ready to cut back on her practice time to foster that intensity. For Alli right now, quality is more important than quantity.''

THE CHRISSIE FACTOR

Although other tennis academies offer similarly competitive programs, here Baker is becoming a member of the Famed Evert family tennis tradition, which began with legendary tennis coach Jim Evert's longtime directorship of Fort Lauderdale's public Holiday Park tennis program from which Chris Evert emanated. Indeed, it may have been the ''Chrissie presence'' that finally convinced the Bakers to make the move.

Having a role model like Chris Evert, who won 18 grand slams and 159 tournaments before retiring in 1989, rifling balls at you from the other side of the net is unbelievable, Baker says. ''I just love her. She comes out here to practice, and she still plays really hard. My mom says she would love to have her body.''

But Baker and Evert are not two peas in a pod as far as playing style. Evert was known for staring her opponents down from the baseline, playing a cool-headed volley game. Fans recall her ''icy stare'' that unnerved some opponents enough to immobilize them. On the other hand, Baker loves to explode to the net with a tenacity that dad Bill Baker says has also yielded success in her doubles game.

Indeed, as Baker has served, sliced and backhanded her way to the top of the rankings, from playing in tourneys from Rio de Janeiro to Paris, comparisons run more to former teenage phenomenon Monica Seles than to Evert or today's young superstars like Serena and Venus Williams. ''She has to play smarter because she's not as big as some of the other players.'' says her dad.

Still, Baker's skinny frame is mentioned as a potential liability, especially when matched against the new breed of power players such as the Williams sisters, who tower above their competitors.

But don't dismiss a growth spurt yet, says, Acuno, the USTA coach. ''I've seen her increase in size by a lot just this year,'' he adds confidently, While Baker sometimes has trouble getting fired up for practice, she loves the weight room and working out. As part of her routine at Evert Tennis Academy, she endures a strenuous regimen along with nearly four hours of court time a day against some of the best young players in the world.

Despite her early success, it's still not advantage Baker. Most of her competitors were already enrolled in tennis academies when then 8-year-old Alli Baker started playing with her mom at Carolina Country Club, drawn more to the sport for the ''cute outfits'' than the competition. Other tennis kids get started way before that, as evidenced by a muffin-sized front-court player, perhaps 5 years old, who spent two hours cranking backhands at her dad-slash-coach on a recent day at the academy. The girl rode her pink Barbie bike with training wheels off the court after the practice. In Baker's case, however, her natural talents shone through right away, and she quickly made up for lost time. She started beating her mom as a 9-year-old—showing right off the bat a natural inclination toward not just good tennis, but winning tennis.

''It was a little bit later when I started to really like the feeling of winning,'' she says. ''Before that, it was just about the outfits and having fun with my friends.''

That love for the game and the big win is now starting to pay off.

* * * * *

Interest in Baker began to percolate two years ago, when USTA began sniffing around Raleigh, following rumors of a phenom-in-the-making. After attending a few national camps and doing well in a number of regional tournaments, Baker bloomed for real last year.

Locally, North Hills Tennis Club coach Nancy Arndt, Raleigh Racquet Club's Mike Leonard and Rali Bakita, and a handful of other top-notch coaches worked on Baker's fundamentals, knowing they had a potential star on their hands. But it was at the Ace Tennis Academy in Atlanta, where Leigh Baker would shuttle her daughter on weekends, that Baker culled those extra pointers that propelled last year's successes.

Before last summer, Baker had already won both singles and doubles at the coveted Easter Bowl, a triumph that sent her like a projectile to the top ranking in the USTA under-14 category. Against older girls up to age 16, Baker is still ranked number seven. Impressed with the wily Raleigh youngster, CBS included Baker in a segment called ''Top Spin'' last summer, along with Pete Sampras and Serena Williams.

The Easter Bowl victory led to Baker's USTA National Champion ribbon. She finished third in the World Cup held in the Czech Republic last year. She was also a runner-up in the Banana Bowl in Brazil, and a semi-finalist in the Acunsion Bowl in Paraguay, and the Windmill Cup in the Netherlands. This year she is again on the U.S. National Team and this spring worked her way into the doubles finals tourneys in London and France. Right now is when competitive circuits around the world are really starting to heat up.

On top of the thrill of competition another boon to her meteoric rise into international tennis is the gang of cool friends. Baker is building around her. Currently, she e-mails a dozen friends in Russia and France, as well as her clan of pals and fans in Raleigh.

CHALLENGER FROM QUEENS

But Ally's best friend on the ground in Boca right now is a gritty, 15-year-old power player from the blue-collar sky-line of Queens, Shadisha Robinson. The two squared off against each other last year where Baker came back from a deep deficit, unwound

Robinson in a 7–6 second set and thrashed her 6–1 in the third. They've been best friends ever since. Evert uses the friendship to boost both players' performance on the court: While Baker leans how to defend against pure power, Robinson gets a lesson in wiliness from the freckle-cheeked Southerner.

''John doesn't really play us together competitively,'' Baker says. ''He knows we are good for each other as training partners, but he doesn't want us to get too much of a rivalry going.''

A straight-A student through primary and middle school, Baker is also managing to keep up with her academic work through it all. While vacationing at the beach last year. Retired Daniels Middle School teacher Lynn Reynolds heard about Baker's decision to go to Florida. She immediately called up the family and volunteered to come out of retirement and ''sign up for the team'' as a home schoolteacher. Reynolds and her young charge have since become close friends, constantly in touch via e-mail and fax—the methods they also use to exchange homework assignments and tests. Daily, the teacher and student log onto the College Boards web site to work out a daily test question posted there—just to make sure Baker is ready for the SAT's when that time comes.

''This high-tech teacher and student relationship has really been fun for both of us,'' Reynolds say. ''She's a quick study and a very smart girl. We've become great friends. This is one of the best teaching assignments of my whole career.''

In two short years, Baker has traveled from Prague to Paris, from Palm Springs to Rio. She says she's enamored with this lifestyle that a simple game has already given her. She misses her friends, but they'll come visit, they promise. Everyone says they will.

If the ''tennis thing'' doesn't work out, Baker says, ''with all the agents I've already met, I've got a chance with my singing''—country, that is, her backburner passion. Already the world has opened its doors to a talented Raleigh kid with enough sense to know that dreams are out there for the getting. ''I mean, if this were to give me a leg up to go to a school like Stanford or Duke, then it's already worth it,'' she says. ''Plus, just look at this place,'' she adds, holding out her hands as if to weigh the fresh, precious Florida air. ''This is prefect.''

Mr. HELMS. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. GORTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX BREAKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, between last Friday and today, in the span of just 4 days, Republican Senators will pass tax breaks, overwhelmingly targeted for the wealthy, that will cost the Treasury one and a half trillion dollars over the next 20 years. You would think that careful attention would be paid to the merits of these astronomical tax giveaways before they are passed. Instead, they are being rammed through by a right-wing Republican majority in Congress bent on rewarding the wealthy and ignoring the country's true priorities that have a far greater claim on these enormous resources.

What about prescription drug coverage for millions of senior citizens under Medicare? I have just returned from Massachusetts where I met with the elderly people. They are asking, Will the Senate of the United States, will Congress, take action to provide some relief to the elderly people in my State and across the country? Really, the unfinished business of Medicare is the prescription drug program. We did not debate that last Thursday and last Friday. We are not debating that issue today. We have basically said, let's find out how we can give the one and a half trillion dollars away over the next 20 years, instead of dealing with the Medicare issue on prescription drugs.

What about greater Federal aid to education to help schools and colleges across the country and the students who attend them? We put into the RECORD last Friday the most recent studies of the Congressional Research Service that showed that by moving to smaller class sizes, there was an enhancement of academic achievement and accomplishment by students in California. That supports the STARS Program of Tennessee. Senator MURRAY of the State of Washington has been our leader championing for smaller class sizes, because we believe that that can be enormously important in enhancing academic achievement. If we do that, plus ensure that teachers get training and professional advancement in their classrooms, working to enhance their professionalism, we will see a very important, significant gain in academic achievement and accomplishment.

We also know the value of afterschool programs, tutorials, and accountability, as Senator BINGAMAN has talked about; the newer digital divide that Senator MIKULSKI has talked about; construction, the need to make sure our schools will be safe and secure and not crumbling, as so many of them are. But, no, we have set that aside. We are not going to have the resources to do that. Make no mistake about it, I say to American families, we have made enhancing academic achievement for our teachers, smaller class sizes, afterschool programs, a lesser priority than providing $1.5 trillion from the Federal Treasury to the wealthiest individuals.

What about health insurance for the millions of hard-working Americans who have no coverage today? We made a downpayment in terms of the children in the CHIP program in a bipartisan way. We reach out to try to get coverage for their hard-working parents, an increasing number of Americans, who do not have health insurance. But we have not put that on the agenda. We are not debating that here on the floor of the Senate. There will not be the resources to try to do that. We are saying we want $1.5 trillion for the wealthiest individuals. Health insurance for hard-working Americans is put aside.

What about raising the minimum wage for millions of low-income Americans, the 13 million Americans, the majority of whom are women who have children? It is a women's issue, it is a children's issue, and it is a civil rights issue because so many of these men and women are men and women of color. It is a fairness issue. People who work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, should not have to live in poverty. No, we cannot debate that up here in the Senate. We can get tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals in this country, but we will not debate an increase in the minimum wage. We will not do it.

I hope we are not going to hear long lectures from the other side about how we ought to be funding, now, the special needs programs. We had great statements from the other side: We have failed in meeting our responsibility to special needs children, to help local communities in the area of education. We have heard that time in and time out, while we have been trying to do some of these other actions for children in this country. We had an opportunity to pay for all those special needs children, but I did not hear from the other side that this is a priority. We did not hear it when they had the $780 billion tax cut 2 years ago, and we could have taken a fifth of that tax cut and funded special needs education for every child in this country for 10 years. No, no, that is not enough of a priority. We are not going to do it. Our tax cut is too important. We are going to give $1.5 trillion away without spending a single nickel on special needs children.

The list goes on about protecting Social Security and Medicare. Right now, I am sure there are scores of Members of the Congress and the Senate going on about how we ought to protect Medicare and Social Security. It is very clear what the priority has been in the Senate: $1.5 trillion, not to protect Medicare, not to protect Social Security, but to provide it to the wealthiest individuals in this country.

That is what has happened over the period of these last 4 days, including a Sunday when we were not even here. All of these priorities and many more are being blatantly ignored by this Republican Congress in their unseemly stampede to enact these tax breaks for the wealthy. Never, in the entire history of our country, has so much been given away so quickly to so few with so little semblance of fairness or even thoughtful consideration.

I make that statement. I wait to be challenged on that. Never, never in the history of this body has so much been given away to so few, in such a short period of time, with such little semblance of fairness and even thoughtful consideration.

I hope we are not going to hear from the other side: We need to study these

issues more carefully in our committee; this hasn't been carefully considered by the committee—when they come out with that $1.5 trillion tax cut, that never even saw the light of day in committee, on the estate tax. Think of having a committee report, think of having a committee discussion, think of having some debate about what the implications of this might be in terms of a wide range of different issues? Absolutely not. We just took it, faced it, and passed it.

So it goes on. Plums for the rich and crumbs for everyone else will be the epitaph of this Republican Congress. It's a dream Congress for the superwealthy and their special interest friends, and a nightmare Congress for hard-working families across America.

The Republican's trillion-dollar tax breaks will eminently deserve the veto that President Clinton is about to give them. The Republicans fail to honestly weigh the nation's priorities, and I believe that this is an irresponsible and reckless way to legislate. Some may view it as good political theater, red meat for the Republican right wing on the eve of the Republican convention. But it is a disservice to all Americans because it prevents action on the many true priorities facing this Nation.

I suspect that Americans who see and understand what is happening here this week in Washington will ask a single question: What if George W. Bush were in the White House? He would sign these irresponsible tax break monstrosities, and the nation would suffer for years to come.

I suspect that millions of Americans who see what is happening here would say: No thanks, we don't need a Congress that would pass such irresponsible legislation—and we certainly don't need a President who would sign it.

Last Friday's estate tax bill gave $250 billion to America's 400 wealthiest families, yet this same $250 billion would buy 10 years of prescription drug coverage for 11 million senior citizens who don't have access to coverage now. Our senior citizens face a crisis today. The extraordinary promise of fuller and healthier lives offered by new discoveries in medicine is often beyond their reach. They need help to afford the life-saving, life-changing miracle drugs that are increasingly available. Cutting a trillion dollars from the federal budget clearly jeopardizes our ability to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare.

Today, in schools across the country, students face over-crowded classrooms, teachers go without adequate training, school buildings are crumbling, and violence is a constant threat. One would think that at some opportunity over these past few days we would have debated what most families are concerned about, as well as insuring academic achievement for their children in a safe and secure area.

No, we are denied that opportunity. We cannot debate that. We are told somehow that it is not relevant. It is relevant to what parents care about, which is their children in school. I daresay it is a lot more relevant than the fact that we will be giving $1.5 trillion, $250 billion of which will go to the 400 wealthiest families. It is a lot more relevant to their lives than that other factor, the giveaway.

Yet, Republicans are rushing through a trillion dollars in tax cuts without serious consideration of what it means for the nation's unmet education needs. Today, the booming economy is helping many Americans, but those who work day after day at the minimum wage are falling farther and farther behind. A recent study by the pro-business Conference Board finds that the number of working poor is actually rising, in spite of the record prosperity. The number of working poor families who seek emergency help in soup kitchens and food pantries across the nation is far ahead of the ability of agencies to meet their needs.

Read the reports from last week about what is happening to children in our society. The total number of poor children has gone down by about a percentage point, a point and a half, maybe, in the last 2 years. But the ones who are living in poverty are living in deeper poverty than they have ever experienced.

We are finding an increased number of children who are not being immunized against basic diseases, and here we are cutting $1.5 trillion, when we are not immunizing our children and cannot find ways to make those programs workable and effective. We are not debating that and trying to find ways to improve it.

The cost of rental housing is skyrocketing in most cities because of the economic boom, but the wages of millions of families who need that housing has failed to keep pace.

My colleague and friend from Massachusetts, JOHN KERRY, made this case so well last week to, effectively, a deaf audience in the Senate. Cutting tax revenues by a trillion and half dollars jeopardizes our ability to respond to these needs.

The American people cry out for action on many other basic priorities, but the tax breaks being passed by the Republican Congress would make fair action on all those priorities virtually impossible. Republicans are well aware that their tax-cutting extravaganza would not survive if it were honestly weighed against the nation's real priorities. That is why Republicans resort to gross distortion of the facts.

They apply the phony label ''death tax'' of trying to deal with family farms and small businesses. Republicans told story after story about how the estate tax hurts owners of small businesses and family farms. Our Democratic alternative would grant them protection, but it wasn't enough for Republicans. Their position was to basically hold small business owners and small farmers hostage until they could get the larger breaks for the largest estates and the wealthiest individuals in the country.

They know this President is going to veto this measure, and instead of truly doing something that would benefit those small family farms and small businesses, they say: Oh, we would rather have it vetoed. We will serve those small family farms up rather than deal with them. They know this is true in the marriage tax penalty as well.

Listen to this: They apply the phony label ''marriage tax penalty'' to the current bill even though 58 percent of the tax cuts go to couples who pay no marriage penalty at all. Do my colleagues hear that? Fifty-eight percent of the benefits of this measure, according to the Joint Tax Committee, a measure which we will start voting at 6:30 this evening, will go to couples who pay no marriage tax penalty at all.

The Democrats have a simple alternative to address the marriage penalty: Let them file as a single person if it will mean it lowers their taxes. What in the world could be simpler than that? If one is paying more because of their marriage situation as a result of commingling of the funds, Democrats say: OK, file as single individuals. That will solve it. There is no red tape and no administrative bureaucracy. It is simple. It meets a particular challenge.

The Republicans: Oh, no. We want our program which will provide this extraordinary windfall to the wealthiest individuals.

Our Democratic alternative would cost $11 billion a year less than the Republican bill—but it would provide greater marriage tax penalty relief to families with incomes below $150,000 a year. But, our sensible Democratic approach does not overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy so the Republicans reject it. Republicans intentionally designed their bill to give 78 percent of the total tax savings to the wealthiest 20 percent of taxpayers.

Ending the marriage tax penalty is a thinly veiled pretext to their latest installment of massive tax breaks for the wealthy. We saw the same tactics during the debate on the estate tax. We heard story after story of how the estate tax will hurt owners of small businesses and family farms.

I found Senator CONRAD's presentation of our Democratic alternative compelling and effective, virtually unchallenged on the floor of the Senate. Oh, yes, there was a challenge saying: Look, why are we supporting that because all of the various groups evidently support the Republican position?

I thought that was very interesting coming after our debate on HMO reform where we had 330 organizations support our HMO reform, and this particular Senate voted against it when they did not have a single one supporting their proposal and the responses by Senator CONRAD were responsive to this challenge.

They are holding small businesses and farmers hostage to their flagrant scheme to help the super-rich even while they talk piously of helping the middle class.

This Republican Congress is the trillion-dollar-travesty Congress. Fortunately, President Clinton and AL GORE are here—in this case, President Clinton—with a veto pen to burst their bubble. But thank goodness that working families, middle-income families, have a President who really cares about the economic and financial situation in this country.

I take pride that I was one of 11 Members of the Senate who voted against the Reagan tax cut that took us from $400 billion to $4 trillion in debt. That is why I am always interested in listening to those on the other side talk about what wonderful economic programs we have had over the recent times.

Let me finally use these charts to demonstrate, once again, what this repeal of the estate tax will cost. It is $55 billion per year that we are effectively giving the wealthiest individuals by the year 2010. This could fund every program in the Department of Education.

We are not saying that just throwing money at it answers all the problems. But it is a pretty clear indication about what a nation's priorities are, about how we are going to allocate resources. We could have fully done that, funded all of education, on this. We could have funded the total cost of prescription drug medicines for every beneficiary and had $15 billion left over. We could have had funding for all the beneficiaries, for all of our senor citizens. We could have provided the funding for the $20 billion which takes care of all the medical research in the National Institutes of Health, and you would still have $35 billion left.

This is an indication of priorities. This is another indication.

This chart depicts that from the Republican estate tax, those who are going to benefit from it, benefit from it to the average of $268,000. All we are trying to get is a Medicare prescription drug benefit that will be valued for our senior citizens at $900.

Here it is: $268,000, by 2010, for those who will benefit under the Republican tax cut. All we are trying to do is get $900 for our senior citizens, our 40 million senior citizens we will have at that time. Or to put it another way, the beneficiaries will have the estates worth $2.3 million. The people we are trying to help average $13,000 a year. They are the people we are trying to look out for.

This is the contrast. I believe, as I have said, never has so much been given to so few in such a short period of time—without, I think, the fair, adequate national debate or discussion in terms of what is really necessary, in terms of meeting the human needs of families in this country, the educational needs, the health needs, of what is needed in terms of housing for working families and what is necessary in terms of prescription drugs.

How are we going to have clean air? How are we going to have clean water? How are we going to clean up the brownfields? How are we going to make sure people are going to continue to have an opportunity to work in employment and have the training and the skills in order to be able to compete in the new economy?

All of those priorities have been washed away. With $1.3 trillion, we would be able to provide the investments for the American people. We have given that away. We have given that away without adequate and fair consideration of these priorities. I welcome the fact that we have a President who is going to veto those measures.

I yield the floor.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 3798

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have amendment No. 3798 at the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 3798.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for weatherization assistance grants, with an offset)

On page 182, beginning on line 9, strike ''$761,937,000'' and all that follows through ''$138,000,000'' on line 17 and insert ''$769,937,000, to remain available until expended, of which $2,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from unobligated balances in the Biomass Energy Development account and $8,000,000 shall be derived by transfer of a proportionate amount from each other account for which this Act makes funds available for travel, supplies, and printing expenses: *Provided*, That $172,000,000 shall be for use in energy conservation programs as defined in section 3008(3) of Public Law 99–509 (15 U.S.C. 4507): *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 3003(d)(2) of Public Law 99–509, such sums shall be allocated to the eligible programs as follows: $146,000,000''.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KENNEDY and Senator SCHUMER be added as cosponsors of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would provide an additional $8 million for the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program.

Across the country this summer, Americans have faced unacceptably high gasoline prices. Last winter, our constituents, particularly in the Northeast, saw extraordinary increases in home heating oil prices.

Members of this body have offered various proposals to address this issue, ranging from urging OPEC to increase production; increasing domestic crude oil production, by drilling in new areas; building up our refining capacity; and expanding our use of ethanol and alternative fuels. Essentially, all of these proposals are supply side proposals, increasing the supply of energy.

In fact, we are reaching a point now where the proposal to encourage OPEC might be running out of time. I note that the Saudi Arabians are asking for a meeting of OPEC in the next few days, because if there is not a meeting immediately, even if there is an increase in production, it will be insufficient in terms of reaching our markets for the winter heating season.

All of these supply side proposals are interesting, but we are neglecting an important aspect of the overall composition of the heating market—and that is demand.

The weatherization program goes right to this critical issue of demand. By weatherizing homes, by making them more energy efficient, we are literally cutting down the demand for energy, and typically foreign energy.

As Congress debates these proposals for supply relief, we should also start thinking seriously about demand reduction. That is critically involved in the whole issue of energy efficiency and weatherization. At the same time, our weatherization program protects the most vulnerable people in our society because they are aimed at the elderly, individuals with disabilities, children, all of them being subject to huge increases in heating costs, not only in the wintertime—that is the case in the Northeast—but in the Southeast and Southwest and the very hot parts of this country in the summertime.

In fact, it was not too long ago—several years ago—in Chicago where there was an extraordinary heat spell. People literally died because they could not afford to keep their air-conditioners running, if they had air-conditioning. Or they could not afford to keep paying exorbitant energy costs because their homes were inefficient in terms of retaining the cool air from air-conditioning. So this is a program that cuts across the entire country.

The Weatherization Assistance Program supports the weatherization of over 70,000 low-income homes each year. To date, over 5 million American homes have been weatherized with Federal funds, and also local funds, which must be part of the formula in order to provide this type of assistance for American homes.

Last December, I had a chance to witness this program in action. I was in Providence, RI, with Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson. We went to a low-income home in Providence. In just a few hours, a contractor was able

to blow in insulation between the walls; they were able to caulk windows and doorways; they were able to conduct tests to ensure that the energy efficiency of the structure had increased dramatically.

This was a home of a family of first-generation Americans. They had come from Southeast Asia in the turmoil of the war in Southeast Asia. The father was in his late 40s, early 50s, and had several children—all of them American success stories. The children were in college. His mother was living with them. She was disabled, suffering from Alzheimer's.

This is typically the type of families—low-income families, struggling, working hard with jobs, trying to get kids through college—who are the beneficiaries of this program. It is an excellent program. It is a program that is terribly needed by these low-income families.

Typically, low-income families will spend about 15 percent of their income on heat—or in the summer, air-conditioning—more than four times the average of more affluent families. Over 90 percent of the households that are served by this weatherization program have annual incomes of less than $15,000. This is a program that works. It works for these individual families.

Not only that, it also works for us. It creates jobs. About 8,000 jobs throughout the country have been created because of this weatherization program. It also saves us from consuming and wasting energy.

I argue, as I have initially, one should look at the supply side complications of the energy crisis. One should implore OPEC to increase production. One should have sensible problems to ensure supply. But if we neglect the demand part of the equation, we are not only missing the boat, but I think we are deficient in our responsibility to formulate a comprehensive approach to energy efficiency in this country.

In 1996, the budget was $214 million, but because of cuts generated by the Contract With America, and other proposals, it dipped down to about $111 million—a significant cut. This was one of those programs that was devastated by the budget policies of the mid-1990s.

Since that time, we have added money back because, again, I believe this body particularly recognizes both the fairness and the efficiency of this program. But still we are at about $135 million in fiscal year 2000.

That is still 37 percent below the 1996 figure.

If we can afford, as Senator KENNEDY said, at length and eloquently, to engage in trillion-dollar tax cuts, multi-billion-dollar benefits that go to the very wealthiest Americans, we should be able to at least increase our weatherization funding by $8 million to cover additional families, low-income families, families who have disabled members, families who are working hard trying to get by and need this type of assistance.

Again, as we look over the last several weeks, and even this week, talking about relief for the marriage penalty, estate tax relief, it reminds me of a play on Winston Churchill's famous line about the RAF, ''never have so many owed so much to so few.'' We seem to be in a position of saying, never have so few gotten so much from so many.

I want to ensure that at least when it comes to weatherization we are responding to the critical needs of families across this country. I had hoped we could move towards the President's request of $154 million. That would be about a 14-percent increase over our present level of $135 million. My amendment does not seek that full increase. It simply seeks an additional $8 million. I think the money will be well spent. The program works. It puts people to work. It helps low-income families. It helps us address a problem which is growing with increasing importance, and that is to control our insatiable demand for energy, particularly petroleum.

For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I hope, perhaps, we can even work out a way in which this amendment can be accepted by the chairman and his colleagues.

If it is appropriate, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, just under 2 hours ago, at the outset of this debate, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, Mr. THOMPSON, came to the floor with an eloquent plea about the lack of money to properly manage Great Smokey National Park and pointed out the tremendous challenges to that major national park in our system. The Senator from Nevada, the other Mr. REID, spoke in agreement with that proposition. The Senator from Tennessee did not have an amendment to increase the appropriations for Great Smokey National Park or for any other.

I have found it curious that in the several years I have managed this bill and written this bill, almost without exception the amendments that are brought to the floor are amendments to increase the amount of money we donate to other units of Government for their primary purposes and almost never do they express a concern for increasing the amount of money to support the functions of the Government of the United States itself.

I have gone a long way—my committee has gone a long way—in drafting this bill at least to begin to make up for the deferred maintenance in our national parks and in our national forests and with respect to our Indian reservations and our Indian programs and the management of the Bureau of Public Lands. I think we have at least turned the corner. As I said in my opening remarks on the bill, this is our primary function and our primary goal; that is, to see to it that we manage the public lands of the United States and the other functions in this bill that are exclusively Federal functions first and deal with other matters later.

I sympathize with the eloquent statement of the Senator from Rhode Island. In fact, I have supported that case in this bill for several years. When one compares this appropriation with that in the first year during which I managed this bill, it is increased by a good 20 percent. But here we have a proposal to add another $8 million, which will come out of every program for which the U.S. Government has exclusive responsibility. It will mean there will be less—not much less, but there will be less —for Great Smokey National Park. There will be less for the Fish and Wildlife Service and its multitude of obligations. There will be less for the Smithsonian Institution. There will be less for research and development of the very programs for energy efficiency which are the key to providing both energy independence and the proper and efficient use of energy.

With all respect to the Senator from Rhode Island, this has nothing to do with the tax debate. We have a budget resolution and a set of allocations that have given this committee a fixed number of dollars with which to work. I repeat that: a fixed number of dollars with which to work. It is all spent in this bill. So we can't just add this $8 million or $18 million to the bill and say, well, let's take it out of a tax cut or out of a budget surplus or the like. The Senator from Rhode Island recognizes that. He has a match for this $8 million. But I simply have to repeat: The match is from the primary functions of the Federal Government, the management of our national parks and forests, the energy research we undertake, the cultural institutions of the United States. That is from where this match comes.

A year ago, we said: If this program is so important to the States, let's require them to match what we come up with by 25 percent. Let them come up with 25 percent. Some States do provide some money for this. We had to postpone that for a year. In this bill we have had to have a way to grant State waivers, when States regard this program evidently as so lacking in importance that they are not willing to put up 25 percent of the money for their own citizens for something that is primarily their responsibility.

As I said, we are $3 million above the level for the current year. The House is $5 million above the level for the current year. If we end up with a larger allocation—and, personally, I hope for a larger allocation—by the time the conference committee has completed its

work, we will have a modestly larger amount of money for this program in a final conference committee report. But it is not responsible to take it out of our National Park System. It is not responsible to take it out of our existing energy research. It is not responsible to take it out of the cultural institutions of the United States. That is precisely what this does.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORTON. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do applaud the Senator's efforts over many years to increase this account. He has done that. I think it makes a great deal of sense to provide a local match, which he has, and we would encourage more local participation. It is true we have provided an offset because I recognize that we do not have unlimited free money to put back into the budget.

We have taken money from every Federal agency. But I am told that our cut represents .05 percent per agency coming out of travel pay, coming out of administrative overhead. I think that is probably something they could well absorb. I daresay it would not require them to either turn down the heat or turn off the air-conditioning, whereas we are talking about a situation of homes throughout this country where they don't have that luxury.

So I agree in principle that we are taking it from agencies, but we are taking such a minute fraction that I think it would be readily absorbed. And we are putting it into a program that is both worthwhile and necessary in so many cases, and also going to the heart of ensuring that people can go into this heating season —particularly in the Northeast—with a little more confidence. I am concerned we are going to see tremendous oil heating price hikes which will force people into very difficult choices between heating or eating. This is a way, I believe, in which we can begin to start addressing this point.

Again, I recognize that the chairman has very diligently and sincerely tried to increase these funds. I hope we can do better. I don't think we are penalizing the agencies, and I don't anticipate a park being shut down by the loss of .5 percent of their travel expenses and other overhead.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, first, there is another far more important program and far more expensive program that goes to these very issues. The appropriations bill for military construction included many other matters. There was $600 million more for the direct assistance to people with their heating oil bills. In some respects, this is every bit as important a program because it tries to lower the bills in the first place.

The Senator from Rhode Island is correct; this is a small percentage of the budgets for the national parks. It is also the subject of match for several other amendments here because it is so easy. We don't say this program is much more important than another program, so let's cut the other program; we just say, in effect, cut them all across the board. But it is $8 million more in deferred maintenance for our national parks, or for our other national lands. And since this is a program that, over the course of the last 5 years, has increased more rapidly, bluntly, than the amount of money we have for these primary responsibilities, that is the reason we came up with the amount that we did.

Would I have liked to come up with more? Yes. If I have a larger allocation later, I will. Will there be more? There will be. I don't think at this point, for a State program, that many States aren't matching—and the requirement for match is only 25 percent—that this is as important as the national priorities that are the subject of the rest of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3800

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS], for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. ENZI, proposes an amendment numbered 3800.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the management of conflicting activities and uses)

On page 125, line 25 strike ''$58,209,000'' through page 126, line 2 and insert in lieu thereof ''$57,809,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

SEC. . MANAGEMENT STUDY OF CONFLICTING USES.

(a) SNOW MACHINE STUDY.—Of funds made available to the Secretary of the Interior for the operation of National Recreation and Preservation Programs of the National Park Service $400,000 shall be available to conduct a study to determine how the National Park Service can:

(1) minimize the potential impact of snow machines and properly manage competing recreational activities in the National Park System; and

(2) properly manage competing recreational activities in units of the National Park System.

(b) LIMITATION OF FUNDS PENDING STUDY COMPLETION.—No funds appropriated under this Act may be expended to prohibit, ban or reduce the number of snow machines from units of the National Park System that allowed the use of snow machines during any one of the last three winter seasons until the study referred to in subsection (a) is completed and submitted to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about an issue that is very important to many people. It is certainly important to me as chairman of the parks subcommittee in the Senate and as a supporter of parks. Having grown up right outside of Yellowstone Park, the parks there are very much a part of our lives.

Let me quickly summarize what this amendment does. I can do it very quickly because it is quite simple. It deals with the idea and the concept of having access to national parks, when it is appropriate, for the use of individual snow machines—something we have done for some 20 years—frankly, without any particular objection until this last year, and without any real evidence that we can't make some changes that would allow us to continue to do that.

Unfortunately, rather than looking for an opportunity to bring about some changes in the machines, or some changes in the way they are used, or to manage the way they are used, this administration has simply said: We are going to bring about a regulation unilaterally that will eliminate the use of snow machines in the parks of the United States.

What this amendment does, simply, is provide some money—$400,000; and we have found a place to get that money—to conduct a study to determine how the national parks can do a couple of things: One, minimize the potential impact of snow machines and properly manage competing recreational activities in the National Park System. That is pretty logical stuff. In fact, you can almost ask yourself, haven't they done this? The answer is that they have not. Two, properly manage competing recreational activities in units of the national park. Again, that is pretty easy to do. In Yellowstone Park, where there is a great demand for using snow machines, on the one hand, and cross-country skiing, on the other, with management you can separate these two so that they are not conflicting uses. Of course, that requires some management.

So then the second part of it is that no funds may be appropriated until such time, basically, as the Park Service has completed their study and submitted it back to the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations in the Senate. So this doesn't put any long-time restriction on what can be done. It simply says: Here is some money; take a look at where we are, what the problems are, and what we can do about them, and bring that back and make some management decisions. It is fairly simple and, I think, fairly reasonable. That is what this amendment is all about.

I guess the real issue comes about due to the fact that we have had a considerable amount of activity. What really brings it about is a winter use study that is going on now in Yellowstone and the Teton Parks. It has to do with the broad aspect of winter use and with buffalo moving out of the park and what kinds of things can be done there; and how people can get in and out of the parks and utilize them in the wintertime, which really brought about this whole thing. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior went out to look and came back with an idea—I think mostly of his own—that we ought to do away with snowmobile use. He did this without having any facts, science, or looking at what could be done so that you could be consistent with the purpose of the park.

The purpose of a park is basically to maintain the resource and to maintain it in such a way that its owners can enjoy the use of it. Those things are not inconsistent. Those things are not inconsistent with snowmobiles, in my judgment. But whether it is my judgment or not, more importantly, the idea to come to the conclusion that they are inconsistent without any facts is something we ought not to accept.

I am a little surprised that someone in this Congress would rise to defend the authority of the executive branch to go around the Congress and to do something without even including the Congress or the people. That is not the way this place is set up. That is not what we are here for. That is why we have a division between the executive and the legislative and the judicial—a very important division. It is, frankly, being ignored by this administration not only on this issue but on many of them. They are overtly saying: If we don't get approval, we will just do it. That is not the way things are supposed to happen.

I am also a little surprised, frankly, that a representative of a public lands State would be interested in having the agencies that manage—in the case of Nevada—nearly 90 percent of the land and, in Wyoming, over half, making decisions without involving some of the people who should be involved, who are involved with living in these areas.

I think we are really talking about a system of rulemaking—a system of regulation—and one that needs to be based on facts and based on the idea that you take a look at issues. Frankly, the substantial amount of evidence about what has been said about snowmobiles in west Yellowstone and other places simply isn't factual. I could go through all of that stuff, but I will not. But it is terribly important that we try to do things based on real facts.

The Department of Interior has announced that it intends to ban snowmobiles in all but 12 of about 30 parks—not all in the West, as a matter of fact. We sent a letter to the Secretary of the Interior some time ago with 12 signatures on it. They quickly came to the Senate from Maine, from Minnesota, from the west coast, and some from the Rocky Mountains. It is not only in the area that has limited interest; it has interest from all over the whole country.

The Department claims that only a complete ban to curb snowmobiles on issues and noise will protect the wildlife. That simply isn't the only alternative that is available.

I want to make it very clear that it is not my position, nor would I defend the notion that snowmobiles ought to continue to be used as they are currently being used. They can be changed substantially. We have had meetings with the manufacturers, which, by the way, have a very strong presence in Minnesota. Lots of jobs and lots of issues are involved. Jobs isn't really the issue. The issue is access to the land that belongs to the people of this country, but they can be changed.

One of the things that has not happened and that should happen is there ought to have been some standard established for snowmobiles, saying here is the level of emissions that is acceptable, and here is the level of noise that is acceptable. If you want to use your machine in the park, you have to have one that complies with these regulations. There have been none.

The same thing could be said about where you use the machine. If you are going to be in the same track as deer, it doesn't need to be that way.

We have had failure on the part of management of the Park Service to do something to make these kinds of uses compatible with the purposes of the parks. Rather than do that, or rather than making efforts to do that, they simply say, no. They are just going to cut it out; they aren't going to do that.

I object to that process. I don't think that is the kind of process that we ought to look forward to in this country—whether it is snowmobiles, or water, or whether it is automobiles, or whether it is food regulations, or whatever. We have to have something better. Interior has never considered a single management scheme to be able to make it better.

Certainly I hear all the time: Well, the snow machine people should have done something better. Maybe so. I don't argue with that. However, if you were a developer of snow machines, if you were a manufacturer and you were going to invest a good deal of money to make changes in them, I think it would be important to you to know what the standard is going to be so you are able to meet those requirements and continue to be able to put out the machine that would comply.

We have had hearings. We have met with those manufacturers. They testified they can and will produce and market the machine, if EPA will set the standard.

It is kind of interesting that most of the parks, such as Yellowstone, are full of cars, buses, and all kinds of things in the summertime which do not seem to have an impact here. But in the wintertime, it seems that something much less in terms of numbers is what we are going to cut off.

I want to deal largely with the concept that we ought to really pay attention to the purpose of these resources—to make them available, to have access to them, that we need to have a system that is based on findings of fact and science, and be able to come up with alternatives rather than simply making the bureaucrat decision downtown that we are going to do away with this or we are going to do away with that.

We ought to put into effect a time that this agency can study this issue, look at the alternatives, provide some money to do that, have them bring their findings back, and then certainly make some choices.

This amendment is simple and straightforward. I think that is better than the bureaucratic approach of just deciding somewhere in the bowels of the Interior Department we are going to do something.

I find a great deal of reaction to it in my State, of course, and the surrounding States which are very much impacted.

This is not a partisan issue. I have worked with the majority leader and the Senator from Montana to try to find a solution. We are looking for solutions. That is really what we need some time to be able to do.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment to reverse the snowmobile ban in our national parks and provide funding for a study to determine how the National Park Service can minimize the impact of snow machines and properly manage competing recreational activities in the National Park System. I want to thank Senators THOMAS and CRAIG for their efforts to bring this important amendment before the Senate for consideration.

While the Interior Department's ill-conceived ban will not immediately affect snowmobiling in Minnesota's Voyageurs National Park, it will impact snowmobiling in at least two units of the Park System in my home state—Grand Portage National Monument and the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway. In addition, this decision will greatly impact Minnesotans who enjoy snowmobiling, not only in Minnesota, but in many of our National Parks, particularly in the western part of our country.

When I think of snowmobiling in Minnesota, I think of families and friends. I think of people who come together on their free time to enjoy the wonders of Minnesota in a way no other form of transportation allows them. I also think of the fact that in many instances snowmobiles in Minnesota are used for much more than just recreation. For some, they're a mode of transportation when snow blankets our state. For others, snowmobiles provide a mode of search and rescue activity. Whatever the reason,

snowmobiles are an extremely important aspect of commerce, travel, recreation, and safety in my home state.

Minnesota, right now, is home to over 280,000 registered snowmobiles and 20,000 miles of snowmobile trails. According to the Minnesota United Snowmobilers Association, an association with over 51,000 individual members, Minnesota's 311 snowmobile riding clubs raised $264,000 for charity in 1998 alone. Snowmobiling creates over 6,600 jobs and $645 million of economic activity in Minnesota. Minnesota is home to two major snowmobile manufacturers—Arctic Cat and Polaris. And yes, I enjoy my own snowmobiles.

People who enjoy snowmobiling come from all walks of life. They're farmers, lawyers, nurses, construction workers, loggers, and miners. They're men, women, and young adults. They're people who enjoy the outdoors, time with their families, and the recreational opportunities our diverse climate offers. These are people who not only enjoy the natural resources through which they ride, but understand the important balance between enjoying and conserving our natural resources.

Just three years ago, I took part in a snowmobile ride through a number of cities and trails in northern Minnesota. While our ride didn't take us through a unit of the National Park Service, it did take us through parks, forests, and trails that sustain a diverse amount of plant and animal species. I talked with my fellow riders and I learned a great deal about the work their snowmobile clubs undertake to conserve natural resources, respect the integrity of the land upon which the ride, and educate their members about the need to ride responsibly.

The time I spent with these individuals and the time I've spent on my own snowmobiles have given me a great respect for both the quality and enjoyment of the recreational experience and the need to ride responsibly and safely. It has also given me reason to strongly disagree with the approach the Park Service has chosen in banning snowmobiles from our National Parks.

I was stunned to read of the severity of the Park Service's ban and the rhetoric used by Assistant Secretary Donald J. Barry in announcing the ban. In the announcement, Assistant Secretary Barry said, ''The time has come for the National Park Service to pull in its welcome mat for recreational snowmobiling.'' He went on to say that snowmobiles were, ''machines that are no longer welcome in our national parks.'' These are the words of a bureaucrat whose agenda has been handwritten for him by those opposed to snowmobiling.

The last time I checked, Congress is supposed to be setting the agenda of the federal agencies. The last time I checked, Congress should be determining who is and is not welcome on our federal lands. And the last time I checked, the American people own our public-lands—not the Clinton administration and certainly not Donald J. Barry.

I can't begin to count the rules, regulations, and executive orders this Administration has undertaken without even the most minimal consideration for Congress or local officials. It has happened in state after state, to Democrats and Republicans, and with little or no regard for the rule or the intent of law. I want to quote Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt from an article in the National Journal, dated May 22, 1999. In the article, Secretary Babbitt was quoted as saying:

> When I got to town, what I didn't know was that we didn't need more legislation. But we looked around and saw we had authority to regulate grazing policies. It took 18 months to draft new grazing regulations. On mining, we have also found that we already had authority over, well, probably two-thirds of the issues in contention. We've switched the rules of the game. We're not trying to do anything legislative.

As further evidence of this Administration's abuse of Congress—and therefore of the American people—Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Carol Browner was quoted in the same article as saying:

> We completely understand all of the executive tools that are available to us—And boy do we use them.

While Ms. Browner's words strongly imply an intent to work around Congress, at least she did not join Secretary Babbitt in coming right out and admitting it.

Well, Mr. President, I for one am getting a little sick and tried of watching this Administration force park users out of their parks, steal land from our states and counties, impose costly new regulations on farmers and businesses without scientific justification, and force Congress to become a spectator on many of the most controversial and important issues before the American people. Quite frankly, I'm getting a little sick and tired of this Administration's positions of zero-cut, zero-access, and zero-fun on public lands.

When forging public policy, those of us in Congress often have to consider the opinions of the state and local officials who are most impacted. If I'm going to support an action on public land, I usually contact the state and local official who represent the area to see what they have to say. I know that if I don't get their perspective, I might miss a detail that could improve my efforts are necessary or if they're misplaced. They can alert me to areas where I need to forge a broader consensus and of ways in which my efforts might actually hurt the people I represent. I think that is a prudent way to forge public policy and a fair way to deal with state and local officials.

I know, however, that no one from the Park Service ever contacted me to see how I felt about banning snowmobiling in Park Service units In Minnesota. I was never consulted on snowmobile usage in Minnesota or on any complaints that I might have received from my constituents. While I've not checked with every local official in Minnesota, not one local official has called me to say that the Park Service contacted them. In fact, while I knew the Park Service was considering taking action to curb snowmobile usage in some parks, I had no idea the Park Service was considering an action so broad, and so extreme, nor did I think they would issue it this quickly.

This quick, overreaching action by the Park Service, I believe, was unwarranted. It did not allow time for federal, state, or local officials to work together on the issue. It didn't bring snowmobile users to the table to discuss the impact of the decision. It didn't allow time for Congress and the Administration to look at all of the available options or to differentiate between parks with heavy snowmobile usage and those with occasional usage. This decision stands as a dramatic example of how not to conduct policy formulation and is an affront to the consideration American citizens deserve from their elected officials.

That is why this amendment is so important. It reverses the dark of night, back room tactics used by this Administration to arrive at this decision. We cannot simply stand by and watch as the administration continues its quest for even greater power at the expense of the deliberative legislative processes envisioned by the founders of our country. Secretary Babbitt, Administrator Browner, and Donald J. Barry may believe they're above working with Congress, but only we can make sure they're reminded, in the strongest possible terms, that when they neglect Congress they're neglecting the American people. This amendment does just that.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the Senator from Wyoming, Senator CRAIG THOMAS, regarding a study on snowmobile use within our National Parks.

The development of the Yellowstone and Grand Tetons National Parks winter use plan draft environmental impact statement has been a landmark exercise for inclusion and cooperation between state, local and Federal Agencies involved in the land management planning process. While this endeavor has not progressed without flaws, it has established that local and state governments possess the expertise and ability to respond in a timely and educated manner to address issues critical to the development of a comprehensive land-use document.

In spite of these efforts, however, the United States Department of the Interior has announced a decision to usurp this process and has chosen to implement an outright ban on all snowmobiles, in virtually all national parks, including Yellowstone.

I must admit I am not surprised at the over-reaching nature of this action. In fact, several months ago I predicted that the Park Service would ban snowmobiles in Yellowstone Park and would

extend its ban on snowmobiles to all national parks. I am further concerned that this action will spread to include other public land including the national forests. In fact, discussions with National Forest supervisors surrounding Yellowstone indicate that all it will take is an adverse opinion by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ban snowmobiles altogether.

The United States Forest Service could claim that increased snowmobile use on our national forests will impact the Canadian lynx, or some other threatened or endangered species, without proof or documentation to put such a ban in place.

After a ban in the forests, we can expect action on BLM lands. After snowmobiles, what next? A ban on automobiles and then even on bicycles? If that sounds farfetched, think back just three years ago when we were assured that snowmobiles would not be banned in Yellowstone Park. Soon, we may even expect that bans on other types of recreation will follow and our public lands will no longer be available to the public.

As one of the Senators representing the bulk of Yellowstone, I feel it is my duty to correct some of the misconceptions that surround this proposal by the federal government to prohibit access to our nation's oldest and dearest of national parks.

Millions of visitors come to Yellowstone National Park each year to experience first hand the park's unique and awesome beauty. They come from all over the world to see Earth's largest collection of geothermal features and to witness some of the largest free-roaming bison and elk herds in the United States.

In a proposal announced March 24, 2000 the U.S. Department of the Interior declared its plan to permanently ban snowmobiles from the park beginning in 2002. This announcement was followed by a later statement, on April 27, 2000, where the Department of Interior expanded a proposed ban to dozens of other national parks across the country. If federal officials and national special interest groups have their way, however, a visit to Yellowstone National Park may become as rare and endangered as the trumpeter swan or black footed ferret.

There is little evidence to support claims that this proposal was made to protect the environment or to reduce the impact on Park animals. In fact, later statements by park personnel indicate that the main reason for this ban was to comply with changing Park Service policy which was developed to supersede ongoing efforts to reach a reasonable compromise on national park winter use.

As I stated earlier, the decision to ban snowmobiles was announced before the Park Service had completed its review of comments on a draft environmental impact statement created by the park and adjacent states and counties to address concerns over winter use in Yellowstone and its neighbor, Grand Teton National Park. The announcement also came before officials could incorporate revisions and amendments to major studies that the Park Service relied on in drafting the draft environmental impact statement.

The Park Service admits these initial studies were seriously flawed and exaggerated snowmobile pollution estimates. The original draft study on snowmobile emissions erroneously computed emissions amounts using pounds instead of grams as is used to compute all standard emission amounts.

So what is the real reason for banning snowmobiles from Yellowstone and all other national parks? The Park Service's proposal to ban snowmobiles is all about deciding who will have the privilege of experiencing the Park up close and in person, and who will be forced to stay home. Unfortunately, this will leave an even larger segment of the United States ignorant of how vast and wonderful our parks really are.

It is vitally important, therefore, that a true picture be painted for the American public to understand what is really being taken away from them.

One poll touted by national environmental organizations claims most Americans favor banning snowmobiles, partially based on an image of snowmobiles as heinous, smog producing, noisy devices used to run down poor, defenseless animals and lacking a conception of the size of the park and the limited number of snowmobiles accessing the park on any given day.

The administration failed to inform the public of other alternatives to an outright ban that were in the works. For example: snowmobile manufacturers are interested in cleaner, quieter machines. There was also discussion about reducing the number of snowmobiles that could access the park every winter. Not many people realize that local leaders were very involved in trying to resolve the situation to avoid implementing a full fledged ban.

In addition, the snowmobile industry has been working for several years to develop air and noise standards with the Environmental Protection Agency so there is a clear target for cleaner, quieter machines. Industry has stated time and time again that once they have clearly defined standards they will develop the technology to meet those standards (assuming some reasonableness to the standard) One company even gave the Park Service some advanced model snowmobiles to test.

Right now, snowmobiles are only allowed on groomed roads, the same roads used by cars in the summer and average less than two-thousand snowmobiles a day. A speed limit of 45 miles per hour is strictly enforced. Any driver who puts one ski off the designated trails is subject to fines and possible arrest. The same goes for speeding.

This is a significant point to make by the way, because the Executive order this ban is based on regulates off-road vehicle use on our national parks, and as I just noted, snowmobiles are not off-road vehicles in national parks.

What a snowmobile ban really does is deny access for old and young riders with physical limitations that preclude them from snowshoeing or cross country skiing into the park. The only alternative left for those visitors unable to snowshoe or ski into the park will only be able to access the park via a mass transit vehicle known as a snow coach.

Because of its size, and the type of terrain, it is incredibly impractical to limit access to Yellowstone to just snow coaches or cross country skis and snowshoes. Yellowstone is made up of approximately 2.2 million acres, most of which is already closed to public access other than by foot, snow shoe or skis, and has less than 2,000 snowmobiles inside the park on any given day.

By comparison, the State of Connecticut is slightly larger than Yellowstone Park with more than 3.3 million people, many of which drive a car every day. Perspective is important.

On its face, and in the safety of your own living room, the idea of riding a van-sized, over snow vehicle may sound like a romantic mode of travel, but in reality, snow coaches are large, cumbersome vehicles that grind, scrape, and shake their way across high mountain passes. It is impossible to ride in a snow coach for long periods of time.

As a result, the proposal to only access the park by means of mass transit further restricts time and access to the park by virtually eliminating all entrances to Yellowstone except for the gate at West Yellowstone, Montana. The terrain and elevation at Wyoming's East Gate is so rugged and high that it is impractical for snow coaches to travel in that area of the park. Sylvan Pass reaches an elevation of 8,530 feet and is surrounded by mountains that rise well over 10,000 feet on one side, and gorges with sheet drops of several thousand feet on the other. This is definitely not a place for a snow coach.

Furthermore, by moving the southern access point from Flag Ranch to Colter Bay, the Park Service makes any southern day trip into Yellowstone an impossible 113 miles round trip. This also creates a serious safety problem for Idaho snow groomers who, in the past, filled up their gas tanks at Flag Ranch. Under the current proposal, these facilities will be closed and the groomers will not have enough gas to make one complete round trip. This creates a serious safety problem and shuts off access to more than 60 miles of non-Park Service trails.

Once again, I would like to reiterate that the complete banning of snowmobiles is not the only available alternative for national park recreational winter use. For the past three years, I have worked with the communities surrounding Yellowstone to develop a more practical and more inclusive approach to Yellowstone winter use.

After holding dozens of meetings with residents and business owners, we have been able to create a proposal that preserves the park's environmental health while at the same time ensuring future access—for everyone. This amendment will enable the Park Service to rethink its actions and hopefully incorporate a more positive approach to winter management.

I grew up spending time in Yellowstone where grandparents camped inside the park all summer. I have been back many times since, sometimes on a snowmobile. In fact, I get there every year. Over the years the park has improved, not been overrun or run down as efforts mostly to get additional funds imply. Anyone who knows and loves Yellowstone like I do can attest to the fact that there is room enough for wildlife, snowmobiles, snowshoers, cross country skiers and snow coaches in Yellowstone, and a reasonable compromise can be reached to include all of these uses, that is unless federal officials don't step in first and ensure everyone is excluded. Wildlife and human enjoyment of the wildlife are not mutually exclusive. Good administration would accommodate both.

The study outlined in this amendment would establish a necessary first step in restoring access, not just to the park, but to the land planning process, for those people who will bear the brunt of the Park Service's decision to ban snowmobiles. Clearly, the Park Service's decision in this matter is an arbitrary decision that bypassed local communities, counties, states and even Congress. The Park Service needs the direction provided for in this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I stand in support of my colleague from Wyoming on his amendment.

I was quite surprised when Senator REID of Nevada spoke on the floor about this issue because I heard what he was saying before. It was given in testimony before the Subcommittee on Parks, chaired by the Senator from Wyoming, by the national environmental groups. He was following their script. Their script says: Get all of the snowmobiles out of the park. For some reason that impacts the parks. I have ridden snowmobiles in Yellowstone. I am not sure the Senator from Nevada has. I am not sure many Senators have. I don't dispute the need to manage the number of snowmobiles and the entry of snowmobiles where they travel.

But arbitrarily and without justification, Assistant Secretary Barry—who has now fled to the Wilderness Society once he tried to accomplish his damage here in this administration with the Park Service—came before the committee and emphatically said they had to go. In a press conference a few days prior to that hearing in almost a defiant, arrogant way, he said he was going to take all of them out of the parks, finish the rulemaking in Yellowstone, and so be it—failing to recognize the industries that have built up around snowmobiling at both entrances to Yellowstone Park; failing to deal with them in a responsible, cooperative way—so that he could ensure the mantra of the Clinton administration, and that public lands generate economies in recreation and tourism.

Here quite the opposite was going on—no economy, everything for the environment, even though the facts bear out that you can still have an economy, meaning people on snowmobiles in Yellowstone in the wintertime, and still protect the environment.

How do you accomplish that? You work with the industry. What do you do with the industry? You ask them to redesign their sleds so they make little to no noise and very little pollution—if there is any of consequence that would damage the environment to begin with.

What does the industry say? They can do it. In fact, last winter they were operating in Yellowstone with a prototype put out by one of the snowmobile manufacturers. It was a four-cycle instead of a two-cycle engine. The Senator from Nevada was bemoaning the pollution of the two-cycle. We now know they can produce a four-cycle that will be certainly less environmentally damaging. They are willing to do that.

The moment the industry said to the Park Service we can supply you with a new sled that meets these standards, the Park Service says: Oh, well, it wasn't air pollution, it wasn't noise pollution, it was wildlife harassment.

Somehow the wildlife of Yellowstone is going through some emotional problem as a result of snowmobiles trafficking by recreationists on a daily basis. I am not quite sure they have had any examples of these wildlife species in therapy. But somehow they seem to know a great deal about it.

The bottom line is simply this: The environmentalists have told this administration they want snowmobiles out of the parks.

I suggest to the National Park Service that they have a real problem on their hands in management. In other words, they are denying public access to parks that were designed to protect the environment and also allow public access. They have a crisis in management.

They don't have an environmental problem in Yellowstone, they have a management problem, a failure on the part of this administration, and certainly this President, to recognize the cooperative balance between the environment and the public and how one benefits from creating this kind of balance for all to benefit from.

Mr. GORTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I note another Senator interested in the subject. I note there are 55 minutes between now and 6:15. I have a minimum of 3 amendments that I know are going to be debated and will require votes, and perhaps five. While there are no limitations on this, I appreciate it being concluded relatively quickly so we can go to the Senator from Nevada. His amendment will be contested, and there will be more after that. We are scheduled to go off this bill, for good, except for votes, at 6:15.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for giving an evaluation of the time remaining on the amendments that must be dealt with. I know the chairman has been struggling since around 3:15 to get Senators to debate the amendments, and now all of a sudden they appear on the floor in the last minutes.

I conclude my debate. The Senator from Montana, I know, wants to speak to this issue. It impacts his State and the economy of his State. Once again I say to the administration, shame on you for taking people out of the environment, all in the name of the environment. It doesn't seem a very good solution to me, if you are going to tout tourism and recreation to us western States as an alternative to the elimination of the extractive resource industries that have provided economies to our States for the last 100-plus years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. It will not take long to make the point. I will facilitate everything, as the chairman of the subcommittee wants.

If Members want to talk about wildlife in Yellowstone, you will see very little variety in wildlife in Yellowstone in the wintertime. If you have been there, you know that about the only thing you will see is bison. Let me tell you, you don't bother them with a little old snowmobile. They are just walking around, and they go wherever they want to, whenever they want to. So let's not be worried about the bison. Whether you agree with it or not, there are too many bison in the park. We have grazed that country right into the ground.

I remind Members that those who operate the snowmobiles out of West Yellowstone have gone to the Park Service and said: We will make arrangements to prevent line-ups at the gate, we will get new, cleaner, quieter machines, we will work with you in order to protect the environment of Yellowstone Park.

There will be more people in a week this summer through the park than all of next winter. You cannot even get through that park for traffic right now. One of these days, you will have to go to a gate and pick a number and they call your number and you get to go to the park. The impact is in the summer, not in the winter, no matter what you are riding. It could be an old gray horse or a snowmobile, it doesn't make any difference. And are we concerned about that?

Let's not be shocked. The Senator from Wyoming has a good idea. It is time we take a realistic look at this, do the study, and go forward with the recommendations that are made.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Environmental Protection Agency has issued proposed regulations governing the emissions of snowmobiles in our National Park System. It is very clear that these vehicles cause big problems. Why do I say that? A single snowmobile belches out the same pollution that 20 automobiles do. One snowmobile equals the pollution of 20 passenger cars.

Also, my friend from Tennessee earlier talked about the air pollution in the Great Smoky Mountains because of coal-fired generating plants in that area. There isn't much that can be done, at this stage at least, to stop those longstanding power producers from generating the emissions they do. But there is something we can do to stop air pollution from developing as it has in our National Park System.

It is a national disgrace that the levels of toxic pollution, such as carbon monoxide—in Yellowstone National Park, to pick just one—rival major urban centers such as Los Angeles and Denver. I repeat, it is a national disgrace that levels of toxic pollutants such as carbon monoxide, in our national parks—especially Yellowstone—at times, rival major urban centers such as Los Angeles and Denver. That is significant.

But what is being proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency is nothing that is going to eliminate snowmobiling in our country.

For example, of the more than 130,000 miles of designated snowmobile trails in the United States, less than 1,000 of those miles are in national parks—to be exact, there are 600 miles. So this furor, and the offering of this amendment, to eliminate this proposal to stop the air pollution of snowmobiles in national parks is really a red herring. There are other places you can ride snowmobiles. In fact, you can ride them over 129,000 miles in the United States alone. We need not ride them this 600 miles in national parks.

Appropriate access to national parks is important, but such access does not include all forms of transportation at all times. Protecting parks from air, water, and noise pollution, for the enjoyment of all Americans, should be our No. 1 goal.

I am very happy that the Senator from Tennessee spoke earlier about how important national parks are. I agree with him. We are the envy of the rest of the world with our national parks.

Yosemite, Great Basin National Park, Yellowstone National Park—these wonderful gems of nature, that we are attempting to preserve, need to be preserved.

The amendment would prohibit the Park Service from doing its job to protect some of America's most awe-inspiring national treasures. The landscape of our national parks should reflect the wonders of our Creator, which I think we have an obligation to protect. National parks do not need to serve as racetracks for noisy, high-polluting snow machines.

The State of Nevada shares Lake Tahoe with California. We wish we had all of Lake Tahoe, but we do not mind sharing it with California. It is a wonderful, beautiful lake. There is only one other lake like it in the world, and that is Lake Bakal in the former Soviet Union, now Russia, an alpine glacial lake. Lake Tahoe it is very deep—not as deep as Lake Bakal, which is over 5,000 feet deep, but very deep. It was only 35 years ago they found the bottom of Lake Tahoe. It is extremely cold. It is beautiful. It is emerald colored.

But one of the things contributing to the ruination of Lake Tahoe is two-stroke engines. They were outlawed last year. I am glad they were outlawed. People may complain: What are we going to do for recreation?

There are plenty of things to do for recreation without these two-stroke engines. They are gone now. The lake is less polluted. It sounds better. Two-stroke engines are also the engines that snowmobiles use. They have been outlawed at Lake Tahoe. Why? Because they are inefficient, highly polluting, and contribute disproportionately to the decline of the lake's legendary clarity and degradation of its water quality.

Our national parks deserve similar protection from the pollution produced by these snow machines.

In sum, the use of snowmobiles currently prevents adequate protection of air and water quality for wildlife. Damage is being done to national parks not some time in the future but right now. The unnecessary delay caused by this amendment would allow further damage to our parks.

Congress should allow individual parks that currently allow snowmobiling to go through a public comment process to determine what course of action is appropriate. This amendment would eliminate that.

EPA agrees that the Park Service has the primary and immediate duty to take action to protect parks from snowmobile impacts. In comments on the draft EIS for winter use at Yellowstone, EPA said:

> We encourage the National Park Service to take the steps necessary to protect human health and the environment immediately rather than to depend on future regulations of off-highway vehicle engines from EPA.

They are saying let's not wait for us to do it. The Park Service has an obligation to do it right now. Postponing Park Service action on the snowmobile issue is a delay tactic, pure and simple.

The amendment we are debating assumes there is an inherent right of snowmobiles to run wild in the national parks, irrespective of their impact on other users and the environment. This is a very flawed assumption. They have no inherent right to run wild in national parks.

All Americans have the right to enjoy our national parks but only in ways that do not damage the parks. Prohibiting snowmobiles in national parks will have an insignificant impact on recreational opportunities available to snowmobilers. Again, there are more than 130,000 miles of designated trails in the United States, and less than 1,000 of those miles are in national parks. That is less than 1 percent.

Because millions of acres of public lands are already open to public snowmobiling, banning snow machines in national parks does not prevent recreationists from using their vehicles. It just prevents them from using the most sensitive and heavily visited public lands.

Arguing that every form of recreational access should be allowed in national parks is silly. Visitors do not need to jet boat in Crater Lake National Park. Visitors do not need to ride dirt bikes in the Grand Canyon. Visitors do not need to bungee jump from the Washington Monument.

Prohibitions against such activities do not restrict Americans' access to our parks; rather, they indicate a willingness to protect parks for the enjoyment of all visitors.

Great Basin National Park in Nevada already prohibits snowmobile use. Glacier and Yosemite Parks do not allow snowmobile use.

What are some of the environmental problems caused by snowmobiles in national parks?

Environmental analyses done at Yellowstone and elsewhere have shown that snowmobiles can seriously damage park resources. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, existing scientific evidence ''clearly and convincingly demonstrates [that] current snowmobile use is adversely affecting the natural . . . aesthetic . . . and scenic values'' in Yellowstone.

Air pollution: Yellowstone and several other national parks are recognized as Class I airsheds under the Clean Air Act. The Park Service is required by law to protect these areas from any degradation. The presence of snowmobiles in the park makes that task virtually impossible.

Air quality monitors at Yellowstone's west entrance have found carbon monoxide levels that rival or exceed those found in major urban areas such as Denver and Los Angeles.

Snowmobiles account for up to 68 percent of Yellowstone's annual carbon monoxide emissions and up to 90 percent of hydrocarbon emissions, even through automobiles out number them 16 to 1.

Water pollution: Every winter, snowmobiles spew unburned fuel into the snow in national parks and ultimately into their rivers and lakes.

Contaminants released by snowmobiles two-stroke engines include polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH) and methyl tertiary butyl ether.

PAHs in water are toxic to aquatic life, and MTBE is an identified human health hazard

Noise pollution: The preservation of natural sounds is a major national park management objective,

A study of snowmobile noise interfered with visitors' ability to hear natural sounds at 12 out of 13 popular locations, including Morning Glory Pool, Grand Prismatic Spring, and other destinations. At Old Faithful, the world's most famous geyser, snowmobile engines were the dominant sound 100 percent of the time.

Wildlife impacts: The NPS Biological Resources Division found that ''snowmobile usage adversely affects wildlife.''

Noise and the physical presence of snowmobiles cause animals to alter their activity patterns, This behavioral response is of concern because snowmobile use occurs when food supplies are low and an animal's ability to conserve energy may be critical to its survival.

Heavily used snowmobile routes can cut off winter migration paths used by park wildlife.

Conflicts with other park visitors: Snowmobiles detract from other people's experience in the national parks. A 1996 visitor use study conducted in Yellowstone found many people who reported that encounters with snowmobiles were the least enjoyable part of their park visit because of the noise, pollution, and impact on wildlife viewing.

How will restrictions on national parks affect other recreational snowmobiling opportunities?

According to the International Snowmobile Manufacturers Association there are approximately 230,000 miles of groomed and marked snowmobile trails in North America, and about 130,000 miles in the United States. This does not include areas such as national forest roads that are open to snowmobiles but not explicitly designated for snowmobiles. In contrast, there are only about 600 miles of roads and waterways open to snowmobile in national parks in the continental United States, and 300 of those miles are excluded from the NPS April 26 announcement. Closing national parks will not diminish recreation opportunities for snowmobiles, but it will help reduce noise, pollution, and congestion in Yellowstone and other parks.

Many states have thousands of miles of designated trails for snowmobilers to enjoy. Promotional material from the state of Wyoming does not even mention Yellowstone National Park, but does promise that ''with over 2,200 miles of snowmobile trails, you can access some of the most scenic backcountry in the world.'' (See attachment #8)

Snowmobile opportunities in other States include: Colorado, over 3,000 miles of trails; Idaho, over 7,200 miles of trails; Maine, over 12,000 miles of trails; Michigan, 5,800 miles of trails; Minnesota, 14,000 miles of trails; and Montana, over 2,500 miles of trails.

How much snowmobile use is there in the national parks?

There are 42 units of the National Park System that allow snowmobiles, 28 of these parks are in the continental U.S. Over 175,000 snowmobiles use these 28 parks annually. The five parks with the most annual use are: Yellowstone, 65,000 are 1.5 million registered snowmobiles in the United States.

How will this affect individual national parks?

The National Park Service action DOES NOT immediately ban snowmobile use in all national parks. Late this summer, the Park Service plans to release a proposed rule that will amend its overall snowmobile regulation, 36 CFR 2.18 and address each of the parks that currently allow snowmobiles. This proposed rule would modify or amend those special regulations to bring parks into compliance with the Executive Orders, statutes, and regulations. Public comments will be incorporated before the rule is made final.

For example, approximately 80 percent of existing snowmobile use at Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore is expected to continue. and at St. Croix National Scenic Riverway, an annual ''Winterfest'' celebration that includes snowmobiles is expected to continue under a special use permit.

There are arguments by opponents of Park Service regulations.

Argument: A snowcoach system in Yellowstone would deny visitors access to the park.

Response: The snowcoach system proposed by the Park Service for Yellowstone and Grand Teton national parks will provide park visitors access to all of the areas currently open to snowmobile visitors.

The only access proposed to be limited is that of backcountry ski and snowshoe visitors in off-trail areas of critical winter wildlife habitat.

The snowcoach system will allow the same number, if not more, of visitors to enter the park each winter, while reducing the number of vehicles by 90% (assuming average capacities of one person per snowmobile and the ten per snowcoach).

There is a tendency to confuse access with recreational use. Snowmobiles as currently used are a form of recreation. The parks have a duty to determine the means of access to park attractions that cause the least damage to resources. In no way is public access being eroded, rather a recreational pursuit is being eliminated due to its negative impacts on park resources. A less damaging mode of transportation will be substituted to allow visitor access to the parks.

Proposals to allow snowmobiles but to cap their numbers would essentially limit the numbers of winter visitors to the park. People are not the problem in the parks. Noisy, polluting machines are what's needed to be limited.

In relation to economic impacts—argument: The Yellowstone gateway communities are uniformly opposed to the removal of snowmobiles because it will destroy their winter economies.

Response: Scores of businesspeople in West Yellowstone, MT, the main winter gateway to Yellowstone, have raised their voices in support of removal of snowmobiles from the park. Several representatives of the community/business owner organization West Yellowstone Citizens for a Healthy Park traveled to Washington, D.C. this spring to tell Congress that the health of their local economy depends on the health of Yellowstone National Park.

Current snowmobile use in Yellowstone creates numerous problems of safety, noise and air pollution in gateway communities. A change in winter park transportation will allow for much-desired diversification of gateway economies.

In relation to improved technology—Argument: The regulation of snowmobiles in national parks should be delayed until new snowmobile technologies are available.

Response: The EPA has explicitly told the Park Service not to wait for upcoming EPA regulations: ''This DEIS includes extensive analysis of the effects from current winter use and that analysis demonstrates significant environmental and human health impacts. We encourage NPS to take the steps necessary to protect human health and the environment immediately rather than to depend on future regulation of OHV engines from EPA.'' EPA comments on Draft EIS for Winter Use Plans, Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks and John D. Rockefeller Jr. Memorial Parkway, Region 8 EPA, Denver, CO.

EPA regulations will not address noise emissions from snowmobiles and may not require air emissions stringent enough to protect park air quality.

Compliance with park regulations and laws regarding wildlife, noise and visitor conflict will not be addressed by the development of snowmobiles with less air pollution.

Less polluting snowmobiles would not address the mass transit needs of the parks. Many parks are adopting mass transit using the cleanest, quietest technologies available; this is also the case in Yellowstone. Transportation alternatives to the one-person, one vehicle model have been implemented in Acadia and Denali, and will soon be in place in Grand Canyon, Zion and Yosemite National Parks. The NPS should be a leader in promoting clean, quiet and affordable modes of group transportation that are protective of the natural qualities of the parks.

Recognizing that it is the vehicles, not the people at the root of the problem, Yellowstone in winter is a natural place to look next for expansion of the alternative transportation program already taking place in the Park System.

In relation to the history of Snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park, in 1963, the first snowmobile enters Yellowstone. In 1973–1974, 30,000

snowmobiles enter Yellowstone. In 1972 the National Park Service Regional Director asked all parks to devise winter use plans. Glacier National Park undertook such a review and noted the variety of problems caused by snowmobiling in the park including air and noise pollution, wildlife disturbance and conflicts with other park users. For these reasons and because of strong public sentiment against disrupting the quiet and beauty of Glacier National Park with snowmobiles, the park decided to ban them. Yosemite, Sequoia/Kings Canyon, Lassen and others followed suit.

Yellowstone, however, did not follow the directive to assess the impact of snowmobiles on park resources. Complaints from visitors and park rangers concerning air and noise pollution grew commonplace and the first studies documenting adverse impacts to wildlife from snowmobile use were completed. Future superintendents of Yellowstone allowed further expansion of snowmobiling in the park despite ongoing concerns about air and noise pollution and wildlife impacts. Finally, in the 1990s conditions in Yellowstone and Grand Teton grew so bad that the parks were forced to take action.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I wanted to take a few minutes to discuss the rulemaking that has been proposed by the National Park Service to limit the use of snowmobiles in national parks.

National parks are the crown jewels of our nation's system of public lands. They harbor diverse wildlife, rare and beautiful species of plants and spectacular geological formations. In my home state of South Dakota, the Badlands National Park is home to a rich trove of ancient fossils and it provides important habitat for the black-tailed prairie dog and black-footed ferret.

I support the efforts of the National Park Service to ensure that these lands remain pristine so that future generations of Americans can enjoy them. I also understand the strong desire of many snowmobilers to continue to have wintertime access to these lands, where the activity has been enjoyed for many years.

While snowmobiling does not currently take place in national parks in South Dakota, there is a great deal of interest in this issue in the state and support for appropriately managed access to national parks. By carefully managing the parks, I believe that we can provide this access in a manner that is sensitive to the needs of the environment and to those who go to public lands in search of solitude and quiet.

Today, Secretary Bruce Babbitt wrote me to describe in greater detail how the National Park Service intends to proceed in coming months. I believe that it is critical for the agency to review a variety of options for managing snowmobiles and to ensure a full opportunity for public comment. According to the Secretary's letter, the agency does not intend to ban snowmobiles, but will proceed with a rulemaking and public comment period that will allow a full analysis of this issue and provide options for the controlled use of snowmobiles in national parks. I look forward to continuing to discuss this issue with my colleagues, the administration, representatives of environmental groups and snowmobiling enthusiasts.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary Babbitt be included in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 17, 2000.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DASCHLE: I am responding to your recent request for clarification of the status of National Park Service actions on the use of snowmobiles in national parks. Since there have been some misperceptions about what the Service has done, I appreciate the opportunity to provide this clarification.

In response to a petition for a rulemaking, the National Park Service has reviewed the snowmobile use that is now allowed in 42 of the 379 units of the national park system. That review, including a review by the Office of the Solicitor of the Department, had led us to conclude that much of the snowmobile use that is now occurring is not consistent with the requirements of Executive Orders 11644 and 11898, issued by Presidents Nixon and Carter, and other legal requirements. Accordingly, in April the Department and the Service announced that we would undertake a new rulemaking to modify the existing system-wide general rule (36 CFR 2.18), and additional park-specific special rules, to bring them into compliance with the applicable legal requirements. We did not announce that any decision had been made, but instead that we intend to initiate a rulemaking process. In that process, we will comply with all established requirements for rulemaking, including the requirements for seeking and considering public comments. It is our current intent to publish by mid-September a proposed rule, for public comment, to begin the formal process of making these changes.

Until a new rulemaking is completed, the existing rules on snowmobile use in the national parks remain in effect.

We will seek public comment on a proposed rule generally following the format of the existing rule, which prohibits snowmobile use in national parks except in certain instances. The draft rule has not yet been completed, but, when finalized, it would not affect snowmobile use opportunities in national park system areas for the following purposes: For access to private, or other nonfederal property; for access across national parks to reach private or other public lands that are open to snowmobiles use; where the roads through national parks are not under federal jurisdiction; and as authorized in specific national park enabling statutes (i.e., with respect to national parks in Alaska and Voyaguers National Park).

In addition, as a result of settlement of litigation, the National Park Service is in the final stages of preparing a Winter Use Management Plan and EIS for Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks. The final decisions on winter use have not been made there, but those decisions will determine future winter use management in these two parks, including the use of snowmobiles.

If we do propose a rule containing these elements, and if, following public comment, we finalize a rule along these lines, the net effect would be that some level of snowmobile use would continue in about 30 of the 42 national parks where it is now allowed. Of course, since the proposed rule will be subject to public review and comment, we are likely to consider additional alternatives during this process and a different outcome could result.

To summarize, the National Park Service has not made any final decisions on what changes to make in the snowmobile use that is allowed in national parks, and any decisions we make will be made following public comment and in compliance with other requirements for agency rulemaking. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this.

Sincerely,

BRUCE BABBITT.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to comment on the issue of snowmobiling in Yellowstone.

It is pretty clear to anyone who has visited Yellowstone during the winter that changes need to be made to protect the park. I have met with folks on all sides of this issue, and I think that most people agree that the noise, air pollution and wildlife impacts are unacceptable and have to be addressed.

Yellowstone is the engine for local economies and is part of our national heritage. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to make sure that we don't harm the park and its wildlife.

That having been said, I don't think we need an outright ban. I believe that we can protect the park and its wildlife in other ways. Already, people have put forth a number of creative alternatives to meet these goals, including limiting the number of snowmobiles allowed in the park, requiring clean and quiet machines, and using guided tours.

I think we need to explore all these alternatives and work together to strike a common-sense balance that best serves Yellowstone and Montana. A balance that protects the Park, the local economies and involves people on all sides of this issue.

As my colleagues in this body know, I am not in favor of legislating on appropriations bills. I am pleased that the Senate has decided to not pursue that route for the time being. It is my hope that the current administrative process that is underway for Yellowstone will produce an administrative compromise that protects Yellowstone National Park and provides for a broad range of visitor uses of the Park.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3800, WITHDRAWN

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator from Montana and the other Members who have joined.

There is no one in this place who is a stronger supporter of national parks than I. I continue to support the national parks. Here is a chance to find some alternative ways to do that.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for giving time.

I do not intend to ask for a vote.

Mr. GORTON. Is the Senator withdrawing the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. I will withdraw the amendment. I intend to withdraw the amendment to try to find a mutual resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for that gesture. I support the cause to which he has spoken. If there is a way to get at least part of that adopted, I will try to find it.

I express my appreciation to my friend from Nevada to whom I made a promise about debating this amendment earlier that I could not keep. He has been most understanding.

Mr. BRYAN. I appreciate the distinguished leader's comments. The Senator from Washington has honored his commitment because, as the Senator knows, I had a previous commitment earlier in the day. I thank the Senator for his accommodation.

As I understand the parliamentary status, I will need to seek unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment for the purpose of offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3883

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], for himself, and Mr. FITZGERALD, proposes an amendment numbered 3883.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the Forest Service timber sale budget by $30,000,000 and increase the wildland fire management budget by $15,000,000)

On page 164, line 19, strike ''$1,233,824,000,'' and insert ''$1,203,824,000,''.

On page 164, line 23, strike ''(16 U.S.C. 460*l*6a(i)):'' and insert ''(16 U.S.C. 460*l*6a(i)), of which $220,844,000 shall be available for forest products:''.

On page 165, beginning on line 6, strike ''*Provided*'' and all that follows through ''accomplishment:'' on lines 11 and 12.

On page 165, line 25, strike ''$618,500,000, to remain available until expended:'' and insert ''$633,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $419,593,000 shall be available for preparedness and fire use functions:''.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment with my colleague from Illinois that is a win-win for the American taxpayer and for those communities that reside near our National Forests.

The Bryan-Fitzgerald amendment will cut $30 million from the Forest Service's money losing timber program and shift $15 million to needed fire planning and preparedness activities.

Thee is a crucial need for increased fire planning on our National Forests.

Our amendment responds to the findings of a recent internal Forest Service report that found that the agency was violating its own National Fire Management Policy due to the lack of ''Fire Management Plans'' for each national forest.

The report indicated that fire management planning has not been a priority within the Forest Service, with less than 5 percent of the National Forests having current, approved fire plans.

The Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy calls for ''every area with burnable vegetation [to] have an approved Fire Management Plan.''

The Wildland Fire program protects life, property, and natural resources on the 192 million acres of National Forest System lands as well as an additional 20 million acres of adjacent State and private lands that are protected through fee or reciprocal protection agreements.

In my home state of Nevada, we have a multi-jurisdictional firefighting organization known as the Sierra Front, which is comprised of federal, state, and local fire management agencies. I might say, parenthetically, in my experience both as a former Governor and as a member of this body, the Sierra Front has done an extraordinary job in terms of coordinating and preparing its own activities and is relied upon by local, State, as well as national forest administrators for a coordinated effort.

There are similar organizations in other States, and all of these organizations depend heavily on Federal fire preparedness funds for necessary training and organizational planning activities.

The amendment we offer will provide an additional $15 million for the Forest Service to enhance its capability to prevent, detect, or take prompt, effective, official suppression action on wildlife fires.

There is a financial benefit, a cost-benefit analysis that needs to be considered. I bring my colleagues' attention to an internal Forest Service report issued earlier this year entitled ''Policy implications of large fire management, the strategic assessment of factors influencing the cost.'' I think our colleagues will be interested to know that this report concludes that estimates have shown that for every dollar of appropriated preparedness dollars received, there is a savings of $5 to $7 in fire suppression and emergency rehabilitation funds spent.

The point that needs to be made is, a little fire management planning goes a long way to reduce and to minimize the overall impact when fire comes because of the training, the planning, and the preparedness activities that go on as a result of that. That is a dollar savings to the American taxpayer and, in my judgment, is a very prudent expenditure of Federal dollars.

Unfortunately, notwithstanding this assessment, the myth that commercial logging is the best method of fuels reduction is driving some of my colleagues to appropriate more funds for the timber program at the expense of needed fire plans for national forests, increased education for residents on wildland boundaries, and on fire preparedness activities. In fact, to the contrary, it is widely recognized in the scientific community that past commercial logging and associated road-building activities are the prime culprits for the severity of many of our wildfires.

Commercial logging removes the least flammable portion of trees—their main stems or trunks, while leaving behind their most flammable portions—their needles and limbs, directly on the ground. Untreated logging slash can adversely affect fire behavior for up to 30 years following the logging operations.

According to the Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project report, issued in 1996 by the Federal Government,

timber harvest, through its effects on forest structure, local microclimate and fuel accumulation, has increased fire severity more than any other recent human activity.

In addition, a recent GAO report stated that:

Mechanically removing fuels through commercial timber harvesting and other means can also have adverse effects on wildlife habitat and water quality in many areas. Officials told GAO that, because of these effects, a large-scale expansion of commercial timber harvesting alone for removing materials would not be feasible. However, because the Forest Service relies on the timber program for funding many of its other activities, including reducing fuels, it has often used this program to address the wildfire problem. The difficulty with such an approach, however, is that the lands with commercially valuable timber are often not those with the greatest wildfire hazards.

Logging causes adverse changes in forest composition—intensive thinning and clearcutting dry out soils and leave behind debris that becomes tinder dry in open clearcuts.

Congress should invest in proactive fire planning and non-commercial hazardous fuels reduction projects as the best means of avoiding the high costs to taxpayers, damage to ecosystems, and risk to firefighters from reactive, unplanned, emergency fire suppression actions.

This bill contains $250 million for the administration of the timber sale program, which is more than $30 million above the Administration's budget request.

These expenditures for a money losing timber program are an enormous drain on the Treasury.

In their most recent Forest Management Program Annual Report, July, 1998, the Forest Service admits to losing $88.6 million from their timber program in FY97.

This was the second consecutive year that the Forest Service reported a loss.

In addition to the reported loss, the $88.6 million figure excludes a full accounting of all costs associated with logging.

In past fiscal years, independent analyses estimate the loss from below-cost timber sales are far greater than those reported by the Forest Service.

The General Accounting Office estimated that the timber program cost taxpayers at least $2 billion from 1922 to 1997, and in recent testimony they indicated that ''[t]he Forest Service is still years away from providing the Congress and the public with a clear understanding of what is being accomplished with taxpayer dollars.''

Our amendment would reduce funding for the Forest Service's timber program by $30 million to the level requested by the Administration.

In spite of the fact that our National Forest supply a mere 4% of our nation's annual timber harvest, this bill continues to reflect the dominance of the timber program at the expense of other programs designed to improve forest health and enhance the public's enjoyment of our national forest.

Over 380,000 miles of roads criss-cross the national forests—that is over eight times the distance of the Federal Interstate Highway System—and, in addition, there are an additional 40,000 miles of univentoried roads.

The Forest Service estimates that over 80% of these roads are not maintained to public safety and environmental standards.

As a matter of public policy, I would argue that it makes more sense to maintain the roads we already have than to spend money building new roads we don't need for a logging program that costs taxpayers millions of dollars each year.

I urge my colleagues to support the Bryan-Fitzgerald amendment to cut wasteful subsidies for the commercial timber industry and to enhance the Forest Service's ability to combat the devastating wildfires confronting many of our communities in the West.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have been listening with great interest for the last several minutes as the Senator from Nevada made his presentation in relation to an amendment to take $30 million out of the timber program. He has given the reason that we have a catastrophic situation in the West today—some 39 million acres of our public timbered lands are in a critical situation as it relates to stand-altering fires, and we ought to do better planning. Therefore, we ought to take the money out to do better planning so we could circumvent this situation. And, oh, by the way, logging exacerbates that problem by leaving some slash on the ground.

The argument of the Senator might have some modicum of validity if we had not done what we did last week. Last week, we passed Senator PETE DOMENICI's bill for which the Senator from Nevada voted. We put $240 million, not $30 million—$240 million in a fuel reduction program. In fact, the Forest Service says it funds entirely, Senator BRYAN, all that they can do. It even provides additional money for planning. So, really, the fire issue should be set aside in your debate, based on the actions of the Senate last week. I think what the Senate did last week is responsible, to put that kind of money into fuel reduction, especially in the urban interface and in those areas of the kind we saw at Los Alamos, in New Mexico, where we saw hundreds of homes go up in smoke as a result of bad policy and bad management on the part of this administration coming together.

What are we talking about, then, if the fire issue has been dealt with appropriately by this Senate? If what we are talking about is the existing timber program that obviously the Senator from Nevada opposes, as do many environmental groups that he finds himself here on the floor today representing, then the fire issue I think is relatively moot. So let's talk about the timber sale program.

What the Senator from Nevada is doing when he talks about it being a money loser is he is taking money out of a program from a portion of the program that really is the money maker. So he is fulfilling a prophesy of argument that somehow this will continue to be a money loser, and most assuredly it will be if you take money from that kind of program.

Let me talk about the program for a few moments, where it is as a part of an overall forest policy in our Nation, and why it is important we keep some approach to a timber program, whether it is for green sales to supply dimensional timber to the housing industry of our Nation, or whether it is for the purpose of thinning and reducing the overall burden of the number of trees within a stand of timber, therefore increasing the viability of forest health in our Nation's forests.

Those 39 million acres of timberland that are in critical condition today across our Nation are, in fact, a result of the overstocking of these acreages. Some 400-plus trees per acre now exist on land that 100 years ago, long before man was out there logging them, had only 60 trees per acre.

As a result, we need a concentrated program of management for fuels reduction for fire, but I also think we can reasonably argue that we can take some of those trees out for timber, logging, home building, purposes for the Nation's economy.

Let me give an example of where we are with the industry at this moment and why I think it is important we discuss it.

On this first chart, it shows in 1989 there were about 150,000 jobs in the timber industry nationwide. In 1997, that had been reduced to about 55,000 timber jobs, almost a two-thirds reduction in overall employment that is in direct correspondence, in part, to the amount of logging that goes on.

Since the Clinton administration has come to Washington, its timber policies have reduced logging on our national forests by over 80 percent nationwide—an 80-percent reduction nationwide in overall logging.

What does that mean on a State-by-State basis? Let me give an example of what it means in at least three States. It does not mean much in the State of Nevada. They do not have trees to log, except in very limited ways. This is what it means in the State of Washington from 1989 to present: It means 55 mills closed and 3,285 primary mill jobs. That is what that kind of policy means. In my State of Idaho, 13 mills closed, 1,083 people. In the State of Oregon, 111 mills closed and 11,600 people. That is even after the President's new plan.

Remember, when he came to office, he held a big timber summit in Oregon: Save the trees and save the jobs. They have not been able to produce the jobs. In fact, they had to backtrack and even back away from their own policy because of the pressure from environmental groups. They were unwilling to support their own policy. The Senator from Nevada is now on the floor trying to argue for a major reduction in that policy.

In the State of California, 46 mills and 4,427 jobs. It will not affect Nevada. They do not cut trees there, or cut very few.

I have worked with the Senator from Nevada on an area that I think is tremendously important. The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources just reported out S. 1925, the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act. The Senator from Nevada and his colleague have been extremely concerned about the health of the forest in the Greater Tahoe Basin, and he should be. That forest is an overmature, climax forest. In other words, it is beyond the point of healthy adulthood. Trees are dying; trees are too thick. There is an urban interface with beautiful big recreational homes built amongst the stands of timber. They have a silviculture problem with the potential of massive wildfires in the Tahoe Basin, losing those beautiful homes, and creating a catastrophic environmental situation that could badly damage the beautiful Lake Tahoe itself.

The Senator from Nevada has a problem. He has a bill that authorizes work to be done in the basin, but he has no money. What he is doing tonight is cutting out of one of the budgets of the Forest Service, some of the very money that will go to restore Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Basin. I am not quite sure he can get it both ways.

I have worked with the Senator from Nevada to try to assure the Tahoe Basin restoration program will go forward and that we will have adequate moneys to begin to do the kinds of

silviculture programs, the thinnings and the necessary efforts, that will create a higher level of forest health in the Tahoe Basin. We cannot do it tonight because the Senator from Nevada is cutting $30 million to the detriment of his own program.

I suggest when he was approached by the environmental groups to do this amendment that was not a factor, but what is a factor is that the Senator from Nevada has not had money appropriated for his project. He will hand it over to the Forest Service at large. It is a bill that will authorize the Forest Service to move in that area, and he is even cutting the budgets of the Forest Service, or attempting to as we speak.

That is frustrating. It is extremely frustrating to this Senator who has worked very closely with the Senator from Nevada to assure that his Tahoe Basin project is authorized because it is necessary and it is appropriate.

Last week, the Senator from Nevada joined with us to put over $240 million into a fire reduction program and a program to allow the Forest Service to study even greater amounts of fire suppression by reduction of the fuel loading on our national forest floors.

Yet today he comes back with that argument. Let me suggest this argument is for one purpose and one purpose only, and his amendment will serve for one purpose and one purpose only. We find it right here in a letter from the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. This labor union—men and women who work for the forest products industries—says:

> The Bryan amendment places thousands of forest product jobs at risk and jeopardizes the social and economic stability of rural communities.

You are darned right it does. In the rural communities of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington that still have mill jobs, that still ought to be cutting trees. We have 13 and 14 percent unemployment, and this will drive the unemployment up even further.

No, those communities are not reaping the benefit of the current full employment economy. The mills on the eastern side of Washington are not reaping the benefit of the high-tech jobs of western Washington. The mills in north Idaho are not reaping the benefits of the high-tech jobs of south Idaho, and so on.

What we have attempted to do with reasonably consistent and environmentally sound policy is to ensure a balance. The Senator from Nevada denies us that balance by refusing to allow the Forest Service to have the very tools necessary to properly manage the current timber program.

This is not about new roads. There is a road moratorium. The Senator from Nevada knows that. The environmental community last week claimed a major victory with the President's new roadless area initiative. The Senator knows there is not going to be any new roads built. So roads are not the argument, not now and not for the near future.

What is at stake is the very jobs that produce the dimensional lumber that comes to the markets that builds the homes of America. It is right and reasonable to assume that some of it ought to come from the forests of Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and California.

I hope the Senator, recognizing that this whole issue has shifted pretty dramatically in the last 72 hours, will recognize that his amendment no longer has carrying with it the validity that his argument might have had just last week.

Mr. President, $240 million later, this Congress, in a responsible fashion, has addressed the catastrophic fire situation that might now exist in our public lands and are willing to deal with it. Those are the issues at hand that are so very important to all of us.

Lastly, the very money the Senator will eliminate from the projects and from the programs—here is a letter from the Society of American Foresters saying that the fire in Los Alamos that cost us 235 homes clearly demonstrates that if we had been allowed to have used the stewardship timber sales programs that, in part, the Senator's amendment will now deny us, we could have reduced the fuel loading and, in many instances, we might have saved those homes. That is exactly what we are trying to deal with here.

I hope my colleagues will vote with me in voting down the Bryan amendment. There is no basis for the arguments that are placed today that relate to the amendment itself. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I must say I have difficulty following the arguments of my friend from Idaho. First, I have no objection to—in fact, I am very supportive of it—the amendment offered by Senator DOMENICI last week. That has to do with hazardous fuels reduction, $120 million going to the Forest Service, $120 million going to BLM. I am for that.

As the Senator knows, that is a separate budget category entirely than the issue of the Bryan-Fitzgerald amendment. That is a subcategory of fire operations. What we are talking about is preparedness money, a totally different concept.

The issue is not whether Lake Tahoe could be harmed. Lake Tahoe does not have a commercial harvest timber program as such. It is minimal. We are talking about the money that is necessary to do the hazardous fuels reduction. The Senator from Nevada is very supportive of that. The Senator from Nevada wants to see more money set aside for preparedness and planning which is cost effective.

Let me, by way of an additional comment, point out that the program which the Senator from Nevada supports is cost effective; that is, it saves taxpayers dollars. It is a savings. The argument that the Senator from Idaho made refers to a program that has cost taxpayers, between 1992 and 1997, $2 billion. We are subsidizing them. I do not think that is a particularly good value.

But even though I might not think it is a particularly good value, I have not sought to eliminate that program. That program would be funded, if the Bryan-Fitzgerald amendment were offered, for $220 million. That is what the President recommended.

So what we are simply trying to do is to reprogram some of that money into an area that would be cost effective, in terms of planning and preparedness—something that all of the agencies that interface with the urban, forest, local, State, and Federal support and favor—and simply reduce, by the amount of $30 million, the amount that would go into a timber harvest program that has been found, by the GAO, and other internal reports, to be cost ineffective in a substantial subsidy.

So the issue is not, as my colleague from Idaho suggested, whether you favor timber harvest in the national forests—that is not the issue we are debating today; maybe he wants to make that the issue—but the question of where you allocate the funds.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRYAN. I will yield.

Mr. CRAIG. We checked with the Forest Service when we prepared the Forest Service budget, and their preparedness program has been fully budgeted for the year. They told us that it was adequate to meet their needs, and the current needs.

Does the Senator know otherwise?

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Nevada believes it is not adequate. Indeed, I think the amount of money that has been——

Mr. CRAIG. Even though the chief and his budget people say it is? I see. That is what we understood. Does the Senator now have information from the Forest Service that says otherwise?

Mr. BRYAN. If the Senator follows that line of reasoning, would he not agree the same managers will tell you that $220 million is adequate for the timber harvest program, would the Senator agree with that?

Mr. CRAIG. No, not at all, because what we did with the $220 million——

Mr. BRYAN. Did they argue for more?

Mr. CRAIG. Are you talking about timber harvest or the fuel reduction program?

Mr. BRYAN. The program that is called timber harvest.

Mr. CRAIG. I am quite sure they would say that it is funded adequately because this administration does not want to cut trees commercially.

Mr. BRYAN. You can't have it both ways.

Mr. CRAIG. Yes, we can, because I am giving categorical facts that the President's chief of the Forest Service

said the preparedness program was fully funded. That is all I am saying.

Mr. BRYAN. I would say to the Senator from Idaho, I thought we were all Americans, and these positions did not represent a particular party; they represent the entire country. The national forests belong not to Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. CRAIG. Now, the chief is a political appointee.

Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BRYAN. I would yield for one more question.

Mr. CRAIG. In the Tahoe Basin Restoration Program, that is near and dear to the Senator—and it is to me; it is a beautiful part of our country.

Mr. BRYAN. It is indeed.

Mr. CRAIG. Where trees must be removed—merchantable timber—there are areas where thinning is clearly necessary and so proscribed under the act.

Mr. BRYAN. The Senator from Nevada would agree with that.

Mr. CRAIG. Those would be under the commercial logging program because they could be done for less money and more efficiently. And that is the point of my argument, I say to the Senator. That is the program you are cutting.

Mr. BRYAN. I am not sure I would agree with the Senator from Idaho. Clearly, the hazardous fuels reduction program, in which we have provided, as you pointed out, 120 million additional dollars, would be the program that would address that issue, in my judgment.

I know other colleagues need to speak.

Mr. CRAIG. We yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I know my colleague from Connecticut has an amendment, so I will defer to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the extremely distinguished occupant of the chair. I also thank my friend from Oklahoma. I will try to respond to his graciousness by being brief.

AMENDMENT NO. 3811

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3811, which I filed at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] proposes an amendment numbered 3811.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funding for maintenance of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, with an offset)

On page 183, strike line 15 and insert ''$165,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $8,000,000 shall be derived by transfer of unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated under the heading ''NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES'', and of which $8,000,000 shall be available for maintenance of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.''.

On page 225, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 3. STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVE PLAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of Amendment No. 6 to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Plan transmitted by the Secretary of Energy on July 10, 2000, under section 154 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6234), the Secretary may draw down product from the Regional Distillate Reserve only on a finding by the President that there is a severe energy supply interruption.

(b) SEVERE ENERGY SUPPLY INTERRUPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of subsection (a), a severe energy supply interruption shall be deemed to exist if the President determines that—

(A) a severe increase in the price of middle distillate oil has resulted from an energy supply interruption; or

(B)(i) a circumstance other than that described in subparagraph (A) exists that constitutes a regional supply shortage of significant scope or duration; and

(ii) action taken under this section would assist directly and significantly in reducing the adverse impact of the supply shortage.

(2) SEVERE INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF MIDDLE DISTILLATE OIL.—For the purposes of paragraph (1)(A), a severe increase in the price of middle distillate oil'' shall be deemed to have occurred if—

(A) the price differential between crude oil and residential No. 2 heating oil in the Northeast, as determined by the Energy Information Administration, increases by—

(i) more than 15 percent over a 2-week period;

(ii) more than 25 percent over a 4-week period; or

(iii) more than 60 percent over its 5-year seasonally adjusted rolling average; and

(B) the price differential continues to increase during the most recent week for which price information is available.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment along with my colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, and Senator LEAHY of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent Senators DODD and LEAHY be added as cosponsors to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, we think this amendment is critical for the energy security of the Northeastern United States. Last winter, in the Northeast, we were really whacked by oil market whims, as we saw the prices of home heating oil soar, and we hovered dangerously close to heating oil supply shortages.

In New England, the price of home heating oil rose from an average of $1.18 a gallon to about $1.79 a gallon in just 3 weeks' time.

Some residents of my State were actually paying over $2 for a gallon of heating oil, which meant they were spending almost $500—some of them—to fill their tanks. Of course, lower income residents and fixed-income residents, including thousands of elderly, were faced with the tough choice of buying heating oil for their homes or food for their tables.

This burdensome situation was caused by high crude oil prices, resulting from low crude oil supplies and low stocks of home heating oil converging with a downward turn in the weather that led to these price shocks that so disrupted the Northeast.

There were a series of meetings and much concern last winter. I think one of the best ideas that emerged was to build on the strategic crude oil reserve that we have and to create a regional Northeast home heating oil reserve in which the Government would possess home heating oil, which at times of crisis could be moved out into the market to increase supply and therefore reduce price.

I recall that one of the places that this idea was discussed was at a bipartisan meeting of Members of Congress from the Northeast with the President at the White House. He said he would take this under advisement. In fact, President Clinton did act to create a Northeast home heating oil reserve earlier this month, pursuant to his congressionally authorized authority under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

This amendment, which Senators DODD and LEAHY and I offer, would appropriate $4 million to maintain the Northeast heating oil reserve that the President has now created. The President has directed that the reserve be filled with home heating oil by conducting oil exchanges with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Therefore, there is no initial cost of filling the reserve.

However, the funding that is made possible by this amendment is critical for maintaining the reserve. The reserve itself is an integral piece of ensuring that if we do encounter exorbitant prices and short supplies again this winter, we will be able to count on our own publicly owned reserves of heating oil to get us through the crisis.

In fact, the following Energy Information Agency report, unfortunately, indicates that the industry at the current time is way below the desirable level of building up inventories of home heating oil, which means that if this continues as we head toward the winter and the weather turns cold, people in our region of the country are going to be suffering economically and physically. So that is the intention of offering this amendment.

I do want to indicate that I am exercising my prerogative as sponsor of the amendment to modify the amendment by striking the section of the amendment that begins on line 8 on the first page, and ends at the end of the document. This section describes an appropriate trigger mechanism for releasing the home heating oil reserve. In addition, I want to change the amount of funding requested from $8 million to $4 million. Finally, I would like to specify that the offset for these funds would come from unobligated funds from the

Strategic Petroleum Reserve petroleum account in the amount of $3 million, and $1 million from the Naval Petroleum Reserve and oil shale reserves.

AMENDMENT NO. 3811, AS MODIFIED

Mr. President, I send to the desk, therefore, a copy of the amendment as it emerges after the modifications that I have just announced, which is effectively a $4 million appropriation for this regional reserve the President has created.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Without objection, it is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 183, strike line 15 and insert ''$165,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which $3,000,000 shall be derived by transfer of unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated under the heading ''STRATEGIC PETROLEUM RESERVES PETROLEUM ACCOUNT'', and of which $1,000,000 shall be derived by transfer of unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated under the heading ''NAVAL PETROLEUM AND OIL SHALE RESERVES'', and of which $4,000,000 shall be available for maintenance of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve.''.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill that I think is critical for the energy security of the Northeastern United States. My amendment would fund the Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, which was created by the President on Monday, July 10. The President created this reserve under his Congressionally authorized authority under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

The Northeast region of the country is heavily dependent upon home heating oil—instead of natural gas, as is the case in much of the rest of the country—for heating homes and other buildings during cold months of the year. As heating oil is refined from crude oil that is produced both domestically and abroad, the price of heating oil is subject to the same market whims that we have seen and continue to see in gasoline and other petroleum products. The difference, however, is that when a family runs out of heating oil, they literally run out of heat. This is a dangerous situation in the Northeast, where people may face days at a time of icy-cold weather.

This part winter in the Northeast, we got a taste of market whims as we saw the prices of home heating oil soar, and as we hovered dangerously close to heating oil supply shortages. The price of home heating oil rose from an average in New England of $1.18 per gallon to about $1.79 per gallon in three weeks. Some residents were paying over $2.00 for a gallon of heating oil. Lower-income residents were faced with buying heat for their homes versus food for their tables. In this instance, we saw high crude oil prices and low stocks of heating oil converge with extremely cold weather, leading to the price shocks that so disrupted the Northeast. We saw a similar situation in 1996, when prices of heating oil soared.

I want to offer my amendment to ensure that this type of problem does not happen again. My amendment would appropriate four million dollars to maintain the Northeast heating oil reserve that the President has created. The President has directed that the reserve be filled with home heating oil by conducting oil exchanges with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Therefore, there is no initial cost to filling the reserve. However, this funding is critical for maintaining the reserve. The reserve itself is an integral piece to ensuring that if we do encounter exorbitant prices and short supplies again, we will be able to count on our own reserves of heating oil to get us through the crisis.

I would like to exercise my prerogative to modify my amendment by striking the section of the amendment that begins on line 8 on the first page and ends at the end of the document—this section describes an appropriate trigger mechanism for releasing home heating oil from the regional reserve. In addition, I would like to change the amount of funding requested from eight million dollars to four million dollars. Finally, I would like to specify that the offset for these funds will come from unobligated funds from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve Petroleum Account in the amount of three million dollars and from the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves in the amount of one million dollars.

Senator DODD joins me in offering this amendment.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his explanation and for the modifications which have at least brought this amendment within the parameters of the bill itself. I must say, without going into it, I think there are several serious policy questions about this amendment, but more than that I think it needs to be resolved in the context of a reauthorization of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. I understand the Senator from Connecticut is working with the chairman of the committee on that, and so we can defer our final decision until tomorrow.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to an amendment that would make drastic cuts to the timber program.

While we have heard a lot of rhetoric regarding the timber program, it is important to understand the context within which these cuts to the timber sale and road construction programs are being considered. Federal timber sales are in a steep and devastating decline. Forest health is increasingly at risk from fire, insects and disease.

Both the economic and ecological contexts created by this reduction are undesirable.

More than 80,000 jobs have been lost and a 1999 General Accounting Office study reported that over forty million acres of National Forest system lands are at risk of catastrophic wildfire. Another twenty-six million acres are at risk from insects and disease. The recent fires in New Mexico and in other states provide alarming evidence of the impact of increased fuel loads in our forests. Already this year, more than four-and-a-half million acres have burned. Active management is vital to forest health, and it is irresponsible for the federal government to reduce the management options available to local forest managers who best know how to deal with their specific situations.

It is confounding that additional cuts in the federal timber sale program are being considered at a time when the industry and those working men and women who depend on it has already been crippled by deep cuts and our forests are suffering from lack of active management that includes responsible timber harvest. Since the early 1990s, the timber program has been reduced by 70 percent and more than 75 percent of the National Forest system is off-limits to timber harvest. The federal timber supply has dropped from twelve billion board-feet harvested to three billion board-feet harvested annually. This amendment would jeopardize 55,000 jobs and $2 billion in employment income, mostly in rural areas. In addition, national forests have 50 percent of our nation's softwood growing stock, which is used for home construction. New reductions in the availability of this supply will hurt housing prices.

In my home State of Idaho, small, rural communities continue to suffer devastating reductions in Forest Service Payments-to-states funds from timber sales. In rural Idaho and America, schools are going without needed renovation, county governments are struggling, and basic services are already being jeopardized by steep reductions in federal timber harvest in recent years. This amendment would further reduce payments to rural counties by $7 million and returns to the treasury by $30 million.

While some will claim that recreation receipts can replace timber receipts, this simply is not true in Idaho. Eight counties in Idaho derive more than 20 percent of their employment activity from the primary timber industry. There are only two counties in Idaho that have more than a 5 percent dependence on the recreation industry.

This amendment is also counterintuitive from an environmental perspective. Active forest management, including thinning and other timber harvest, has widely acknowledge benefits. In fact, most timber sales are currently designed to attain other stewardship objectives. Interestingly enough, it is the sales that have been planned to focus on stewardship objectives that have been criticized as below cost. Timber sales are the most economical, efficient, and effective

method available to local resource managers to treat and control many insect epidemics. These harvests contribute greatly to reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire and promoting diverse stands.

Each year, the National Forest system grows 23 billion board-feet. Six billion board-feet die naturally. Only 3 billion board-feet are harvested annually. Tree growth in the National Forest system exceeds harvest by 600 percent. There is no need, environmental or otherwise, to further cripple this important program. I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and for the health of rural economies and the forests within the National Forest system.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment introduced by the Senator from Nevada, Senator BRYAN, that would cut funding for the United States Forest Service's Timber Sale program. Our Nation is experiencing a renaissance in Forest Health initiatives. The terrible tragedies suffered in New Mexico earlier this summer have awakened our understanding of the current state of our forests.

These forests, that traditionally housed wildlife and produced valuable resources used in building our Nation, have become deadly fire time bombs. The Forest Service itself has reported that more than 40 million acres of our National Forest System are at high risk of destruction by catastrophic wildfire and an additional 23 million acres are at risk from insects and disease. And yet, at a time when national awareness is up, and we have an increased commitment to improve forest health, there are still those critics who would remove the Forest Service's single most effective tool for restoring forest health.

The use of modern silviculture practices in regards to Federal timber sales are designed to accomplish a number of goals and objectives in regards to forest management. And they do so in a way that provides jobs for local communities, and money for rural schools and counties. We have also just begun to realize the value that a well-designed and carefully conducted timber sale can have on things like water quality and the future of a healthy water table.

The city of Denver had to learn this the hard way. Several years ago a fire swept through the city's watershed and turned the surrounding ecosystem into ashes. Since then, the city has had to pay millions of dollars to dredge and remove silt and other particles carried into its water supply. What the city learned is that fires, not timber sales are the biggest threat to watershed health. The city now actively manages its watershed and conducts regular assessment and thinnings to maintain a healthy, fire resilient forest.

Notice I said fire resilient, not fire resistant. Fire can be an invaluable management tool when conducted under the proper circumstances. Those conditions, however, do not exist in Western forests, nor will they exist until our forest managers are allowed to thin out the forests and remove the dense undergrowth and some of the increasingly taller layers of trees that create the deadly fuel ladders that feed catastrophic fires.

I am also deeply concerned about the impact this amendment could have on rural economies. The United States is importing more and more wood every year as a result of declines in federal timber sales. This means that the American lumber market is being fed by highly-subsidized timber that was produced under conditions that do not meet our Nation's high environmental standards. As a result, not only do we loose the environmental benefits that federal timber sales can produce, but we are feeling negative social and economic effects as America jobs are lost and moved offshore. The brunt of these losses are felt most keenly in rural areas, where forest products jobs are concentrated.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to add that the Federal Timber Sale Program is not a subsidy for the forest products industry. Federal timber contractors do not receive any special benefit, nor do they pay less money for the timber they harvest on federal lands. Federal timber is sold by means of a competitive bid system. As a result, these auction sales are the most likely of any type of commercial transaction to generate the returns that meet or exceed market value. Because timber sales are designed to generate market value prices, we therefore must conclude that there is no subsidy.

Furthermore, the forest products industry has consistently demonstrated that the benefits gained by the public through the Federal timber sale program far outweigh the costs to the Federal treasury. I therefore urge my colleagues to oppose Senator BRYAN's amendment and to support our National Forest and rural communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 3884

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment, and I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] proposes an amendment numbered 3884.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To defend the Constitutional system of checks and balances between the Legislative and Executive branches)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . FUNDING FOR NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be used to establish or expand a national monument under the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) after July 17, 2000, except by Act of Congress.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this amendment basically says: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be used to establish or expand a national monument under the act of June 8, 1906, the Antiquities Act, after July 17, 2000, except by an Act of Congress.

What I am trying to do is to make sure we don't have additional national monuments declared by this administration without some congressional input.

I will insert a copy of the Antiquities Act for the RECORD. It was passed in 1906. The Antiquities Act states:

The President of the United States is authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

That is the Antiquities Act.

This administration, particularly this year, has added millions of acres under the designation of national monuments without congressional authorization or approval, without consent of Governors, without consent of local entities. I am saying there is another process. I happen to serve on the Energy Committee with Chairman MURKOWSKI and others. We pass land bills all the time. I urge the President, if he wants to pass or declare something a national monument, send it to Congress. We are happy to look at it. We are happy to pass it. This is a committee that works in a bipartisan fashion. We pass land bills all the time. This week we are supposed to mark up 17. We do that in a bipartisan fashion.

I also will include for the RECORD a comparison of lands that have been added as national monuments during all the Presidents.

This Antiquities Act passed under Theodore Roosevelt in 1906. It is interesting to note, Theodore Roosevelt, who was quite the conservationist, made some very significant additions to the national monuments, the total acreage of which was 1.5 million acres. President Clinton has done more than that this year alone. As a matter of fact, President Clinton has already designated 3.7 million acres. He has done more than any other President of the United States, with the exception of President Carter, who added a lot of land in the State of Alaska.

It is also interesting to note that the State of Alaska Senators had amended the Antiquities Act to say no lands should be made into a national monument that exceeds 5,000 acres unless there is an act of Congress. That doesn't apply to the rest of the country.

This administration, while they had designated 1.7 million acres in the first

7 years, in this year, since January, has already declared 2 million acres a national monument. There is some talk that there are additional monuments in the works. If there are, great. If this amendment passes—I hope and expect that it will—I am sure Congress will be happy to receive the request from the President. We will review it. We will consider it. We will have hearings. We will go through the legislative process. We will hear from the Governors. We will hear from local entities. We will make a decision, as the process should be.

I believe the President's actions, particularly this year, have greatly exceeded what is called for in the Antiquities Act. Again, in the Antiquities Act, it says, that the area:

> . . . in all cases should be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected.

We should abide by this law. When the President has added 2 million acres this year alone, I don't believe he is in compliance with it. I think Congress has a legitimate role. If not, are we going to allow the President to declare wilderness areas, millions of acres?

My point is, I may well agree with the President on every single designation he has made, but the process needs congressional authorization. It needs congressional input; it needs congressional hearings. It needs input from local officials and people who are directly impacted.

I hope our colleagues will support this amendment. I appreciate the leadership of my friend and colleague, Senator GORTON of Washington, and also Senator BYRD. I used to chair the subcommittee. It is a challenging subcommittee, one which the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia have handled with a great deal of professionalism and expertise. I compliment them on their efforts. I urge our colleagues to supports this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a list of Presidents and what they have added to the national monuments under the Antiquities Act.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENTS AND THE ANTIQUITIES ACT

The following lists units and approximate acreage affected by each President. Where acreage figures are not given they are not available.

	Acreage
Theodore Roosevelt (1906 (Antiquities Act enacted)-1909)	
Chaco Canyon National Monument	10,643.13
Cinder Cone National Monument	5,120
Devil's Tower National Monument	1,152.91
El Morro National Monument	160
Gila Cliff Dwellings National Monuments	160
Grand Canyon I National Monuments	808,120
Lassen Peak National Monument	1,280
Lewis & Clark National Monument	160
Montezuma Castle National Monument	161.39
Mount Olympus National Monument	639,000
Muir Woods National Monument	295
Natural Bridges National Monument	120
Petrified Forest National Monument	60,776.02
Pinnacles National Monument	1,320
Tonto National Monument	640
Tumacacori National Monument	10
Wheeler National Monument	300
Total	1,529,418.45
William H. Taft (1909–1913)	
Big Hole National Monument	655.61
Colorado National Monument	13,466.21
Devils Postpile National Monument	798.46
Gran Quivara National Monument	183.77
Lewis & Clark National Monument	160
Mount Olympus National Monument	
Mukuntuweap (Zion) National Monument	16,000
Natural Bridges National Monument	120
Navajo National Monument	360
Oregon Caves National Monument	465.80
Petrified Forest National Monument	
Rainbow Bridges National Monument	160
Shoshone Cavern National Monument	210
Sitka National Monument	51.25
Total	32,631.10
Woodrow Wilson (1913–1921)	
Bandelier National Monument	23,352
Cabrillo National Monument	.50
Capulin Mountain National Monument	640.42
Casa Grande National Monument	480
Dinosaur National Monument	80
Gran Quivira National Monument	
Katmai National Monument	1,088,000
Mount Olympus National Monument	
Mukuntuweap (Zion) National Monument	76,800
Natural Bridges National Monument	2,740
Old Kasaan National Monument	43
Papago Saguaro National Monument	2,050.43
Scotts Bluff National Monument	2,503.83
Sieur de Monts National Monument	5,000
Walnut Canyon National Monument	960
Verendrye National Monument	253.04
Yucca House National Monument	10
Total	1,202,913.22
W.G. Harding (1921–1923)	
Bryce Canyon National Monument	7,440
Carlsbad Cave National Monument	719.22
Fossil Cycad National Monument	320
Hovenweep National Monument	285.80
Lehman Caves National Monument	593.03
Mound City Group National Monument	57
Papago Saguaro	−110
Pinnacles National Monument	
Pipe Spring National Monument	0
Timpanogos Cave National Monument	250
Total	9,555.05
Calvin Coolidge (1923–1929)	
Castale Pinckney National Monument	3.50
Chaco Canyon National Monument	
Chiricahua National Monument	3,655.12
Craters of the Moon National Monument	22,651.80
Dinosaur National Monument	
Father Millet Cross National Monument	.0074
Fort Marion (Castillo de San Marcos) National Monument	18.51
Fort Matanzas National Monument	1
Fort Pulaski National Monument	20
Glacier Bay National Monument	2,560,000
Lava Beds National Monument	45,589.92
Meriwether Lewis National Monument	50
Pinnacles National Monument	
Statue of Liberty National Monument	2.50
Wupatki National Monument	2,234.10
Total	2,634,226.4574
Herbert Hoover (1929–1933)	
Arched National Monument	4,520
Bandelier National Monument	
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument	10,287.95
Colorado National Monument	
Crater of the Moon National Monument	
Death Valley National Monument	1,601,800
Grand Canyon II National Monument	273,145
Geat Sand Dunes National Monument	35,528.36
Holy Cross National Monument	1,392

	Acreage
Katmai National Monument	
Mount Olympus National Monument	
Petrified Forest National Monument	11,010
Pinnacles National Monument	
Saguaro National Monument	53,510.08
Scotts Bluff National Monument	
Sunset Crater National Monument	3,040
White Sands National Monument	131,486.84
Total	2,125,720.23

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933–1945)	
Arches National Monument	29,160
Big Hole Battlefield National Monument	195
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument	2,860
Capitol Reef National Monument	37,060
Ceder Breaks National Monument	5,701.39
Channel Island National Monument	1,119.98
Crater of the Moon (Deletion of unknown size)	
Death Valley National Monument	305,920
Fort Jefferson National Monument	47,125
Fort Laramie National Monument	214.41
Fort Matanzas National Monument	
Glacier Bay National Monument	904,960
Grand Canyon II	−71,854
Jackson Hole National Monument	210,950
Joshua Tree National Monument	825,340
Katmai National Monument	
Meriwether Lewis National Monument	33,631.20
Montezuma Castle National Monument	
Mukuntuweap (Zion) National Monument	49,150
Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument	330,690
Pinnacles National Monument	4,589.26
Scotts Bluff National Monument	46.17
Santa Rosa Island National Monument	5,500.00
Statute of Liberty National Monument	
Tonto National Monument	
Tuzigoot National Monument	42.67
Walnut Canyon National Monument	
White Sands National Monument	158.91
Total	2,626,559.7

Harry S. Truman (1953–1961)	
Aztec Ruins National Monument	1
Channel Island National Monument	25,600
Death Valley National Monument	40
Effigy Mounds National Monument	1,204
Fort Matanzas National Monument	179
Great Sand Dunes National Monument	
Hovenweep National Monument	80
Hovenweep National Monument	81
Lava Beds National Monument	211
Muir Woods National Monument	504
Sitka National Monument	54,30
Total	27,954.30

Dwight D. Eisenhower (1953–1961)	
Arches National Monument	−240
Bandelier National Monument	3,600
Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument	−470
Cabrillo National Monument	80
Capitol Reef National Monument	3,040
Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument	4,800
Colorado National Monument	−91
Edison Laboratory National Monument	1
Fort Pulaski National Monument	
Glacier Bay National Monument	−24,925
Great Sand Dunes National Monument	−8,805
Hovenweep National Monument	
White Sands National Monument	478
Total	−22,530

John F. Kennedy (1961–1963)	
Bandelier National Monument	−1,043
Buck Island Reef National Monument	850
Crater of the Moon National Monument	5,360
Gila Cliff Dwelling National Monument	375
Natural Bridges National Monument	4,916
Russell Cave National Monument	310
Saguaro National Monument	5,360
Timpanogos Cave National Monument	
Total	26,128

Lyndon B. Johnson (1963–1969	
Arches National Monument	48,943
Capitol Reef National Monument	215,056
Katmai National Monument	54,547
Marble Canyon National Monument	26,080
Statue of Liberty National Monument	48
Total	344,674

Richard M. Nixon (1969–1973)	0

Gerald R. Ford (1973–1977)	
Buck Island National Monument	30
Cabrillo National Monument	56
Total	86

Jimmy Carter (1977–1981)	
Admiralty Island National Monument	1,100,000
Aniakchak National Monument	350,000
Becharof National Monument	1,200,000
Bering Land Bridge National Monument	2,590,000
Cape Krusenstern National Monument	560,000
Denali National Monument	3,890,000
Gates of the Arctic National Monument	8,220,000
Glacier Bay National Monument	550,000
Katmai National Monument	1,370,000
Kenai Fjords National Monument	570,000
Kobuk Valley National Monument	1,710,000
Lake Clark National Monument	2,500,000
Misty Fiords National Monument	2,285,000
Noatak National Monument	5,800,000
Wrangell-St. Elias National Mlonument	10,950,000
Yukon-Charley National Monument	1,730,000
Yukon Flats National Monument	10,600,000
Total	55,975,000

Ronald W. Reagan (1981–1989)	0

George Herbert Walker Bush (1989–1993)	0

William Jefferson Clinton (1993–Present)	
Aquafria National Monument—established January 11, 2000	71,100
California Coastal National Monument (acreage unspecified) established January 11, 2000	
Canyon of the Ancients—established June 9, 2000	164,000
Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument—established June 9, 2000	52,000
Grand Canyon-Parashant National Monument—established January 11, 2000	1,014,000
Giant Sequoia National Monument—established April 15, 2000	327,769
Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument—established September 18, 1996	1,700,000

	Acreage
Hanford Reach National Monument—established June 9, 2000	195,000
Ironwood Forest National Monument—established June 9, 2000	129,000
Pinnacles National Monument—established January 11, 2000	7,900
Total	3,789,669

Mr. NICKLES. I mentioned all of the Presidents. President Clinton has greatly exceeded the amount of new additions compared to any President, with the one exception of President Carter. To give a comparison, President Ford added 86 acres in national monuments in his tenure as President. President Reagan and President Bush added zero. Teddy Roosevelt added 1.5 million acres; William Taft, 32,000 acres. I could go on down the list. My point is, the amount President Clinton has added this year alone exceeds what almost any other President has done.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of the Antiquities Act.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTIQUITIES ACT

TITLE 16—CONSERVATION

CHAPTER 1—NATIONAL PARKS, MILITARY PARKS, MONUMENTS, AND SEASHORES

Subchapter LXI—National and International Monuments and Memorials

SEC. 431. NATIONAL MONUMENTS; RESERVATION OF LANDS; RELINQUISHMENT OF PRIVATE CLAIMS.

The President of the United States is authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmark, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land, the limits of which in all cases shall be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected. When such objects are situated upon a tract covered by a bona fide unperfected claim or held in private ownership, the tract, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the proper care and management of the object, may be relinquished to the Government, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept the relinquishment of such tracts in behalf of the Government of the United States.

(June 8, 1906, ch. 3060, Sec. 2, 34 Stat. 225.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator for the leadership he has taken in this area. It is so critically important.

About a month and a half ago, I got a call from the Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt, who said: I am headed to Idaho. I am going to look at the Craters of the Moon National Monument. I might want to expand it.

''I might want to expand it,'' was what he said. It is currently 54,000 acres. He has recommended that it be expanded to 754,000 acres. He doesn't take into consideration grazing. He wants to overlay Park Service and BLM management into a confusing new kind of configuration.

Most importantly—this is the point the Senator from Oklahoma has just made—there have been no public hearings, no local input. He went around and held some meetings with some affected or potentially affected parties.

If the Congress were handling this, we would have the full NEPA process. We would have an EIS. We would incorporate our county governments. We would look at the kind of impact this designation would have. The Senator is right, he and I might ultimately agree with it, but what about the county roads that go through it and some of the private roads that go through it and the elimination or the blockage of those roads. Those are the kinds of issues this President and this Secretary have totally ignored in the name of the Clinton legacy.

I hope this amendment will pass. It is time we halt this action and bring this through the Congress to an appropriate public process to sort out all these difficulties. That is what the committee on which the Senator from Oklahoma and I serve has the responsibility of doing: refining and crafting public policy.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague, Mr. President.

I know the chairman of the subcommittee wants to address this and perhaps other issues.

One other comment: The President did this first in September of 1996 prior to the election. I know my colleague from Nevada might remember this because he did it with a press conference overlooking the Grand Canyon, talking about the addition of a new national monument, except the monument he was talking about was not in Arizona, not in the Grand Canyon; it was actually in Utah. It was the Grand Staircase National Monument, 1.7 million acres. It happened to have billions of dollars of raw materials.

Interestingly enough, the Utah Governor was not consulted. The Utah congressional delegation was not consulted. People in the community were not consulted. We had a massive land grab, power mineral grab—you name it—by the President of the United States for a photo op for election purposes that, in my opinion, may have been granted but needed congressional input and authorization. That is the purpose of the amendment, to make sure this type of thing does not continue without at least some input from other local officials.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, we have about 5 minutes remaining. The Senator from Nevada is going to introduce two additional amendments, quite appropriately, before that.

In connection with this amendment, however, I need to say that this amendment causes a conflict on my part more than any other here. I agree with the amendment. I think the power has been misused. I am not sure it can be reversed by another President. The Senator from Idaho seems to feel that it can be. But I believe we have had a number of actions that have raised far more questions than they have actually settled.

By the same token, I know perfectly well if this amendment is in the bill that goes to the President, the President will veto the bill. I simply say, since I know my friend from Nevada will be on the conference committee, I don't intend to send a bill to the President that we don't believe he ought to sign, at the very least. I just have to leave that notice at this point.

We have 4 more minutes. I will say one other thing. At least in theory, amendments can be brought up and discussed to this bill—the amendments that are listed in the unanimous consent agreement—and they could be further discussed after the end of the many votes that we have tonight.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Nevada so he can introduce the remaining amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be temporarily set aside.

AMENDMENT NO. 3885

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mrs. BOXER, proposes an amendment numbered 3885.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventive application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as identified by the Environmental Protection Agency in National Parks in any area where children may be present.

AMENDMENT NO. 3886 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3885

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for Mr. BOND, proposes an amendment numbered 3886 to amendment No. 3885.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit use of funds for application of unapproved pesticides in certain areas that may be used by children)

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR APPLICATION OF UNAPPROVED PESTICIDES IN CERTAIN AREAS THAT MAY BE USED BY CHILDREN.

(a) DEFINITION OF PESTICIDE.—In this section, the term ''pesticide'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136).

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the application of a pesticide that is not approved for use by the Environmental Protection Agency in any area owned or managed by the Department of the Interior that may be used by children, including any national park.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the methods of pest control used by the Department of the Interior do not lead to unacceptable exposure of children to pesticides.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, my bipartisan amendment, cosponsored by Senators LINCOLN, KERREY of Nebraska, and ROBERTS, prevents funds from being used for the application of any pesticide that is not approved for use by the Environmental Protection Agency in any area managed by the U.S. Park Service that may be used by children. Further, it directs the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate with EPA to ensure that pest control methods do not lead to unacceptable exposure of children to pesticides.

Let there be no mistake that every member of this Senate supports the protection of children. It is the mandate of the EPA to do so. They are already required by law to do so.

The strict standard that mandates EPA on product approval is: ''reasonable certainty of no harm.'' That is a tall hurdle.

The shocking thing about this underlying amendment by the Senator from California is that its premise holds that the EPA, is not, I repeat, not, doing its job protecting children. Let me repeat, this is a referendum on whether EPA is protecting children. Now, I think, that if the EPA were paying attention, it would be news to the EPA Administrator that her agency is not protecting children. As Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on VA/HUD, I have listened to countless hours of testimony about the Administrator's devotion to protecting children. I would think, that if we had a Sense of the Senate that Administrator Browner is not doing her job protecting children, we would defeat that.

I asked the nominee (James V. Aidala) to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances of the Environmental Protection Agency if the EPA already protects children on military bases from harmful pesticides and we got the following response:

The protection of children is one of our highest priorities. When we register, re-register, or reassess tolerances for existing pesticides we try to ensure that our actions are protective of all consumers, especially children.

He continued on to say that,

FQPA requires special protections for infants and children including: an explicit determination that tolerances are safe for children; an additional safety factor, if necessary, to account for uncertainty in data relative to children; and consideration of children's special sensitivity and exposure to pesticide chemicals.

Let the record also show that the reason that many pesticides are used is to protect children from bacteria and disease including asthma, encephalitis, malaria, lyme disease, Legionnaires' disease, and other diseases all of which that occur here in the U.S.

Mr. President, what is a pesticide? According to EPA,

. . . all of these common products are considered pesticides. Cockroach sprays and baits; insect repellents for personal use; rat and other rodent poisons; flea and tick sprays, powders, and pet collars; kitchen, laundry, and bath disinfectants and sanitizer; products that kill mold and mildew; some lawn and garden products, such as week killers; and, some swimming pool chemicals.

Pesticides eradicate a wide variety of pests, including cockroaches, biting insects, algae, bacteria, poisonous Brown Recluse Spiders—as found in the U.S. Capitol buildings—and infectious microbes which result in unsanitary and unhealthy conditions at food and medical care facilities.

Many common cleaners, disinfectants and sanitizer are used to eradicate infectious microbes, bacteria, and algae in bathroom and kitchens and nursing homes, hospitals and other health care facilities. Cooling systems and water supplies are treated. Chlorine, which is registered as a pesticide by EPA could be affected by the underlying amendment. Products that sterilize medical equipment are carcinogenic and would thus also be affected.

Used according to EPA—label instructions, pesticides not only prevent property damage from termites, but also protect our children. West Nile virus and encephalitis, which have been detected throughout the mid-Atlantic, are carried by mosquitoes. Deer ticks carry lyme disease, and cockroaches have been linked to the worsening of asthma symptoms.

According to the New York Times, asthma is now the most common cause of hospitalization among American children affecting a total of five million. Deaths among children with the condition rose 78 percent from 1980 to 1993.

Again, these pesticides are approved by the EPA following a rigorous and science-based process to determine what is safe and what is not safe. With our concern for the safety of our children in mind, this body passed the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) unanimously in 1996. FQPA was designed to update the safety standards of pesticides especially with respect to children and other vulnerable sub-populations. The Environmental Protection Agency has been implementing this law for the past four years. In the regulatory review process EPA reviews data from up to 120 tests conducted on pesticides prior to registration.

When registration decisions are made, the EPA includes additional safety factors for children. According to EPA, ''. . . these specific requirements in the statute will help EPA in its efforts to implement the NAS report and ensure that risks to infants and children are always considered. . . .'' And, under FIFRA, EPA has the authority to immediately cancel the use of any pest control product that it believes poses an imminent risk to public health.

Obviously, EPA has the authority to protect children. Obviously, EPA believes that the law protects children. Obviously, EPA believes they are protecting children.

Since the new law in 1996, EPA has re-reviewed thousands of products. We are spending about $50 million in taxpayer money to pay full-time experts at the EPA to Administer the FQPA and to re-review the products. They tell us what is safe and what is not safe.

Contrary to what was mistakenly represented in previous debate, EPA does NOT support this amendment. According to EPA in answers in response to questions I submitted for the RECORD on June 30, 2000, ''. . . the amendment has not been subject to a full review by the Administration, nor has the Administration taken a position on the amendment.''

With this extensive regulatory process in place and recently updated, I cannot support the Senator's proposal to regulate further pesticides by completely ignoring and circumventing EPA's aggressive implementation of FQPA, as well as the Clinton Administration's entire regulatory process. The Senator from California's proposal will effectively regulate pesticides from the Senate floor on an appropriations bill, which is not only bad science, but bad public policy as well, and a process we all should want to avoid. I think if we are going to have a referendum on whether the EPA protect's children, we should have some cursory review of the subject first.

I am also not an expert on asthma or encephalitis or lyme's disease or salmonella, or e. Coli or Legionnaires' disease or the West Nile virus.

If the Senator from California has some information that says that the EPA is not doing their job, then I think the information should be reviewed and the EPA should have the opportunity to respond and comment and defend itself. If there is an emergency that the Senator from California is aware of, EPA has the regulatory authority to deal with it and they should. If EPA is not appropriately dealing with an emergency, perhaps we should ask the Administrator to tell us why that is

the case. Absent that, it is not a very good idea for us to be substituting our scientific judgment for the judgment of Administrator Browner's scientists as to what is and is not safe.

We also know that according to industry and EPA, there is no legal or regulatory or industry ''term of art'' for a ''category I or category II acute nerve toxin.'' If we are going to tell EPA to prohibit something, EPA should understand what we want them to prohibit. If we are going to tell industry that they cannot use a product, they should know what product they are forbidden to use.

One organophosphate, for example, is Raid. Organochlorides, I am told, are products that contain carbon and chlorine which wipes out all hard surface disinfectants. One such hard surface disinfectant which is used daily to clean our bathrooms is Lysol disinfectant. Some of the same products are used to clean our cafeteria. Some carcinogens are used to sterilize medical equipment.

The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has just received a bipartisan letter from the Chairmen and Ranking Members of the House committee of jurisdiction stating that this is an issue under their jurisdiction which should be dealt with solely through the authorization process. The bipartisan letter was signed by Congressmen COMBEST, STENHOLM, GOODLATTE and CLAYTON.

Mr. President, I am continuously amazed at the knowledge and dedication of my Senate colleagues but I will admit that I am not an expert on organophosphates or nerve toxins. I fear that this issue about nerve toxins and organophosphates and ''probable carcinogens'' may be a mystery to a good number of my colleagues and it is a horrible precedent for regulation, which will impact not only the urban uses of pest control products, but also the agricultural uses for our Nation's farmers.

We know that the EPA does not support this amendment. It has not reviewed it and I don't expect them to review it during an election year.

My amendment protects children by allowing Carol Browner and her cops on the beat to do their job.

We have a dreadful picture of a bite from a Brown recluse spider. This spider is bad news as the picture indicates. This poisonous spider was found in the Capitol on more than one occasion and it is called a recluse spider because it is hard to discover. In the last three weeks, a Senate appropriations staffer was bitten by this spider.

Used according to EPA-label instructions, pesticides protect our children by controlling harmful pests like disease carrying insects, infectious bacteria, poison ivy, and other noxious weeds.

This underlying Boxer amendment would prohibit the use of products that have been scientifically tested and approved for use by the EPA to help prevent disease and improve the quality of life for all Americans, especially children. The EPA has a sound regulatory process in place that protects children and provides safe, effective pest control tools for use in the farmer's field, the cafeteria, hospitals, playgrounds, and the home. To undermine the process of the strictest pesticide regulations in the world would not only set a misguided precedent, but would indeed threaten the health of our children. It would also send a shocking message that our EPA is not following its legal mandate and its perpetually-articulated mission of protecting children.

In summary, the underlying amendment it is unnecessary, it is overly-broad, it is a horrible precedent and it is encumbered with far-reaching unintended negative consequences that are harmful to children.

I just do not believe the U.S. Senate should take an action which makes the visitor's centers of our national parks the largest cockroach hotels on the planet.

My amendment prohibits the use of any pesticide not approved by Administrator Browner's team and ensures consultation to ensure that pest control methods do not lead to unacceptable exposure of children to pesticides. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and preserve the effectiveness and the integrity of the science-based regulatory system.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from the Farm Bureau opposing the underlying amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2000.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOND: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I am writing to express our deep concern and opposition to the Boxer amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill. The amendment as proposed would stop the use of pesticides on public lands, pesticides use to prevent and control noxious weeds, invasive species and other pests that threaten the health and long-term sustainability of those lands. The amendment is without merit or scientific basis and should be defeated.

This amendment is misguided and would be harmful to the public interest. The current federal laws governing pesticide use, specifically the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) require scores of tests and large amounts of scientific data to be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) before a pesticide is approved for public use. Products used in accordance with the label are safe. It is essential for public confidence that pesticide decisions be based on sound science and objective regulatory review. This amendment arbitrarily circumvents the regulatory process and creates confusion in the public mind.

Agricultural producers who farm and ranch on or adjacent to public land face increased threats to their economic viability. The spread of pests, noxious weeds and invasive species represents a real economic burden to farming and ranching operations in many areas, particularly where they are near public lands. Additionally, they pose a substantial environmental and public health risk if left uncontrolled. For example, efforts to control mosquitoes carrying the deadly West Nile encephalitis virus could be threatened by this amendment, as could efforts to control pests such as the Gypsy Moth Caterpillar and Asian Longhorned Beetle that have devastated hardwoods in both our urban and rural areas.

Please oppose the Boxer amendment to the Interior Appropriations bill.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the amendment I offered on behalf of Senator BOXER would limit the use of dangerous pesticides in our national parks. In particular, it prohibits the routine use of highly toxic pesticides—those containing known or probable carcinogens, acute nerve toxins, organophosphates, carbamates, or organochlorines—in our national parks, where children may be present.

Such pesticides could be used in the case of an emergency. This is already the policy of the National Park Service. This amendment would codify this important policy.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Bond second-degree amendment prevents funds from being used for the application of any pesticide that is not approved for use by the Environmental Protection Agency in any area managed by the Park Service that may be used by children, and directs the Secretary of Interior to coordinate with EPA to assure pest control methods do not lead to unacceptable exposure of children to pesticides.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be temporarily set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3887

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], for Mr. BINGAMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 3887.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the protection of Indian program monies from judgment fund claims)

On page 163, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) in 1990, pursuant to the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act (ISDEA), 25 U.S.C. et seq., a class action lawsuit was filed by Indian tribal contractors and tribal consortia against the United States, the Secretary of Interior and others seeking redress for failure to fully pay for indirect contract support costs (Ramah Navajo

Chapter v. Babbitt, 112 F.3d 1455 (10th Cir. 1997));

(2) the parties negotiated a partial settlement of the claim totaling $76,200,000 which was approved by the court on May 14, 1999;

(3) the partial settlement was paid by the United States on September 14, 1999, in the amount of $82,000,000;

(4) the Judgment Fund, 31 U.S.C. 1304, was established to pay for legal judgments awarded to plaintiffs who have filed suit against the United States;

(5) the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 requires that the Judgment Fund be reimbursed by the responsible agency following the payment of an award from the Fund;

(6) because the potential exists that Indian program funds in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS) would be used in Fiscal Year 2001 to reimburse the Judgment Fund, resulting in significant financial and administrative disruptions in the BIA, the IHS, and the Indian tribes who rely on such funds;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services should declare Indian program funds unavailable for purposes of reimbursing the judgment fund; and

(2) if the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services determines that there are no other available funds, the agencies through the Administration should seek an appropriation of funds from Congress to provide for reimbursement of the judgment fund.

KYOTO PROTOCOL RESTRICTIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as the Senate debates the FY 2001 Interior and Related Appropriations Act, I would like to take a moment to ask the distinguished subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Member a clarifying question concerning Section 329 of the bill. That section, as my colleagues know, contains language concerning the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol.

Mr. President, the Senate has clearly expressed its views regarding the Kyoto Protocol in S. Res. 98, the Byrd-Hagel resolution adopted unanimously by the Senate on July 25, 1997. That resolution calls on the Administration to support an approach to climate change that protects the economic interests of the United States and seeks commitments from developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Administration is aggressively engaging developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through international projects and activities emphasizing market-based mechanisms and environmental technology. Furthermore, the U.S. is currently engaged in climate change negotiations to ensure meaningful participation of developing countries and to ensure that greenhouse gas emissions reductions are achieved in the most cost-effective manner.

Mr. President, I ask my friend from West Virginia if my understanding is correct that Section 329 of the FY 2001 Interior bill is not intended to restrict the Administration from engaging in these international negotiations related to both the Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the Senate in 1992, and the Kyoto Protocol to that Convention? Am I also correct in my understanding that Section 329 is not intended to restrict international programs or activities to encourage commitments by developing countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I appreciate the question from my distinguished colleague from Vermont, whose background in international affairs is well known and impressive, indeed. In response, I say to my friend that his understanding is correct, Section 329 is not intended to restrict U.S. negotiations or the other activities such as he has described. On the contrary, the section is intended to prevent the Administration from implementing the Kyoto Protocol prior to itss ratification by the Senate.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I concur with the statement just provided by the Senator from West Virginia.

SEA TURTLE CONSERVATION

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, will the distinguished Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee yield for a question?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I will gladly yield to a question from my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Chairman. I want to commend the gentleman from Washington and the distinguished ranking member for the great leadership they have demonstrated in crafting the FY2001 Interior Appropriations bill. Gentlemen, last year you were both instrumental in securing funds for a project of great personal interest to Senator LOTT and myself, the Kemp's ridley sea turtle project. The project, funded in part through the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is a twenty-year-old on-going success story in the recovery of a highly endangered species. Since 1978, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service has spearheaded the sea turtle conservation work at Rancho Nuevo, Mexico. This collaborative conservation project with the Mexican government and the U.S. shrimp industry, through the National Fisheries Institute, protects Kemp's ridley sea turtle nests and females from predation and other hazards, and ensures that young turtles make it into the sea. I am pleased to report that this Spring, the project has reached an all time success level with some 750 turtles laying eggs in over 5,000 nests, a record in the past 40 years. However, this year, despite the demonstrable success of the project, the Fish and Wildlife Service did not request funds for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle project. I am extremely concerned and want to express my strong support for continued funding for this valuable conservation effort.

Mr. GORTON. It is clear from my friend's statement that he knows much about the sea turtle conservation protect, and I share his enthusiasm for these important efforts to project the Kemp's ridley sea turtle. While I am keenly aware of the fiscal constraints on the Fish and Wildlife Service, I once again encourage the Service to consider providing whatever support it can within these existing budget constraints.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with my colleagues from Washington and Louisiana. The Fish and Wildlife Service should make every effort to support this project in order to uphold a scientifically justified success in endangered species management.

REGARDING THE NEED FOR EMERGENCY FUNDING FOR THE WASHAKIE DAM IN WYOMING'S WIND RIVER RESERVATION

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague, Senator GORTON, for helping me address the need for emergency funding for the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of Central Wyoming. On June 1, 2000, Gary Collins, Director of Tribal Water Engineers Office for the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes on the Wind River Indian Reservation in central Wyoming announced the need to evacuate homes down river from the Washakie Dam. The evacuation was the result of a ''first fill'' test being conducted by the tribe for the newly refurbished Washakie Dam. In accordance with first fill protocol and criteria, the dam was filled to the first of two target levels and then held at that first level for a specified number of days to allow inspection of the dam's operation. Because of unusually high seepage at a key structural point—50 gallons per minute at the toe of the dam, however, the tribe implemented its Emergency Action Plan, ordered the down stream evacuation and conducted temporary repairs to stop the flow. The repairs were successful and the immediate danger temporarily abated.

While the seep is now under control, the first fill protocol is still to be completed. Under normal conditions, the tribe would have restarted the first fill protocol and would have refilled the dam to test it again for additional seepage or any other problems. There is not enough water, however, to complete the first fill on the Washakie Dam. Wyoming, along with the rest of the west is suffering from a serious drought situation. The first fill test will not be completed until next spring when, hopefully, we will have enough snowfall to generate the water needed to fill the reservoir.

As with the first fill of any dam, there is always a concern that some unanticipated event will occur which requires immediate action to protect life and property. The reconstruction project was finished ahead of time, and under budget, but the remaining funds will be inadequate to respond to any catastrophic incident. It makes much more sense to set aside funds up front to mitigate a possible catastrophe, than to spend millions of additional dollars, and possibly lose human life, for a disaster that could have been averted.

The decision by Congress to provide emergency funding for incidents before they occur is not without precedent. For example, in 1997 the U.S. Congress provided funds to prevent flooding in and around Devil's Lake in North Dakota. No actual disaster had occurred, but impending weather conditions threatened surrounding communities and we provided the means to avert disaster.

I am therefore asking my colleague for his thoughts on what we can do to help out the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho Tribes and ensure the safety of the residents living around the Washakie Dam.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my colleague and recognize the potential severity of the situation at the Washakie Dam.

I would like to assure my colleague that I will work with him to ensure that adequate funding is available to make any necessary repairs to the dam or to conduct other activities necessary to ensure the safety of people living in the vicinity of the dam.

HAZARDOUS FUEL REMOVAL

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I'm pleased to sponsor Senator DOMENICI's amendment, number 3782, to the fiscal year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill which adds critical funding to the budgets of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service for hazardous fuel removal. These funds are necessary to address the immediate threats to wildland/urban interface areas across the country which are surrounded by public lands choking with natural fuels buildup from a half-century of fire suppression. The Los Alamos fire was a tragic reminder of the threat that exists today around many communities. In my own state of Arizona, which has the largest ponderosa pine forest in the world, the communities of Flagstaff, Tucson, Summer Haven, Pinetop-Lakeside, Showlow, and countless others are virtually surrounded by the national forest.

The work being done by the Ecological Restoration Institute at Northern Arizona University to address forest ecosystem restoration is world-class. I believe my colleagues are aware of the forest treatment and public education programs there. I understand that an agreement was reached to provide $8.8 million directly to the Ecological Restoration Institute for its ongoing efforts from within the funds made available to the Bureau of Land Management. Is this correct?

Mr. DOMENICI. I'm glad to have the Senator from Arizona as a sponsor of my amendment, which does provide additional necessary funding to the BLM and the Forest Service for fuels reduction. And I am aware of the work being done by the Ecological Restoration Institute. My staff met with the director of the program. It is my understanding that, from within funds provided for the Bureau of Land Management in this amendment, $8.8 million is provided for the Ecological Restoration Institute.

Mr. GORTON. That is what we have agreed to, with the concurrence of Senator BYRD.

Mr. BYRD. I am in agreement with that understanding.

HISTORICAL SITES IN NEW JERSEY

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished managers of the bill if they would consider a request I have concerning the conference.

Mr. GORTON; I would be happy to consider a request from my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. I rise to talk about two sites in New Jersey which are worthy of federal funding for their protection. I would hope that should additional funding become available, the Senate would consider providing federal funding to contribute to the acquisition of these sites.

The first is The Historic New Bridge Landing, located in Bergen County, New Jersey. I am concerned that this site will be lost unless federal protection is afforded to it. In November 1776, reeling from a series of devastating defeats in Brooklyn and Manhattan, the Continental Army fled across the Hudson River to New Jersey. The Red Coats, in hot pursuit, continually forced Washington to retreat.

After crossing New Bridge, Washington instructed a contingent of troops to dismantle the bridge and protect the army's rear. Though unable to destroy the bridge, Washington's troops held off the British long enough to allow the Army to escape.

This bridge called ''The Bridge that Saved a Nation,'' was strategically situated at the narrows of the Hackensack River. The bridge and surrounding area were a hotly contested battleground, encampment ground, military intelligence post and headquarters. In 1780, when the Continental army regained control of the area surrounding the New Bridge, Washington used the Steuben house as a headquarters and stayed in a second floor bedroom.

This property has been the object of attention for historians and preservationists for many years. The historical significance of this has been confirmed; the site is listed on both the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places. In addition, in 1999, the site was named among the 10 Most Endangered Historic Sites in New Jersey by Preservation New Jersey, a private state-wide historic preservation organization. Finally, this site is included in the National Park Service's Revolutionary War and War of 1812 Battlefield study, which aims to catalog important sites in need of protection.

New Bridge Landing encompasses 18 acres on both sides of the Hackensack River in Central Bergen County, New Jersey. Commercial development, neglect and time, have combined to erode and threaten to destroy this historically significant site. Since 1995, the Historic New Bridge Landing Commission has been working toward the establishment of a major new historic and cultural park at Historic New Bridge Landing, in Central Bergen County, NJ. The Commission has established a General Management Plan which outlines the objectives of the proposed park.

Today, this site remains a hotly contested battleground, and while the nature of the battle is different, the importance of prevailing is no less important. New Jersey has undergone a revolution from ''Garden State'' to ''Suburban State,'' More than 40 percent of New Jersey is developed. New Jersey is by far the most built-over state in the nation and it is number 1 in the rate at which it is losing its open space. Since 1961, New Jersey has lost over half a million acres to sprawl. The area adjacent to New Bridge Landing have not been spared. Virtually all of the land adjacent to the site has been developed. This development is visible from the site, altering its character and diminishing the visitor's experience of the park's historic landscape.

Mr. President, I would like to introduce this letter from the National Park Service testifying to the importance of Historic New Bridge Landing, and the need for federal efforts to preserve and protect it. Historic New Bridge Landing is worthy of our protection, and I would hope that the Senate would consider providing funding for the protection of this important site.

The second site which I rise today to speak in support of, is the Glen Gray Boy Scout Camp, located in the heart of the Ramapo Mountains, in New Jersey.

Much like the rest of my state, this 850 acre tract is threatened with development. Sprawl threatens to eat away at this pristine site, and the remainder of the Highlands. New Jersey knows all too well the peril of sprawl and has paid a terrible price at the hands of developers of shopping malls and subdivisions.

An average of 10,000 acres of rural/agricultural land is being developed piecemeal every year in New Jersey. The NY–NJ Highlands has seen a 60 percent increase in urbanization in the last 25 years, and is expected to absorb a 14 percent increase in population by 2010. Years ago, we made an important step in the preservation of the Highlands with the effort to protect Sterling Forest. This effort was aided by a study of the New York-New Jersey Highlands Region, conducted by the Forest Service.

That study also found the Highlands to be of national significance due to the diversity and quality of its natural resources and landscape. In addition, the study confirmed threats from development to water quality, critical open space, and recreational resources.

The Highlands regional study has shown us that this region is deserving of federal funding to allow for its protection. I am hopeful that the Committee will share my concern for this region, and commit funding for its protection.

I realize that the Committee faces many demands when putting this bill together. While these requests were not included in the bill, I would ask the Committee to consider funding for these worthy projects in the Conference.

Mr. GORTON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey and assure him that the Committee recognizes the importance of protecting threatened lands throughout the country.

IDAHO PROGRAMS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, would the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee yield for a colloquy regarding several important, proposed projects under the jurisdiction of the Interior Subcommittee?

Mr. GORTON. I would be pleased to yield to the Senator from Idaho to discuss this important issue.

Mr. CRAIG. First, allow me to thank the Chairman and the Ranking Member for their hard work on the Fiscal year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. Despite scarce resources and tough choices, they came up with a fiscally responsible bill that meets important priorities, which I support.

There are some important projects to be funded in this bill that I would like to work with the Chairman on.

We are proud to be the home of Lake Coeur d'Alene in North Idaho. It has become a world-class destination for all sorts of outdoor activities—from golf to water sports to mountain biking. This tourism is important to the local economy and the ability to partake in these activities is vital to the local residents' quality of life. I know the Chairman is very familiar with the area, since it is a short distance from Spokane, Washington and is a popular recreation destination for many of his constituents.

The problem we have encountered is a lack of public boat launching facilities. Most of the lake front land around the lake is privately owned, so land for public launch facilities is scarce. However, the Bureau of Land Management has purchased land for a boat launch facility and has completed all of the appropriate studies and planning; they are simply lacking the funds to build the facility. The local community, including many residents of Washington State, tenaciously support the project and are willing to provide about $700,000 toward the project.

In the same part of the great State of Idaho, mining has been and, hopefully, will continue to be a substantial part of the local economy—providng the minerals we all need. The University of Idaho and Washington State University want to work with the U.S. Geological Survey to develop new high-tech methods of modeling geology, to be tested in North Idaho, but eventually applied world-wide, to provide better exploration and modeling techniques to find groundwater, minerals, etc.

In the Southern part of Idaho, we are very concerned about the proposed listing of the Sage Grouse as an endangered species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has been petitioned to list the species, which would have a dramatic impact on the lives of the people of Southern Idaho, as well as future BLM and Forest Service operations. It becomes readily apparent when you visit Southern Idaho that the entire region is habitat for Sage Grouse.

Local working groups have been formed across Southern Idaho to find local, collaborative projects to restore Sage Grouse habitat and the species which would make a listing under the Endangered Species Act unnecessary. To be successful, this effort appropriately requires some federal support.

Finally, also in Southern Idaho, there is an urgent need to re-open the BLM's air tanker resupply base at the Twin Falls airport. This base was closed in 1998, after an internal inspection indicated unsafe conditions. This is the only such base within 100 miles of most of the Idaho-Nevada border, which uniquely suits it to provide the fastest possible response and turnaround times in this area during the fire season. In this vast expanse of vulnerable landscape, in the dry season, a small accident rapidly could become a major fire disaster. We've seen that happen in other parts of the country and we should take steps here to prevent it. The community has worked diligently with the local BLM office to re-open the base as soon as possible. However, in the national office, this project has been slipped back from year to year and down the priority list. Everyone agrees this base must be replaced. Our concern is simply that it should be done now, rather than be subject to further postponement.

I hope the chairman will work with me when this bill goes to conference to find funds for all of these important and fiscally responsible projects.

Mr. GORTON. I appreciate the Senator from Idaho's interest in these projects. I am familiar with them and recognize their value.

I would be happy to work with the Senator to make sure appropriate consideration is given to these projects in the Conference Committee.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chairman.

CLEAN COAL TECHNOLOGY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior and Related Agencies appropriations bills, I wish to take a moment to address the Department of Energy's Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program, one of the most successful public-private research ventures ever undertaken, and one of the more important projects funded in this legislation.

Fundamentally, the goal of the Clean Coal program is simple: Encourage the private sector to design and demonstrate advanced technologies which will use coal, our most abundant fossil energy resource, more cleanly and efficiently. To achieve that goal, I initiated the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program in 1984 with an initial appropriation of $750 million. In subsequent years, I was able to add to those funds for a total amount in excess of $2.0 billion. I am pleased to recall that then-President Ronald Reagan joined with me in endorsing the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program.

As established, the program calls for the cost of clean coal demonstration projects to be shared equally between the Federal government and the private sector. Forty clean coal projects have been selected through a series of competitive solicitations issued by the Department of Energy. And while Congress required industry to contribute 50 percent of the cost of selected projects, I am proud to say that, in toto, industry has in fact contributed more than 66 percent of the total cost. Moreover, project sponsors are required to repay the Federal government's share of the project cost if and when the technologies are commercialized.

Beyond the successes that have come from the Clean Coal program, though, a few simple facts will also underscore the real necessity of the program as well. Our nation has approximately 274 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves. At current rates of consumption those reserves amount to more than a 200-year supply. Furthermore, more than one half—54 percent to be exact—of the electricity generated in this country last year came from coal. Mr. President, those are staggering statistics which prove that American coal is, and will remain, an abundant and critically important energy source. But those statistics also suggest that our reliance on coal must be carried out in a manner which utilizes the cleanest and most efficient technologies possible. And that is what the Clean Coal program is intended to accomplish.

In furtherance of that objective, the Committee on Appropriations, through its report accompanying this bill, has directed the Department of Energy to issue a report to Congress by March 1, 2001, depicting the nature and content of a potential new round of Clean Coal Technology projects. This information is vital if we in the Congress are to direct the Department to utilize funds already available in the Clean Coal program for the purpose of funding additional demonstration projects.

Indeed, Mr. President, I have heard from a number of companies interested in coal and the development of technologies that will allow this nation to make the best use of this abundant energy resource. These companies, some of which are in my own state of West Virginia, have recommended that any new clean coal solicitation be focused principally upon technologies that will reduce the environmental impacts from existing, as well as new, coal-fired facilities. In addition, I believe that we ought to be encouraging newer technologies that are even more advanced than the clean coal technologies that

have been demonstrated thus far. A new solicitation should therefore encourage technologies capable of reducing emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO_2), nitrogen oxide (NOx), or mercury, as well as increasing the operating efficiency of coal-fired power plants thereby reducing—and through technologies, working to eliminate—carbon dioxide emissions.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I, too, would like to join my distinguished colleague from West Virginia in addressing the Clean Coal Technology program. I would also like to commend the Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, and of course the Ranking Member, Senator BYRD for their work relating to the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program.

Mr. President, I share the optimism of the leaders of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee with respects to the innovations that could be made with further clean coal technology projects. I specifically want to draw attention to one area in which I think that there is great potential—lignite energy development. In my state of North Dakota, the lignite industry provides a low-cost, reliable energy source for more than 2 million people in the upper Midwest. This industry directly employs 3,000 people in North Dakota and has great potential to increase the efficiency of coal-fired power plants while reducing the emissions with the application of new coal technologies.

Mr. President, because of the importance of lignite coal, I would urge the Department of Energy to specifically explore the development of low-rank coals, coals containing high-sodium, and mine-mouth applications and concepts in any new round of Clean Coal Technology projects. I also believe, and I would hope the Department would agree, too, that preference should be given to those states that have lignite research and development programs requiring public and private collaboration. This kind of work should be aspects of the study that the Committee report requires of the Department.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and I agree that the lignite energy industry has the potential to develop more environmentally sound and economically efficient technologies. I certainly welcome efforts to ensure that the lignite energy industry is given due consideration by the Energy Department as it develops its criteria for further Clean Coal Technology projects.

Mr. President, does the Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee agree with us about the need to consider the potential of lignite energy technologies in any new round of Clean Coal Technology projects?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I recognize that the Clean Coal Technology program is an important priority for Senator BYRD and Senator DORGAN and I urge the Department of Energy to consider the viability of concepts not fully developed on low-rank coals and coals containing high sodium as it works on the study we have requested.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his consideration, and wonder if he would answer a question or two to help clarify the Committee's directive regarding the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I would be happy to answer the Senator's questions. I know he is a champion of coal and the Clean Coal Technology program, and I am also aware of his abiding interest in the environmentally sound use of coal as a source of power for this nation.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would it be the Senator's thought that the Department should support technologies which control emissions from coal use or increase the operating efficiency of coal-based power plants?

Mr. GORTON. In response, let me say, Mr. President, that those are certainly the types of technologies that the Department should address.

Mr. BYRD. Would the distinguished Senator also agree with me that further demonstrations projects should be at a size that would permit immediate scale up to commercial capacity? And also, in that instance where the technology is to be applied to an existing plant, that the technology should be widely applicable to a very significant number of existing coal-fired generating facilities?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, again, I agree with the Senator. Given pending environmental requirements applicable to these coal-fired units, it would be my hope that the Department of Energy would consider larger scale projects able to be commercialized immediately. Also, any program should be aimed at developing technologies that could be applied to the greatest number of existing units possible.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Washington for his courtesy in answering my inquiries.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the Chairman a question about the language concerning the 1994 Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan on page 18 of the report accompanying this legislation. It is the Chairman's understanding that the language refers specifically to certain tasks which the Fish and Wildlife Service committed in the Recovery Plan to complete by 1999 and, to my knowledge, have not even begun?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BENNETT. As the Chairman knows, I am deeply troubled that the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and other federal agencies have moved very quickly to impose the land use controls recommended in the Recovery Plan, but have failed to undertake the basic tasks called for in that document to determine whether those land use controls are truly appropriate and are proving to be effective. I am speaking of three tasks: the desert tortoise monitoring that the Plan called ''crucial to determining if desert tortoise populations are stationary, declining, or increasing''; the desert tortoise population estimations that the Plan stated would be made every three to five years; and the Plan's reassessment that also was to be conducted every three to five years.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator is correct. The Committee fully expects the USFWS to fulfill its commitments in the Recovery Plan to carry out the desert tortoise monitoring, population estimation, and Recovery Plan reassessment. Additionally, the Committee expected the plan called for in the report language will focus solely on those three tasks.

Mr. BENNETT. One last point. To ensure that appropriated funds are spent wisely, I want to voice my concern that any methodology to be employed in conducting the monitoring be designed to permit correlation of the new data with the data gathered between 1980 and 2000. This will ensure that population trends, and the efficacy of programs and mitigation undertaken since 1980, can be determined.

Mr. GORTON. The Senator makes an excellent point. The Committee agrees that the desert tortoise monitoring methodology should be designed as you suggest.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUNDS FOR IDAHO

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, would the distinguished Chairman of the Subcommittee yield for a colloquy regarding Land and Water Conservation Funds for Idaho?

Mr. GORTON. I would be pleased to yield to the Senator to discuss this important issue.

Mr. CRAPO. First, allow me to commend the Chairman for his leadership and hard work on this bill. He and the Subcommittee have had to make difficult decisions with scarce resources and have worked hard to do so in a fair manner. I appreciate the Chairman's efforts and diligence.

Idaho is a state of spectacular natural beauty and wildlife habitat. As the Chairman knows, an opportunity exists to use Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF) to acquire easements in the state to protect these valuable habitats and scenic values.

While I am concerned regarding the level of funding appropriated, I appreciate the Subcommittee's recognition of the importance of funding easements in the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, near the Snake River Birds of Prey National Conservation Area, and on the Lower Salmon River. However, many other LWCF projects in the state were not funded. Protecting deer habitat in the Soda Springs Hills, acquiring inholdings to protect elk range and address historic mining activities in the Silver Spar Land Acquisition, securing easements along the Upper Snake River and South Fork of the Snake River, and acquiring private land, the

Sulfur Creek Ranch, within the Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness area are all important projects. These projects are all locally-driven, with wide-spread support, and anxious willing-sellers.

I recognize that the Subcommittee is operating under significant financial restraints and that, unfortunately, not all worthy projects can be funded. It is my hope that if additional LWCF money becomes available, the Chairman can revisit these important Idaho projects. I would ask the Chairman if he would work with us in conference to evaluate these requests, with an eye toward inclusion in the conference report.

Mr. GORTON. I appreciate Senator CRAPO's interest in these projects. I am familiar with these projects and recognize the value in protecting these lands.

I would be happy to work with the Senator to reevaluate these projects in the conference committee. If additional LWCF funding becomes available, we will consider what can be done to address these needs.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank the Chairman.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, our Nation is blessed with many natural treasures that hold unique scientific or cultural value.

That's why in 1906 the Congress passed and the President signed the Antiquities Act to give us a way to protect these unique lands.

Since 1906, presidents of all parties have used the act to designate over 100 national monuments—including several which Congress later designated as National Parks including the Grand Canyon, Grand Teton and Olympic National Parks.

Each year, more than 50 million visitors enjoy our country's national monuments. Today, there are other unique areas throughout our country that hold similar value. Unfortunately, some of these remarkable areas are threatened by growth, development, and harvesting.

I believe we have a responsibility to protect these natural treasures. I believe we have a responsibility to be a good steward of these lands and to pass them on—untarnished—to future generations

I'm proud that Washington state is home to the Hanford Reach—which is the last-free flowing stretch of the Columbia River. During World War II and the Cold War, the people of the Tri-Cities made sacrifices that helped our nation end World War II and win the Cold War. Because of the high security around the nuclear facility, for decades this part of the Columbia River and the surrounding land was protected from development. Unfortunately, its future was not certain.

The Hanford Reach is a key salmon spawning ground and as many of my colleagues know we are working in the Pacific Northwest to help recover our once-abundant salmon stocks. I was pleased that the President used his authority—under the Antiquities Act—to designate the Hanford Reach as a National Monument.

Mr. President, it was the right thing to do.

That designation will help us recover salmon stocks, will ensure families can continue to enjoy the Reach, and will share the history of the Tri-Cities with the American public. And of course, the designation will preserve a unique habitat for future generations.

I hope that in the future, the Hanford Reach National Monument receives the attention and recognition that it deserves. The Olympic National Park began as a National Monument—one of the first—designated by President Roosevelt in 1909. Many generations of Americans have enjoyed the natural splendor that the Olympics and the surrounding area offer. I hope that the Hanford Reach will also become a destination for Americans eager to learn more about our past.

Unfortunately, the Nickles' amendment would deny the possibility of such protection to other deserving areas around the country. It is clear that supporters of this amendment are unhappy with the President's use of the Antiquities Act. But in the end, the President has legally exercised the authority vested in him by the Act.

If this Congress is really unhappy with the Antiquities Act, it could amend the Act itself or override particular designations. But we all know that won't happen. The reason it won't happen is because the majority of Americans believe that the lands protected under the Antiquities Act are deserving of such protection.

The Grand Canyon, Devils Tower, Mt. Olympus, Jackson Hole, Death Valley, Joshua Tree—have all been named as national monuments. Few would argue these areas are not worthy of such recognition and protection. The fact is many of these designations have been so popular that Congress later designated them as national parks, often expanding them at the same time. Again, Olympic National Park in my home state is an example of such Congressional action.

In 1906, Congress had the wisdom to grant the President the power to protect important natural and historic areas of our country. The need for such power is not at an end. Threats of development and impacts from other activities will continue and in some cases will lead to the recognition that greater protection for certain federal lands is warranted. At that time, the President, who ever she or he may be, should have the ability to act as every President has since 1906. Indeed, since the Antiquities Act was passed 14 of the 17 Presidents have used its powers.

If it is indeed the will of Congress to limit this historic power of the Presidency, then let us do so after a full and public legislative process. This amendment is simply a back-door attempt to accomplish what the sponsor and supporters know they cannot do through a stand alone bill.

Despite some controversy, the President's designations have had the support of members of Congress and the public. In fact, I—along with many members of my state's delegation in the House—supported the President's recent designation of the Hanford Reach as a national monument. This designation was also supported by many people in the Tri-Cities and across the state.

Before I close I remind my colleagues that a similar amendment was included in the House Interior bill as it was reported by the Committee. Fortunately, thanks to the leadership of Congressman DICKS and Congressman BOEHLERT, that amendment was removed from the House bill. However, before the amendment's removal, the House bill received a veto threat because of this provision. We can certainly expect a similar veto threat from the Administration if this amendment is adopted.

For the first time in years, we have the opportunity to pass a free standing Interior Appropriations bill into law. This amendment would seriously compromise that possibility.

We should stand up for the people and communities who are eager to share in the benefits of these national monuments.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bryan amendment, which would ensure protection of our nations forests. This amendment would cut $30 million from the National Forest System's forest products program and would redirect $15 million to the Wildland Fire Management's fire preparedness program. The amendment would return the remaining funds to the Treasury to reduce the national debt. There are many reasons why I support this amendment, but let me discuss just two.

First, is the need to end corporate welfare. It is estimated that within the federal budget corporate welfare makes up anywhere from $86 billion (CATO Institute) to $265 billion (Progressive Policy Institute). A recent report by the Green Scissors Coalition estimates that over a five year period the Federal government will spend $36 billion on wasteful and environmentally harmful projects such as the forest products program.

Second, simply, is that by passing this amendment, we enact good environmental policy. The continual construction of new roads required to access our nation's forests removes ground cover and creates a channel for water to run down, accelerates soil erosion, weakens hillsides and fouls steams, destroying the foundation of our recreational and commercial fisheries. Logging roads are a major source of non-point source water pollution. According to the National Forest Service, 922 communities receive their drinking water from streams within the national forests-streams that are polluted from contaminated run-off associated with construction.

The protection of our roadless areas is important because they represent an important legacy for future generations. Areas without roads are becoming scarce in this country and in our national forests. Roadless areas provide significant benefits including: opportunities for dispersed recreation, clean, clear sources of public drinking water; large undisturbed landscapes that provide privacy and seclusion; bulwarks against the spread of invasive species; habitat for fish and game and other rare plant and animal species.

While I would prefer to see this program eliminated completely, at the minimum timber companies should not be subsidized by the taxpayers. The timber industry, like any other business, should bear its own costs. At a time when we are asking all Americans to do more with less, we should have the courage to ask the special interests to at least pay their own way. I support the Bryan amendment, and ask my colleagues to join me by voting for this important initiative.

While I have the floor, I will take a moment to comment on legislation that the Senate will soon consider. The Conservation and Reinvestment Act would guarantee full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and afford permanent protection to our nation's threatened natural, cultural, and historical treasures.

In 1964, Congress made the decision to reinvest revenue from the development of non-renewable resources into acquisition and permanent protection of key land, water, and open space. In the 30 years since its creation, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) has been responsible for the acquisition of nearly seven million acres of parkland-contributing to the creation of the Appalachian Trail, Everglades and Rocky Mountain National Parks. In New Jersey, it helped fund the acquisition of Sterling Forest, and the Cape May and Walkill National Wildlife Refuges.

However, the LWCF is not a true trust fund in the way ''trust fund'' is generally understood by the public. Despite the fact that by law, the revenues are supposed to go to the LWCF, Congress must appropriate the money before it can be spent; if appropriations are not made, the revenues instead go to the General Treasury, to be spent on defense, or roads, or whatever Congress decides. The practical effect is that historically, only a small portion of the funds in the LWCF has actually been used for land preservation.

At no time has full funding of the LWCF been more needed than today, as the demands of development and suburbanization jeopardize land preservation efforts. The United States loses 50 acres an hour to development. In New Jersey, we know all too well the effects of suburban sprawl. Since 1961, New Jersey has lost half a million acres to sprawl. This is not surprising when you consider that New Jersey ranks 9th in terms of population. The reality is that sprawl is settling in over our open space.

In a very exciting development, the House of Representatives recently passed LWCF legislation, and this bill now stands in the Senate. I am hopeful that the Senate will mark up its legislation this week, and I urge the Leadership to schedule floor time for this landmark initiative as soon as possible.

Inscribed in one of the hallways of our nation's Capitol are the words of Theodore Roosevelt. He said: ''The nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, and not impaired in value.'' Let us act on this vision and pass this extraordinary initiative during the 106th Congress.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, every year at this time it seems we're here on the Senate floor debating another attack on the Forest Service's Timber Management Program. Every year those who wish to eliminate logging in our National Forests come up with another angle which they claim helps protect the environment by eliminating ''wasteful'' spending on logging practices. Every year people throughout northern Minnesota and forested regions across the country see their jobs and their livelihoods threatened in the name of preservation or conservation. And every year, those of us who represent the good people of the timber and paper industry in our states have to fight, scratch, and claw our way to a narrow victory that saves those jobs and those families from economic ruin.

I come from a state in which the forest and paper industry is vital to our economy. The reduction in the timber program on National Forests has had a dramatic impact over the past ten years on the number of jobs and the economic vitality of northern Minnesota. According to Minnesota Forest Industries (MFI), jobs provided by the timber program in Minnesota dropped from over 1,900 in 1987 to less than 1,100 last year, and they continue to decline.

The reduction in timber harvests on federal lands has had an equally dramatic effect on unrealized economic impacts. MFI estimates that unrealized economic benefits include over $10 million from timber sales, $25 million in federal taxes, $2.5 million in payments to states, and $116 million in community economic impact in Minnesota alone.

It's important to point out that the timber program in National Forests have a very positive impact on the amount of federal money that goes to rural counties and schools. Nationally, the program contribute $225 million to counties and schools each year through receipts from timber sales in national forests. In Minnesota, the timber program provided roughly $1.7 million to counties and schools in 1998 alone. If the timber program would have met its allowable sale quantity in 1998, that number would have risen to nearly $2.5 million.

I'm fascinated by the claims of some of my colleagues that the timber program is a subsidy to wealthy timber and paper companies and the claims that the timber program loses money because we're giving timber away to these companies. If you truly believe that, I challenge you to visit forested regions and speak with the families who have lost their mills and the loggers who have lost their jobs. Talk to the counties and the private landowners who cannot access to their own property because the Forest Service doesn't have enough money to do the environmental reviews. Or talk directly to the Forest Service personnel and let them tell you how lengthy and costly environmental reviews and the overwhelming number of court challenges to those reviews are making the timber program so costly.

Then go speak with state or county land managers and ask them why their timber programs are so successful. Ask them why their lands are so much more healthy than the federal lands and why they're able to make money with their timber programs. In Minnesota, St. Louis County only has to spend 26 cents in order to generate one dollars of revenue in their timber program and the State of Minnesota spend 75 cents to generate one dollar of revenue. The Superior National Forest, on the other hand, spend one dollar and three cents to get the same results.

I cannot see how my colleagues can stand here on the Senate floor and tell me that the forest and paper industry in our country, and its employees, are the bad guys. The forest and paper industry in America employs over 1.5 million people and ranks among the top ten manufacturing employers in 46 states. These are good, traditional jobs that help a family make a living, allow children to pursue higher education, help keep rural families in rural areas, and provide a legitimate a base from which rural counties can fund basic services. These are jobs that we in Congress should be working diligently not only to protect, but to grow.

Unfortunately, many Members of Congress who advocate these ideas have never taken the time to understand the positive economic and environmental benefits of science-based timber harvests. They've never sat down with a county commissioner who doesn't know where he is going to get the money for some of the most basic services the county provides to its citizens. They've never considered that for every 1 million board feet in timber harvest reductions in Minnesota, 10 people lose their jobs and over $570,000 in economic activity is lost. And they've never taken the time to go into a health forest where prudent logging practices have been essential to ensuring the vitality and diversity of species.

If Members of this body want to make the timber program profitable across the country, then we should have an honest debate about what

works and does not work in the program. We should discuss frankly the ridiculous number of hoops public land managers have to jump through in order to process a timber sale. I think we need to discuss the fact that under the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act the federal government must provide access across federal lands for state, county, and private landowners to access their land. Yet in Minnesota, those landowners either have to wait a number of years or pay for the environmental reviews themselves because the Forest Service claims it doesn't have enough money. We should also discuss openly the dramatic impact court challenges are having on the ability of the Forest Service to do its job and to carry out the timber program in a cost-effective manner. On top of that, it's clear that under this Administration the Forest Service doesn't want a timber program that shows a profit and they've done an effective job of using the powers of the Executive Branch to vilify both the timber program and the men and women of my state who rely upon that program in order to meet their most basic needs.

Virtually everyone in this body, including this Senator, is committed to the protection of our environment and to the conservation of our wildlife species and wildlife habitat. I believe we can expand upon our commitment to wildlife and provide additional resources for habitat protection. But I do not believe we must do so on the backs of timber and paper workers throughout the nation. I am willing to work with anybody in this chamber towards those conservation efforts, but let's not do it by pitting timber and paper workers against conservationists.

We cannot simply stand here and claim that the Bryan amendment is an easy way to throw some money towards planning for the threat of forest fires. Rather, this amendment is going to take jobs from my constituents and hurt the economy of the northern part of my state. The Bryan amendment is just one more step down the road toward eliminating logging on federal land. This amendment is going to reduce the ability of a number of rural counties in my state to make ends meet and to provide necessary services to residents. These are just a few of the realities of the Bryan amendment and just a few of the reasons why I cannot and will not support its passage.

ARCHIE CARR NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE FUNDING

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I would like to first thank my colleagues, Senators GORTON and BYRD for their support in obtaining $2 million in the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior Appropriations bill for the Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge.

Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1991. It is 900 acres in Brevard County Florida which makes up the twenty mile section of coastline from Melbourne Beach to Wabasso Beach in Florida. It is the most important nesting area for loggerhead sea turtles in the western hemisphere and the second most important nesting beach in the world.

Mr. MACK. I would like to join my colleague in thanking Senators GORTON and BYRD and the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee for their support for the Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge. Twenty percent of all loggerhead sea turtle and 35% of all green sea turtle nests in the United States occur in this twenty mile zone. Nesting densities of 1,000 nests per mile have been recorded. Approximately half of this area is available for acquisition. The funds in this legislation will be critical in our ability to move forward on these acquisitions.

Mr. GRAHAM. Despite the importance of this refuge to the loggerhead sea turtle, there is no refuge station at Archie Carr. The result is both a lack of educational opportunities for visitors and a lack of security at the refuge. I join my colleague, Senator MACK, in proposing that $200,000 of the funds provided by the Fiscal Year 2001 Interior Appropriations bill for the Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge be available for use by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for the purpose of site evaluation for a visitor center/research and education center.

Mr. GORTON. Thank you, Senators MACK and GRAHAM. I share your desire to support the need of our National Wildlife Refuges, in particular the needs of Archie Carr National Wildlife Refuge, and will work with Senators MACK and GRAHAM to see if funds can be identified to support site evaluation for a visitor center/research and education center.

Mr. BYRD. Thank you, Senator GORTON. I, too, share the goal of ensuring that our National Wildlife Refuge System receives the funds it requires to preserve the critical habitat it was designed to protect. I concur with your position on the proposal made by Senators GRAHAM and MACK.

NORTH CAROLINA'S STREAM GAUGES AND MONITORING EQUIPMENT

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank you for including my amendment to provide $1,800,000 in emergency funds for the United States Geological Survey to repair and replace stream monitoring equipment damaged by natural disasters. As you know, your Committee recommended a significant increase in the USGS's Real Time Hazards Initiative, including $3,100,000 for new or upgraded stream gauging stations.

1999 was a devastating year for North Carolina. Hurricanes Floyd, Dennis and Irene did extensive damage across eastern North Carolina. And early indications are that this hurricane season will be just as active for North Carolina as last year. North Carolina's stream gauges and monitoring equipment are in desperate need of upgrade and enhancement. I respectfully request that the Committee recommend that the United States Geological Survey give special consideration to North Carolina's needs and address the need for upgrades and enhancements through this appropriation.

Mr. GORTON. I understand that the USGS is willing to address North Carolina's specific needs for stream gauges and monitoring equipment through the Real Time Hazards Initiative. The Committee recognizes the unique danger in North Carolina and, therefore, strongly encourages the USGS to ensure that North Carolina's stream gauges and monitoring devices are enhanced or upgraded to the degree possible within appropriations provided for these types of activities.

ELECTRO-CATALYTIC OXIDATION (ECO)

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I would like to ask my colleagues, Senator GORTON, Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee; and Senator BYRD, the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, about a new and innovative technology. Mr. Chairman, are you aware of an emerging technology known as electro-catalytic oxidation (ECO), which has the potential to reduce emissions, as well as unusable byproducts at coal-fired power plants?

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I would inform the Senator from Ohio that I have been made aware of ECO.

Mr. DEWINE. I ask if he concurs that the Secretary of Energy should participate in a full-scale demonstration of this technology that is planned for the near future.

Mr. GORTON. I would certainly encourage the Department to take a close look at this technology within the context of its coal research programs, and consider carefully any related research or demonstration proposal that may be submitted.

Mr. DEWINE. As the senior Senator from West Virginia is aware, the early tests of this technology show a significant reduction of nitrogen oxide (Nox), sulfur dioxide (SO2), mercury, and fine particulate matter. Would the Senator agree that a cost-effective reduction of these emissions is in the best interest of coal-fired power consumers as well as the coal industry?

Mr. BYRD. I would agree with the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. I thank the very distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia and would note that the Senator from New Hampshire, the state were ECO was developed, is optimistic about the potential of the technology. Would the Senator agree?

Mr. SMITH (of New Hampshire). I would agree with my colleague from Ohio and add that I applaud the innovative efforts that have led to the development of this emerging emissions control technology. As many of you know, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee is currently working to develop a bill that will address the significant problem of the hodge-podge of overlapping Clean Air Act regulation on utilities. Our goal is to draft a comprehensive, multi-pollutant bill to provide a more sensible

emission control regime on utilities while at the same time achieving greater reductions of pollutants than is currently possible under the Clean Air Act. New technologies, much as electro-catalytic oxidation will be critically important to our ability to successfully revise our approach to utility emission control. I would support any efforts to expedite the development of this technology.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the Chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee for his support of this important technology, and I would welcome the opportunity to more closely examine his proposals related to Clean Air reauthorization, and comment on them at a future time. I also thank the Chairman of the Interior Subcommittee and the senior Senator from West Virginia and would encourage them to consider the benefits of ECO to consumers of coal-fired power as well as coal producing states when this bill moves to conference with the other body.

FY 2001 INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR MAINE PROJECTS

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, Maine and the nation have an opportunity to accomplish an enormously meaningful level of forest protection in Maine's 10 million acre Northern Forest if significant funding for Forest Service accounts is allocated for Maine projects in fiscal year 2001. In the last two years, an astounding 20 percent of Maine's total forestland acreage has changed ownership, an occurrence that represents a significant shift in the pattern of stable long-term ownership and use that has characterized the Maine woods for at least the last hundred years.

Ms. COLLINS. The Senior Senator for Maine is correct, Mr. Chairman. This tremendous turnover calls into question whether the traditional use of these lands for forestry and for outdoor recreational activities will continue. We are fortunate that the present owners of these valuable lands are offering an opportunity to secure their lasting protection and productivity. I, along with Senator SNOWE, support these efforts through funding from the Forest Legacy Program and the Forest Service's land acquisition program and hope we can work together during this appropriations process to take advantage of the opportunity afforded us at this time.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I want to thank you for your strong support for Forest Legacy funding in FY 2000 in approving $3 million Title 6 funding for Maine for Phase I of the 656,000 acre West Branch project. This funding, along with the $2 million already allocated from the state grant portion of LWCF, will complement the $4 million being secured through non-federal sources for the conservation and protection of 70,000 acres of undeveloped forestland, including more than 100 miles of undeveloped shoreline along Moosehead Lake, Seboomook Lake, and several smaller lakes.

Ms. COLLINS. Phase II of the West Branch project consists of the remaining acreage of approximately 580,000 acres of what is one of the largest contiguous blocks of forest under single management in the eastern United States and has sustained a flow of timber products for more than 100 years.

Mr. GORTON. I appreciate the Senators' interest in this worthy project and I would be happy to work with the Senators to ensure appropriate consideration is given to these projects in Conference.

Ms. SNOWE. The second Forest Legacy project, Mr. Chairman, known as Mt. Blue/Tumbledown Mountain, is a two-phase project totaling approximately 33,400 acres and will protect some of Maine's most scenic areas—including Tumbledown Mountain, Jackson Mountain, Blueberry Mountain and trailheads leading to these peaks.

Ms. COLLINS. An amount of $1.2 million in Forest Legacy funding will allow the acquisition in fee of 3,600 acres immediately adjacent to Maine's Mt. Blue State Park, and will bring needed protections to Maine's scenic and popular Western Mountain region. I want to express my strong support for the project.

Mr. GORTON. Once again, I appreciate the Senators' interest in this worthy project and I would be pleased to work with the Senators to see that this project is considered fully in Conference.

Ms. SNOWE. I also want to thank you for your appropriations support for funds for the Pingree Forest, which is an excellent example of private sector cooperation and conservation, while at the same time preserving the working forests of our State. The Pingree Family of Maine has been exemplary in the way it has managed its lands for seven generations—160 years. As you are aware, the Pingree Family has entered into the Pingree Forest Partnership with the New England Forestry Foundation, which has committed to raise $30 million for a conservation easement on 754,673 acres of land in Northern and Western Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. The New England Forestry Foundation is within $11.5 million of its goal, which, under the terms of the partnership agreement with the Pingree family, must be met by December 31 of this year. I would note that the Pingree Family has agreed to sell this easement on their land at only $37.10 an acre.

Mr. GORTON. I am very much in support of what the parties are trying to preserve—a way of life through forestry in Maine and the conservation of the magnificent Northeast forests of this nation—and I will carry that support into conference. Funding of this project is certainly a wise use of federal funds for the conservation of outstanding undeveloped lands, and also keeping the Maine woods in sustainable forestry.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank you for your close scrutiny of the merits of this project and your support for what is currently the largest single land conservation project in the world. I would like to point out that, for any appropriation to work under the agreement, I urge you to allocate the funds through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation to the New England Forestry Foundation, which will hold the easement for the Pingree land.

Ms. COLLINS. I would like to add that, in the past, all of NFWF's federal grants have been appropriated through a designation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Land and Water Conservation Fund, and NFWF has received funds from the Forest Service for grants over the past ten years. NFWF's excellent track record gives me confidence that it is the right steward of this important project.

Mr. GORTON. I agree that this clarification is necessary and agree that the funds should be allocated through NFWF.

Ms. SNOWE. Once again, I thank my distinguished colleague from Washington State and praise his continuing efforts for the conservation of our nation's private lands, especially those of great importance to the people of Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I also thank you for your support, Mr. Chairman, for supporting these appropriations that will enable Pingree land to continue to supply area mills and support the local economy while allowing the public continued recreational access.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I would like to engage in a brief colloquy with the distinguished Chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, Senator GORTON, concerning future demonstration projects under the Clean Coal Technology program. Mr. President, clarifying the intent of the program will be helpful in my efforts to ensure that a very worthwhile initiative in Pennsylvania received full consideration by the Department of Energy.

The lack of a coherent and consistent energy policy has contributed to the high fuel prices that have hit the working families in Pennsylvania and across the nation very hard. It is the lack of a national energy policy that has led to our nation's reliance on foreign oil. Today, we import 56 percent of our fuel. This is the highest level in the history of our country. For a historical perspective, we only imported 36 percent of our oil during the energy crisis of the 1970s.

Mr. President, we must reduce our reliance on imported oil. We must conserve energy resources, improve energy efficiencies, and increase domestic energy supplies. We also need to aggressively expand our research and development efforts to encourage the use of domestic renewable energy sources.

The Pennsylvania initiative that I referred to would do just that by developing a facility that would convert Anthracite culm to a clean diesel fuel. The project would produce 1.4 million

barrels a year of zero-sulfur, high-energy diesel fuel, at the same time reclaiming land now rendered unusable and environmentally damaging. Additionally, it would create 1,000 construction and 150 permanent jobs.

Would the Senator agree that the establishment of such a facility, whose principal focus is to develop domestic renewable energy sources by transforming coal and coal waste into high quality diesel fuel, is the type of activity that the Clean Coal Technology program should encourage?

Mr. GORTON. I agree with my friend that the Clean Coal Technology program is meant to encourage projects that develop environmentally-friendly technologies, such as coal conversion. I believe that the Department of Energy should use its limited funding resources to expand its efforts to encourage the development of domestic renewable energy sources.

Mr. SANTORUM. As this bill moves forward into conference, is it the Senator's intention to seek adequate funding for the Clean Coal Technology program so that the Department of Energy can begin a new round of demonstration projects, including a project such as the Pennsylvania initiative I have described here today?

Mr. GORTON. As my colleague is aware, the Senate report accompanying the FY 2001 Interior bill directs the Department to report on options for a new solicitation in the Clean Coal program. In the context of preparing this report, and in conducting any future solicitation, I would expect the Department to give full consideration to such worthwhile projects as the one described by my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, with 1 minute to spare, that concludes the introduction of all amendments pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement of last week.

I repeat, if Members wish to speak to these amendments, they may do so after the conclusion of all of the votes on H.R. 4810, which will begin almost immediately. These amendments, to the extent that they require rollcall votes, will be voted on tomorrow, with the exception of the Bingaman amendment. It has 15 minutes for debate tomorrow.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, I think we agree that we have heard adequate explanation previous times about these amendments. The Senator is not soliciting more comments, is he?

Mr. GORTON. The Senator from Nevada states my position perfectly.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 6:15 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 4810.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3876, WITHDRAWN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of Senator DODD, that his amendment No. 3876 be withdrawn from consideration with respect to H.R. 4810.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. President, what is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to waive by the Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3868 THROUGH 3873, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw all six of my pending amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I second the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There are 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion of the Senator from Delaware to waive.

Mr. REID. I couldn't hear the Chair. What did the Chair say?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. REID. But the amendments of the Senator from Alaska were withdrawn. Is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

MODIFICATION OF MOTION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, it was my intention when I moved to raise this point of order, the waiver for the Lott wraparound amendment, that it be a comprehensive waiver to this point of order for the different permutations of the earned-income tax proposals contained in both the majority and minority proposals. However, the majority leader subsequently offered an amendment that will be considered later.

I ask unanimous consent that the Lott amendment be included in the original waiver that I raised.

Specifically, the new motion is to waive all points of order under the budget process arising from the earned-income credit component in this pending tax—the amendment by Senator MOYNIHAN, the amendment offered by Senator LOTT, the House companion bill, any amendment between the Houses, and any conference reports thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Does he yield for a quorum call?

Mr. REID. Isn't his minute up?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, there is no quorum call.

I urge the adoption of the chairman's proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman has requested a modification of the motion.

Is there objection?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. As modified, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is so modified.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask that we vitiate the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the substance of the motion, which is now a unanimous consent request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The revisions are so adopted.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. That is the spirit. Let's get on with it.

Mr. ROTH. All right.

MOTION TO COMMIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to commit the bill to the Finance Committee.

Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the Senate is again considering legislation that will provide, at long last, relief from the marriage tax penalty.

The marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples. For example, a manufacturing plant worker makes $30,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home $30,500 a year in salary. If they both file their taxes as singles they would pay 15 percent in income tax. But if they choose to live their lives in holy matrimony and file jointly, their combined income of $61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28%. The result is a tax penalty of approximately $1,400.

The Republican marriage penalty relief bill eliminates this unfairness without shifting of the tax burden and without increasing taxes on any individual. Middle and low income families would benefit as much as earners with higher incomes.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, almost half of all married couples—21 million—are affected by the marriage penalty. Over 640,000 couples in Virginia are affected, according to one study.

Most of the tax relief under our plan goes to the middle class. The Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation's distribution analysis estimates that couples making under $75,000 annually will be the biggest winners. Additionally, the Joint Tax Committee estimates that couples earning between $20,000 and $30,000 will receive the biggest percentage reduction in their federal taxes out of any income level, with couples making between $30,000–$40,000 fairing almost as well.

This money belongs to the taxpayers. With a surplus of over $2 trillion, not including Social Security, all taxpayers are entitled to a return of their tax overpayment. In addition, the federal government, through tax policy, should not discourage either parent from staying at home with children. The government should not penalize a family simply because it takes both spouses working outside of the home to make ends meet. Being a stay at home parent should be rewarded.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that taxpayers will send Uncle Sam almost $2 trillion in additional surplus taxes over the next ten years—after Congress has locked up 100% of Social Security surplus and paid down the public debt. This proposal gives back to the middle class families just 10 cents out of every surplus dollar they send to Washington. As I have said before, the Federal government should not put a price tag on the sacrament of marriage.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, are there 2 minutes equally divided for the rest of the evening?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this motion requires we do first things first. It says we should pass marriage penalty relief, but it also says we should substantially extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare at the same time. By 2037, the Social Security trust fund will have consumed all of its assets. By 2025, the Medicare HI trust fund will have consumed all of its assets.

To fix Social Security and Medicare, we can make small changes now or big changes later. That is why President Clinton was right when he said ''save Social Security first.'' It would be irresponsible to enact tax cuts this size before doing anything about Social Security and Medicare. Before the Senate passes tax cuts this size, the Finance Committee should report a plan to extend Social Security and Medicare. We should do first things first. That is what this motion requires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, Senator FEINGOLD's motion to commit to the Finance Committee will not accomplish its stated purpose of Social Security and Medicare reform. The bill before the Senate is limited under the budget resolution to tax cuts. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I can tell you we are actively pursuing a real bipartisan Medicare reform package. Our efforts are not a political stunt, like this motion. On Social Security reform, everyone believes that it is a worthy goal but not one where there is currently a bipartisan consensus. I urge my colleagues to reject Senator FEINGOLD's motion.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), are necessarily absent. I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), would vote ''no.''

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 198 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Johnson	Robb
Chafee L.,	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerrey	Schumer
Conrad	Kerry	Torricelli
Daschle	Kohl	Voinovich
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—49

Abraham	Frist	Murkowski
Allard	Gorton	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gramm	Roberts
Bennett	Grams	Roth
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Jeffords	Snowe
Collins	Kyl	Specter
Craig	Landrieu	Stevens
Crapo	Lott	Thomas
DeWine	Lugar	Thompson
Domenici	Mack	Thurmond
Enzi	McCain	
Fitzgerald	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—6

Coverdell	Hutchison	Rockefeller
Hutchinson	Inhofe	Warner

The motion was rejected.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 3849 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Senator BROWNBACK's amendment No. 3849.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic alternative, amendment No. 3863, and related amendments and motions be considered next, and that amendment No. 3863 be considered germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

MOTION TO WAIVE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Roth motion to waive the Budget Act for the amendments that would strike the sunset provisions in the bill and the Democratic alternative.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the Finance Committee complied with the Byrd rule by terminating or sunsetting the tax cuts in the bill generally on December 31, 2004. I note the Finance Committee Democratic alternative contained a similar sunset provision. The case before us that benefits a simple, broad-based tax policy change that reduces some of the tax burden placed on married couples, outweighs the implications of the Byrd rule.

Frankly, I think there are few more compelling cases for waiving the Byrd rule. Clearly, though, we differ on how to deliver it. Every Senator should place an importance on permanent marriage tax relief. I urge my colleagues to strike a blow for permanent marriage tax relief and support my motion to waive the Byrd rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I regret that I have to disagree with my chairman. The Byrd rule has proved such an important measure to maintain budgetary discipline. It has brought about the present happy circumstances; and this is no time, in our view, to move back to earlier practices which were so devastating in their effect during the 1980s.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would vote ''yes.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Abraham	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Allard	Frist	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gorton	Nickles
Bennett	Gramm	Roberts
Bond	Grams	Roth
Brownback	Grassley	Santorum
Bunning	Gregg	Sessions
Burns	Hagel	Shelby
Campbell	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Helms	Smith (OR)
Collins	Jeffords	Snowe
Craig	Kyl	Specter
Crapo	Lott	Stevens
DeWine	Lugar	Thomas
Domenici	Mack	Thompson
Enzi	McCain	Thurmond

NAYS—47

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Torricelli
Daschle	Landrieu	Voinovich
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	

NOT VOTING—5

Coverdell	Hutchison	Warner
Hutchinson	Inhofe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this motion, the yeas are 48, the nays 47. Three-fifths of the Senate duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURNS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 30 seconds to make an announcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, tomorrow, in S–128, models of the National World War II Memorial will be on display for all Members and staff to see. We encourage you to take a look at the models of this new memorial that will be on The Mall soon, we hope.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I yield back our time, and I raise a point of order that the Roth amendment No. 3864 to strike would worsen the Nation's fiscal position in years beyond those reconciled in the budget resolution and, thus, violates section 313(b)(1)(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, on amendment No. 3865, I yield back the time and I will make a point of order that it is in violation of the Byrd rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield back his time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Yes.

Mr. ROTH. Again, I make a point of order that this amendment is in violation of the Byrd rule of the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 3863

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I will exercise a brief 1 minute to describe the Democratic alternative, which is now to be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, this amendment can be described in one sentence. There are not many such, and I would hope the body might hear me: We propose that married couples be enabled to file jointly or singly, period, end of subject.

There are, sir, 65 marriage penalties in the Tax Code. This amendment abolishes them all. It would not allow the alternative minimum tax to take away the benefits of marriage penalty relief either. Whereas we have before us as a basic amendment that which would only take care of one marriage penalty and touch two others, here is the opportunity to get rid of them all.

In our tax system, no matter how large or small, whatever we do, we must see that the American public believes the tax system is fair. If there is a considerable judgment anywhere that something is not fair, then it ought to be corrected. Our amendment will do that, sir.

Thank you.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this amendment is the same one we considered in the Finance Committee. Supporters of this amendment claim it is preferable because it is more targeted, that it only benefits certain married families, and that it provides more comprehensive marriage penalty relief.

I do not shy away from the fact that our bill benefits virtually every American family. I welcome it. The Joint Committee on Taxation tells us that our bill will help over 45 million families. They also tell us the Democratic alternative will assist only 24 million.

Our bill also addresses the marriage penalty without creating a new penalty—a so-called homemaker penalty. With our approach, all married couples with the same income will be treated alike. This cannot be said of the alternative.

Finally, the Democratic alternative includes that income cap. If we are serious about addressing the inequity of this tax, we should not make this an issue of rich versus poor. Our bill is fair, it is comprehensive, and it is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to oppose this Democratic substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. ROTH. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. ROTH. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we are now having 10-minute votes, under the previous order; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3863 of the Senator from New York.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Johnson	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Torricelli
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Durbin	Levin	

NAYS—50

Abraham	Frist	Nickles
Allard	Gorton	Roberts
Ashcroft	Gramm	Roth
Bennett	Grams	Santorum
Bond	Grassley	Sessions
Brownback	Gregg	Shelby
Bunning	Hagel	Smith (NH)
Burns	Hatch	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Helms	Snowe
Cochran	Jeffords	Specter
Collins	Kyl	Stevens
Craig	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	Lugar	Thompson
DeWine	Mack	Thurmond
Domenici	McCain	Voinovich
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Fitzgerald	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—4

Coverdell	Hutchison
Hutchinson	Inhofe

The amendment (No. 3863) was rejected.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before we proceed, I don't want to delay the proceedings too long, but we are all very

much aware our friend and colleague is undergoing a difficult recovery at this time and I know he has been on our mind. I appreciate the Chaplain including him in the opening prayer this morning. Could I ask my colleagues to join me now in a moment of silence for our colleague, a silent prayer, for his speedy recovery.

(Moment of silence.)

Mr. LOTT. I thank my colleagues.

AMENDMENT NO. 3845

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, amendment No. 3845. There are 2 minutes equally divided between each side.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, this amendment cuts taxes for 7 of 10 taxpayers who take a standard deduction and ensures that many working Americans would not owe any income taxes at all. It would increase the standard deduction for individuals by $250, and would also increase the standard deduction for heads of households. It would continue to increase the standard deduction for married couples to twice that of an individual. It is paid for by striking the provision in the bill that benefits only taxpayers in the top quarter of the income distribution by expanding tax brackets.

My amendment better targets the marriage penalty relief and would simplify taxes and free many from paying income taxes altogether. The tradeoff is clear. Strike the new benefits for the best off quarter of taxpayers to fund benefits for 7 out of 10 taxpayers.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this amendment would strike the increase in the rate brackets of the underlying bill. As my colleagues may know, in dollar terms, the greatest source of marriage penalty for American families is the rate brackets. Under current law, for instance, the 15 percent rate bracket ends for singles at $26,250; it ends for couples at $43,850. Our bill has remedied that unfairness by phasing in a doubling of the married couples' rate bracket so that it ends at twice the ending point of the single's bracket.

While I agree that a further increase in the standard deduction is a good idea, I do not believe we should do it at the expense of the increase in the rate brackets. Accordingly, I must oppose this amendment.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 3845. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), and the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) would vote ''no.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 201 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Akaka	Harkin	Mikulski
Boxer	Hollings	Moynihan
Breaux	Inouye	Murray
Byrd	Johnson	Reed
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Reid
Cleland	Kerrey	Robb
Daschle	Kerry	Rockefeller
Dodd	Kohl	Sarbanes
Dorgan	Landrieu	Schumer
Durbin	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Edwards	Leahy	Wellstone
Feingold	Levin	Wyden
Feinstein	Lieberman	
Graham	Lincoln	

NAYS—56

Abraham	DeWine	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Enzi	Nickles
Baucus	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Bayh	Frist	Roth
Bennett	Gorton	Santorum
Biden	Gramm	Sessions
Bingaman	Grams	Shelby
Bond	Grassley	Smith (NH)
Brownback	Gregg	Smith (OR)
Bryan	Hagel	Snowe
Bunning	Hatch	Specter
Burns	Helms	Stevens
Campbell	Jeffords	Thomas
Cochran	Kyl	Thompson
Collins	Lott	Thurmond
Conrad	Lugar	Voinovich
Craig	Mack	Warner
Crapo	McCain	

NOT VOTING—4

Coverdell	Hutchison
Hutchinson	Inhofe

The amendment (No. 3845) was rejected.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3846

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). There are now 2 minutes evenly divided on the Feingold amendment No. 3846.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. The vital program known as COBRA helps ensure that people who lose their jobs do not lose their health insurance at the same time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, can we have order in the Senate so we can hear what the Senator is saying?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will please take their conferences off the floor.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. The vital program known as COBRA helps ensure that people who lose their jobs do not lose their health insurance at the same time. My amendment would expand access to affordable health insurance through COBRA in two ways. First, it would expand COBRA to cover retirees whose employer-sponsored coverage is terminated.

Employers who promise retiree coverage and then drop it will have to allow early retirees to have COBRA-continued coverage until they qualify for Medicare.

Second, it would create a 25-percent tax credit for COBRA premiums generally. This credit will improve access to and affordability of health insurance for this very vulnerable group. The amendment pays for this health coverage by eliminating an inequitable tax loophole: the percentage depletion allowance for hard rock minerals mined on Federal public lands.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. ROTH. I yield such time as the Senator from Nevada may use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this amendment would be devastating to one of the finest industries in America today: hard rock mining. It is a net exporter of gold especially. Tens of thousands of jobs will be wiped out. These are the highest paid blue-collar jobs in America.

This amendment is bad. We should do everything we can to defeat it. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the pending amendment is not germane and raise a point of order that the amendment violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act, I move to waive the applicable section of that act for consideration of my amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 30, nays 68, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Akaka	Graham	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Breaux	Kennedy	Robb
Collins	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Landrieu	Schumer
Dodd	Lautenberg	Snowe
Durbin	Leahy	Torricelli
Edwards	Levin	Wellstone
Feingold	Lieberman	Wyden

NAYS—68

Abraham	Ashcroft	Bayh
Allard	Baucus	Bennett

Bingaman	Gorton	McConnell
Bond	Gramm	Moynihan
Brownback	Grams	Murkowski
Bryan	Grassley	Nickles
Bunning	Gregg	Reid
Burns	Hagel	Roberts
Byrd	Hatch	Rockefeller
Campbell	Helms	Roth
Chafee, L.	Hollings	Santorum
Cleland	Hutchison	Sessions
Cochran	Inhofe	Shelby
Conrad	Inouye	Smith (NH)
Craig	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Crapo	Kerrey	Specter
DeWine	Kohl	Stevens
Domenici	Kyl	Thomas
Dorgan	Lincoln	Thompson
Enzi	Lott	Thurmond
Feinstein	Lugar	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Mack	Warner
Frist	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Coverdell	Hutchinson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 30, the nays are 68. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The amendment would add new subject matter to the bill and is therefore not germane. The point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

The Senator from West Virginia.

EXPLANATION FOR NOT VOTING

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on vote No. 198, I was unavoidably detained. I apologize for that. I missed the first vote. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 3847

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 3847 is pending. The Senator has 1 minute.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, if we are for equal pay for women and men who do the same work, then this is the amendment to do it—the Paycheck Fairness Act, which was introduced under Senator DASCHLE's leadership. It provides stronger remedies in wage discrimination cases and provides resources to educate employers on wage discrimination. It ensures that women cannot be retaliated against for sharing their pay information with fellow employees.

It is time to stop giving America's women lipservice for equal pay for equal work, but to actually do something to make it happen. That is what this amendment does. I urge its adoption.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, as we discuss the tax code and the issue of fairness for families, Senator HARKIN has offered an important amendment to address an issue of fairness faced by millions of working women and their families. Senator HARKIN and I have worked hard to craft legislation that addresses the wage gap between men and women in this country. This amendment is modeled after my bill, S. 74, the Paycheck Fairness Act. In an era characterized by economic opportunity, it is time for the Senate to consider how America's prosperity can be broadly and fairly shared.

While much has changed over the past 35 years, one thing has remained the same: the wage gap between men and women. When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act in 1963, a woman earned only 59 cents for every dollar earned by a man. This landmark bill reduced the pay gap and helped women make great strides to narrow the pay gap. Nonetheless, 35 years later, women, on average, continue to earn only 73 cents for every dollar earned by a man. This disparity is patently unfair. The time has come to improve and strengthen President Kennedy's landmark law.

Some have suggested that the pay gap is insignificant, but working women know better. Even after accounting for differences in education and the amount of time in the workforce, a woman's pay still lags far behind the pay of a man doing the same work. This persistent wage gap doesn't shortchange just women. It shortchanges families. The wage gap causes the average American working family to lose more than $4000 a year. In fact, it is women's salaries that often bring children and families out of poverty. And families suffer more in South Dakota than in most states because we have the highest percentage in the nation of working mothers with children under the age of 6. These mothers deserve equal pay for equal work.

To address this serious problem, the Paycheck Fairness Act uses a simple approach: we believe that the pay gap will decrease if women and men have more information about it; we believe the pay gap will decrease if we enable women to pursue meaningful suits against employers that have discriminatory practices; and we believe that the pay gap will decrease if employers are educated and rewarded for doing their part to end wage discrimination.

My bill is a modest but needed step in the fight against wage discrimination. The simple fact remains—working families face the problem of wage discrimination every day and lose billions of dollars in wages because of it. Instead of the risky tax scheme the Senate is considering today, we should give women and American families a much needed raise. We should pass the Harkin amendment today and continue to work towards the day when the pay gap is eliminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield my time to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this amendment that my colleague from Iowa has offered amends the Fair Labor Standards Act but it has never had a hearing before the Labor Committee. It has never been marked up by the Labor Committee. It is legislation that would make the trial lawyers very happy because it authorizes unlimited punitive and compensatory damages for discrimination cases brought under the Equal Pay Act. In fact, it would authorize remedies not available in any title VII discrimination case or Americans with Disabilities Act case because damages under those statutes are capped. It would also make it easier for trial lawyers to create class action lawsuits. It is bad legislation and it does not belong on this bill. I encourage my colleagues to support the point of order and reject the amendment.

Mr. President, I make a point of order that the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa is not germane to the underlying bill and would, therefore, result in a section 305(b)(2) point of order under the Budget Act. I, therefore, raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for the consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Akaka	Edwards	Levin
Baucus	Feingold	Lieberman
Bayh	Feinstein	Lincoln
Biden	Graham	Mikulski
Bingaman	Harkin	Moynihan
Boxer	Hollings	Murray
Breaux	Inouye	Reed
Bryan	Johnson	Reid
Byrd	Kennedy	Robb
Cleland	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Conrad	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Durbin	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—53

Abraham	Frist	Murkowski
Allard	Gorton	Nickles
Ashcroft	Gramm	Roberts
Bennett	Grams	Roth
Bond	Grassley	Santorum
Brownback	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burns	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Helms	Smith (OR)
Chafee, L.	Hutchison	Snowe
Cochran	Inhofe	Specter
Collins	Jeffords	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
DeWine	Lugar	Thurmond
Domenici	Mack	Voinovich
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Fitzgerald	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Coverdell Hutchinson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 45, the nays are 53. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The amendment would add new subject matter to the bill and is therefore not germane. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask the two managers to yield to the Senator from Louisiana for a unanimous consent request.

AMENDMENT NO. 3888

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I send to the desk be in order and that it take the place of a Dodd amendment that was removed from the list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3888

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit to provide assistance to adoptive parents of special needs children, and for other purposes)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXPANSION OF ADOPTION CREDIT.

(a) SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—

(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—Paragraph (1) of section 23(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of credit) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter—

''(A) in the case of a special needs adoption, $10,000, or

''(B) in the case of any other adoption, the amount of the qualified adoption expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer.''.

(2) YEAR CREDIT ALLOWED.—Section 23(a)(2) of such Code (relating to year credit allowed) is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''In the case of a special needs adoption, the credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be allowed for the taxable year in which the adoption becomes final.''.

(3) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 23(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)(B)'', and

(B) by striking ''($6,000, in the case of a child with special needs)''.

(4) DEFINITION OF SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—Section 23(d) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—The term 'special needs adoption' means the final adoption of an individual during the taxable year who is an eligible child and who is a child with special needs.''.

(5) DEFINITION OF CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 23(d)(3) of such Code (defining child with special needs) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—The term 'child with special needs' means any child if a State has determined that the child's ethnic background, age, membership in a minority or sibling groups, medical condition or physical impairment, or emotional handicap makes some form of adoption assistance necessary.''.

(b) INCREASE IN INCOME LIMITATIONS.—Section 23(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to income limitation) is amended —

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$63,550 ($105,950 in the case of a joint return)'', and

(B) by striking ''$40,000'' and inserting ''the applicable amount'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable amount, with respect to any taxpayer, for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(i) the maximum taxable income amount for the 31 percent bracket under the table contained in section 1 relating to such taxpayer and in effect for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the dollar amount in effect with respect to the taxpayer for the taxable year under subparagraph (A)(i).

''(D) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2001, each dollar amount under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2000' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(ii) ROUNDING RULES.—If any amount after adjustment under clause (i) is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1,000.''.

(c) ADOPTION CREDIT MADE PERMANENT.—Subclauses (A) and (B) of section 23(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining eligible child) are amended to read as follows:

''(A) who has not attained age 18, or

''(B) who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''(1)'' and inserting ''(1)(B)''.

(2) Section 23(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(a)(1)(B)''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Members, these 10-minute votes have been going much closer to 15, 16, or 17 minutes. At this late hour, I ask the Senators to stay in the Chamber or someplace nearby. We are having to vote long periods of time with people coming from offices and other places. We can do better and save a lot of time if we can vote within the 10-minute period.

AMENDMENT NO. 3848

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the Kennedy amendment No. 3848.

The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are talking about relief from the so-called marriage penalty in the Tax Code. But low-income married parents face a more serious marriage penalty under Medicaid. Under the current law, parents who are married lose their health coverage under Medicaid in some 14 States. In other States, they lose their health coverage under Medicaid if they work more than 100 hours a month. That is wrong.

Our answer to this problem is to provide States with the resources and authority to expand S-CHIP and Medicaid to the parents of the children who are covered under these programs. It is a sensible system. The President has paid for it in his budget. It provides needed relief from the health marriage and work penalty under Medicaid. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the FamilyCare initiative prematurely doubles the size and scope of the new State Children's Health Insurance Program. S–CHIP has been enrolling children for less than 3 years—and it has not reached its goals in terms of covering eligible children. Let us make sure the S–CHIP model works before we expand it so dramatically.

In fact, Mr. President, it is worth noting that if the states want to extend coverage to parents, they may do so now under Medicaid waivers, or even under S–CHIP, if that coverage is ''cost-effective''.

In addition to program concerns, FamilyCare raises a fundamental question. Should parenthood be the driving factor in terms of eligibility for health insurance coverage? FamilyCare rewards parenthood and disadvantages working poor individuals who decide to postpone having families until they are better able to afford to raise a child.

Finally, this new initiative is extremely costly. We are talking about creating a new program with a cost of $50 billion over ten years—all without holding hearings on the bill and without any discussion of priorities.

Mr. President, I make a point of order that the Kennedy amendment is neither germane nor relevant to the reconciliation bill, it is in violation of 305(b)(2) of the Budget Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for the consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), is necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 204 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Breaux	Hollings	Reed
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Byrd	Jeffords	Robb
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Rockefeller
Cleland	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Collins	Kerrey	Schumer
Conrad	Kerry	Snowe
Daschle	Kohl	Specter
DeWine	Landrieu	Torricelli
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

NAYS—47

Abraham	Gorton	Murkowski
Allard	Gramm	Nickles
Ashcroft	Grams	Roberts
Bennett	Grassley	Roth
Bond	Gregg	Santorum
Brownback	Hagel	Sessions
Bunning	Hatch	Shelby
Burns	Helms	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Hutchison	Smith (OR)
Cochran	Inhofe	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	Mack	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	McCain	Warner
Frist	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Coverdell	Hutchinson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 51, and the nays are 47. Three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to waive the Budget Act is not agreed to. The amendment would add new subject matter to the bill and is therefore not germane. The point of order is sustained. The amendment falls.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3851 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3850

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Bond second-degree amendment to the Durbin amendment.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is not fair that a self-employed person cannot deduct 100 percent of health care costs when a large business can. A self-employed person is denied that deductibility, even though we have worked since 1995 when this body accepted my amendment at that time to increase the deductibility of insurance costs for the self-employed. Still, only 60 percent of the health insurance cost is deductible by the self-employed.

I have talked to a lot of these people. They cannot wait until 2003 when they will get 100-percent deductibility. My amendment says there is 100-percent deductibility this year and makes sure that the 5 million Americans in households headed by self-employed can get health care coverage, including 1.3 million children.

It also corrects a disparity in current law which says if a self-employed person is eligible for health coverage from another plan, a second job, or a spouse's plan, they cannot deduct. This says you can deduct so long as you do not participate in another health care plan.

I thank my colleagues on both sides and my colleague from Illinois.

I urge this body to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Missouri has taken a very good amendment and made it even better. I hope Members will join in supporting the second-degree amendment by Senator BOND to my amendment, for the full deductibility of the health insurance premiums for the self-employed. I hope you will resist efforts, if we are successful, to remove this amendment at a later time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second-degree amendment.

The amendment (No. 3851) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3850

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the first-degree amendment?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I yield back my time and ask for a favorable vote on the Durbin amendment, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as amended.

The amendment (No. 3850), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BOND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3852

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I have another amendment at the desk, which if I am not mistaken, is next in order on the list for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on amendment 3852.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are 44 million Americans without health insurance. Among uninsured workers, most of them work for small businesses. This amendment creates a tax credit for small businesses which will offer health insurance for their employees. The tax credits especially favor those businesses which have not offered it in the past. I think it is a good investment to help small businesses take care of their No. 1 concern: health insurance for the owners of the business, health insurance for the employees of the small business.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I look at my colleague's amendment, and he says for health care we will make it a tax credit. That means it is more valuable than wages; that means it is more valuable than any other expenditure for an employer.

We passed several tax provisions to encourage employers and individuals to buy health care. We passed that with the Patients' Bill of Rights. We passed it with minimum wage. The amendment of my colleague from Illinois, in my opinion, is misdirected and very expensive. We have not had a hearing in the Finance Committee. I think it happens to be bad policy. It says for this type of expenditure, it is more important than any other that an employer would make.

I make a budget point of order under section 305 that it is in violation of the Budget Act.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of the act for consideration of the pending bill, and I seek the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire). Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 205 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Baucus	Feingold	Lincoln
Bayh	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Graham	Moynihan
Bingaman	Harkin	Murray
Boxer	Hollings	Reed
Breaux	Inouye	Reid
Bryan	Jeffords	Robb
Byrd	Johnson	Rockefeller
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kerrey	Schumer
Collins	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Durbin	Levin	

NAYS—49

Abraham	Cochran	Gramm
Allard	Craig	Grams
Ashcroft	Crapo	Grassley
Bennett	DeWine	Gregg
Bond	Domenici	Hagel
Brownback	Enzi	Hatch
Bunning	Fitzgerald	Helms
Burns	Frist	Hutchinson
Campbell	Gorton	Hutchison

Inhofe	Nickles	Stevens
Kyl	Roberts	Thomas
Lott	Roth	Thompson
Lugar	Santorum	Thurmond
Mack	Sessions	Voinovich
McCain	Shelby	Warner
McConnell	Smith (NH)	
Murkowski	Smith (OR)	

NOT VOTING—2

Coverdell	Torricelli

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The amendment would add new subject matter to the bill and is, therefore, not germane. The point of order is satisfied. The amendment fails.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. BURNS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3853

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment is amendment No. 3853 offered by the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold for a moment? It is my understanding this is going to be the last vote tonight, is that correct, I ask the Chairman?

Mr. ROTH. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. REID. There are going to be some other votes that do not require rollcalls after this?

Mr. ROTH. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, recognizing this is the last rollcall vote of the evening, I will not take the time of this Chamber. It is a very simple amendment. A majority of this body has already gone on record saying that we will make certain we pass a prescription drug benefit for seniors before we pass all of these other tax cuts. We passed a major tax cut on Friday. We are proposing to pass tomorrow morning another major tax cut.

All this amendment says is, before these tax cuts go into effect, we will have actually delivered on the promise to provide a prescription drug benefit.

I hope it will be the pleasure of this Senate to adopt this amendment and keep the faith with our seniors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, this is an amendment that undermines, not advances, progress on two important issues. Its only effect will be to stop tax cuts for families while not advancing by a day Medicare reform that should include a prescription drug benefit. If anything, it slows down Medicare reform by politicizing the issue.

Prescription drugs should not be pitted against family tax cuts. We can and should be for both. The budget surplus allows for both. The budget passed by Congress allows for both and both are necessary policies, but they must first each be correctly thought through.

Now is the time to pass marriage tax relief, an issue on which we have been working for years. Now is the time to be working together on Medicare reform, as we are in the Finance Committee. Working together we can succeed on both policies. Seeking division we will fail on each. Notwithstanding any policy objections, the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is not germane to the underlying bill and would, therefore, result in a section 305(b)(2) point of order under the Budget Act. Therefore, I raise a point of order against the amendment pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive the applicable sections of that act for the consideration of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 206 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Abraham	Edwards	Lieberman
Akaka	Feingold	Lincoln
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Graham	Moynihan
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Hollings	Reed
Boxer	Inouye	Reid
Breaux	Jeffords	Robb
Bryan	Johnson	Rockefeller
Byrd	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Chafee, L.	Kerrey	Schumer
Cleland	Kerry	Snowe
Conrad	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Landrieu	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Durbin	Levin	

NAYS—50

Allard	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchison	Stevens
Craig	Inhofe	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Lott	Thurmond
Domenici	Lugar	Torricelli
Enzi	Mack	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	McCain	Warner
Frist	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—1

Coverdell

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 50. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The amendment makes provisions of this act contingent upon enactment of other legislation. Therefore, it is nongermane. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3854, 3855, 3859, 3860, 3877, AND 3888

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be agreed to en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the amendments be printed in the RECORD. The amendments are the following: Nos. 3854, 3855, 3859, 3860, 3877, and 3888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments (Nos. 3854, 3855, 3859, 3860, 3877, and 3888) were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3859

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, The Cleland Savings Bond Tax-Exclusion for Long-Term Care Services Amendment would exclude United States savings bond income from being taxed if used to pay for long-term health care expenses. Current law provides an income exclusion for savings bond income used to pay for qualified higher education expenses. This amendment expands the tax code section 135 to allow the savings bond income exclusion for eligible long-term care expenses as well. This measure will assist individuals struggling to accommodate costs associated with many chronic medical conditions and the aging process. A staggering 5.8 million Americans are afflicted with the financial burdens of long-term care.

This legislation will assist families by:

Providing a tax exclusion for savings bonds used to pay for long-term care;

Allowing families to use their savings bond assets to face the dual challenge of paying for long-term care services and higher education expenses.

Thank you and I urge you to support this proposal to provide tax relief to Americans burdened by the financial constraints of providing long-term care and higher education expenses. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3860

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, we have on the books today a special enhanced tax deduction for individuals and corporations which donate computers to our nation's elementary and secondary schools. This deduction—which helps to keep America on the cutting-edge in technology—is scheduled to expire at the end of the year. The amendment I am offering is twofold: it would extend this tax deduction for five years and it would expand it to include computer donations to public libraries and non-profit and governmental community centers as well.

My amendment will help to close the ''digital divide'' which exists in this

country by providing a viable alternative for Americans who are being left behind because they do not have access in their homes to computer and Internet use. We know, for example, that Americans earning less than $20,000 who use the Internet outside the home are twice as likely to get their access through a public library or community center. And Americans who are not in the labor force, such as retirees or homemakers, are twice as likely to use public libraries for on-line access.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It would extend a tax deduction which has proved invaluable in boosting efforts by individuals and companies to donate computer equipment and web access to our Nation's schools. And it will help to keep this Nation a leader in the global economy by helping to close the gap between the technological haves and the have nots.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3856, 3857, 3861, 3862, 3866, 3867, 3876, 3879, 3880, AND 3882 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be withdrawn: Nos. 3856, 3857, 3861, 3862, 3866, 3867, 3876, 3879, 3880, and 3882.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators DASCHLE and JOHNSON be added as cosponsors of the Dorgan amendment No. 3877.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHNSON be added as a cosponsor of the Moynihan amendment No. 3863.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments about the reconciliation bill before us containing marriage penalty tax relief.

This is an issue about fairness, Mr. President for around thirty years our Tax Code has been penalizing people just becuase they happen to be married. This is a perfect example of how broken our Tax Code is. Just like the earnings limitation that discriminated against older Americans, this unfiar Tax needs to be dumped. It took a Republican-led Congress to repeal the Social Security earnings limit.

And now, it's the same Republican-led Congress that's talking the lead in repealing the marriage penalty tax. We tried it a couple of months ago, but we were blocked by the Democratic side from passing the bill. Now, we're back under reconciliation instructions that prevent the other side from gridlocking the Senate.

Of course, the minority side wants you to believe they're all for getting rid of the marriage penalty tax. Of course, they had control of the Congress for decades and never once tried to repeal it.

What's worse, now they're using the old bait-and-switch routine. They say they're for this tax relief, but not until Social Security and Medicare are fixed.

We all know neither the administration nor the Democratic side have comprehensive proposals to fix Social Security and Medicare, so this is just a delyaing tactic to kill the bill so, they say they're for marriage penalty relief—but only sometime in the unknown future. That's Washington D.C. double-talk.

Delaying this tax relief really means no tax relief at all.

Mr. President, we've heard other misleading arguments that under the majority bill, married couples would get a tax cut, but single mothers with kids would not get one. However, an important part of our bill repeals the alternative minimum tax for over then million people. Many of those helped will be single mothers. But, guess what's even more interesting? The Democrat alternative bill is the bill that doesn't help single mothers at all.

In addition, it's important to note that the Democrat alternative discriminates against stay-at-home moms. That's right, the Democrat proposal only helps two earner couples. So, it not only doesn't helpt those single mothers the other side was crying crocodile tears over—it hurts those families where one partent decides to stay at home with the children.

I hope all of you stay-at-home parents out there listening understand what the Democratic alternative will do to them.

Mr. President, we're going to pass this tax relief measure anad send it to President Clinton.

This begs the question—where is the Clinton-Gore administration on providing this tax reljief to working Americans? Well, a few weeks ago, the administration offered to accept mariiage penalty tax relief for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. This is the same tax relief bill the Clinton-Gore administration and Democrats have been attacking and deriding for months. Now, they're saying, forget all those bad things we said, we're ready to deal.

This just shows the Clinton-Gore administration either doesn't have any principles, or they're willing to trade them to the highest bidder.

Of course, for years this administration has been saying they would work with Congress to save social security and medicare. But, here we are near the end of this administration, and it has no comprehensive plan to save either program. They're reduced to trying to salvage a legacy by creating a hugely expensive entitlement program that could end up draining the hard-earned surplus. This is a surplus earned bythe American people, not the Government, who wants to spend it all. Interestingly, a recent polly said that 60 percent of Americans credit American workers and businesse for our successful economy. Only 39 percent credit the administration, who would like you to believe they did it all.

I think the American people are finally figuring out the Clinton-Gore charade.

We're going to see more and more of these con-games as sthe Year winds down, and this tired, worn-out administration desperately tries to reshape its disappointing place in history.

Mr. President, the time for delay is over. The time for gridlock is over. Now is the time to pass this important tax relief measure, and I urge the members of this body to come together and do what's right, by passing this legislation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4810—legislation that would dramatically reduce one of the most insidious aspects of the tax code: the marriage penalty.

As my colleagues are aware, there are several primary causes of the ''marriage penalty'' within the tax code, including different tax rate schedules and different standard deductions for joint filers versus single filers.

In terms of the impact of these differing tax provisions, the marriage penalty is most pronounced for two-earner couples in which the husband and wife have nearly equal incomes. While this may not have been as noticeable in society 30 or 40 years ago, the demographic changes that have occurred since the 1960s—with more married women entering the workforce to help support their families—has led to a significant increase in the share of couples who suffer from the marriage penalty.

Make no mistake, the impact of the marriage penalty is severe. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), 42% of married couples incur marriage penalties that average nearly $1,400.

When measured by income category, fully 12% of couples with incomes below $20,000 incurred a marriage penalty in 1996; 44% of couples with incomes of $20,000 to $50,000; and 55% of couples with incomes above $50,000.

In addition, according to CBO, empirical evidence suggests that the marriage penalty may affect work patterns, particularly for a couple's second earner. Specifically, because filing a joint return often imposes a substantially higher tax rate on a couple's second earner, the higher rate reduces the second earner's after-tax wage and may cause that individual to work fewer hours or not at all. As a result, economic efficiency is harmed in the overall economy.

Furthermore, while I would hope that the tax code would not be a factor in a couple's decision to marry or stay single, the simple fact is that a couple's tax status could worsen if married and could, therefore, impact a couple's decision to marry. Therefore, we should eliminate this potential barrier to marriage and ensure that couples make one of life's biggest decisions based on their values and beliefs—not on the federal tax code.

As a strong opponent of the marriage penalty, I am an original cosponsor of S. 15, legislation introduced by Senator

HUTCHISON that eliminates the marriage penalty through a proposal known as ''income splitting.'' Under this approach, a married couple would add up all their income and then split it in half. Each spouse would then file as a single individual and pay taxes on his or her half of the total income, with exemptions, deductions and credits being split evenly between the two spouses.

Last year, to advance this legislation or any other proposal that would provide marriage penalty relief, I offered an amendment during the markup of the FY 2000 budget resolution that ensured a significant reduction in—or the outright elimination of—the marriage penalty would be a central component of any tax cut package adopted during last year's reconciliation process.

Later that summer, in accordance with my budget amendment, the $792 billion tax cut reconciliation package that was passed by the Senate included such relief, as did the final House-Senate conference report. However, just as President Clinton vetoed the tax bill in 1995 that included marriage penalty relief, last year's tax bill was vetoed as well.

In an effort to address this issue outside a broader tax package, the House of Representatives passed legislation earlier this year—by a bipartisan vote of 268 to 158—that would reduce the marriage penalty. The Senate considered its version of the legislation in April, but a Democratic filibuster prevented us from bringing the bill to a final vote. Today, we are considering nearly identical legislation yet again, but—thanks to the budget reconciliation process—we are assured it will come to a final vote.

Mr. President, H.R. 4810 would dramatically reduce the marriage penalty by doubling the standard deduction for married couples relative to single filers; expanding the 15 percent and 28 percent income tax brackets for married couples to twice the size of the corresponding tax brackets for single filers; increasing the phase-out range of the Earned Income Credit for couples filing joint returns; and permanently exempting family tax credits from the individual Alternative Minimum Tax.

I am especially pleased that the legislation does not penalize families in which a spouse foregoes an income to raise children. Unfortunately, the proposal that is being espoused by the minority would do just that.

Specifically, by allowing married couples to file their taxes as if they were single, the substitute proposal would provide relief only to families in which both spouses have taxable incomes. As a result, if a spouse has no earned income by virtue of the fact that he or she is working at home to raise the family's children—but doesn't actually earn a salary for each of the myriad of tasks this profession entails—the couple would receive none of the benefits of the larger tax brackets or standard deduction that a single taxpayer currently receives because only one-half of the couple has an income to report.

I believe a spouse's decision to work outside the home and utilize daycare, or work at home to raise children, should be made with only the best interests of the family in mind—not the tax code. We should not take a significant step to eliminate the marriage penalty only to replace it with a ''homemaker penalty''—and I'm pleased that H.R. 4810 ensures that the benefits it provides can be used by all couples, including those in which a spouse foregoes an income to raise a family.

It is my hope that, by considering this package of marriage penalty relief proposals as a stand-alone bill—and not as part of a broader, and potentially controversial, tax cut package—we will not only pass this legislation with strong bipartisan support, but ultimately send a bill to the President that he will sign for the benefit of all married couples.

The bottom line is that we should not condone or accept a tax code that penalizes married couples or discourages marriage, and this bill provides the Senate with the opportunity to correct this inequity in a straightforward manner.

Ultimately, the bill we are considering is not simply about providing the American people with a reasonable and rational tax cut—rather, it is about correcting a gross discrepancy in the tax code that unfairly impacts married couples. Accordingly, even though individual members of this body disagree on a wide variety of tax cuts policies, I would hope we would all agree that the act of marriage should not be penalized by the Internal Revenue Code—and would support S. 4810 accordingly.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for this pro-family, pro-economic growth legislation. It is unfortunate that government continues to burden its citizens with excessive and unfair taxation. Indeed, America's income tax system reduces freedom and economic growth. An embarrassing example of this inequity is the marriage penalty—essentially, a quirk in the income tax code that causes some married couples to be penalized and taxed at higher rates, simply because they marry.

The treatment of marriage provides an important example of why we need to support equity in the tax code. Consider that two couples who are exactly the same—except one is married and the other couple is not. A peculiar feature in our tax code is that these two couples may pay different taxes. Simply put, when a man and woman get married, their tax liability can rise and the federal government can take more of the married couple's money. This is a fundamental problem in the tax code. I believe in fairness and simplicity when it comes to taxes. A married couple should not pay more taxes than an unmarried couple with the same total income. This is poor policy.

Marriage neutrality is the principle that when two people get married, their total bill should not change. Unfortunately, the U.S. income tax is not marriage neutral. According to the Congressional Budget Office, almost half of all married couples—22 million—suffered from the marriage penalty last year. In my home state of Idaho, 129,710 couples were adversely affected because of this system. These married couples on average paid an extra $1,500 in income tax. Moreover, as women are working hard to achieve salary equity, it is unfortunate that as women approach income levels similar to their husbands, the marriage penalty increasingly kicks in and the federal government simply takes their money back.

Under this bill, beginning next year, Congress will restore marriage neutrality to the code. The Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act will increase the standard deduction for married couples to approximately $8,800. This is twice the basic standard deduction for a single tax filer. The bill will also widen the 15 percent and 28 percent income tax brackets for married couples filing a joint return to twice the size of the corresponding rate brackets of single individuals. This is a commonsense solution to ending any disparity for married couples who find they are paying a penalty. Fortunately for them, the rules under which we are debating the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act will also shield senators from excess delay and we will have an up-or-down vote. True to the bill's name, we are here to reconcile an unfair tax provision that is counterproductive to our goal of equity and fairness.

Today, we have finally put an end to expensive entitlements and the reckless fiscal behavior that created large deficits in the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s. Indeed, the surging U.S. economy has produced an unprecedented tidal wave of federal tax receipts. This year, the country will see a $76 billion dollar surplus—over the next ten years the non-social security surplus is estimated at $1.9 trillion. This raises the question: when will the government start returning money to the people? With these surpluses there is no doubt that there is room for marriage tax relief and additional debt reduction. Therefore, we should seize this opportunity to return these surplus dollars, before the bureaucrats in town start spending them. If we do not, an opportunity to restore horizontal equity to the tax code will be lost, because surpluses—like we have today—will certainly invite an irresponsible flurry of new spending.

Americans have historically and consistently expressed their discontent for excessive and unfair taxation. I have stacks of letters in my office from honest and hard-working Idahoans who rightfully want to know where their

tax cut is. Let us take this opportunity to return something to those American families who are married and working to support families and loved ones. Let us make good on our constituent promise by voting to eliminate the marriage tax penalty and let us give the President an opportunity to honor his State of the Union promise by signing this bill.

The federal tax code remains intrusive, overly complicated, and excessively burdensome. As part of my effort to bring tax relief to the American people, I have co-sponsored or voted for legislation to reduce the death tax, gas tax, beer tax, and telephone excise tax. Today, we have an opportunity to vote for a bill that I hope will have broad bipartisan support. Senators should be mindful of the opportunity to provide needed relief to married couples. Death and taxes are certainties in life. Let us vote to ensure that fairness is too. I urge my colleagues to support repeal of the marriage tax penalty. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, it was about two-and-a-half years ago that I came to the Senate floor to call on the Senate to repeal two of the most egregious and unfair taxes imposed by the nation's Tax Code: the steep taxes imposed on people when they get married and when they die. The good news is, for the second time in two years, the Senate has cleared legislation to repeal the death tax. And this week, for the third time, we will clear a measure to repeal the marriage penalty.

In 1995, Congress passed legislation that would have provided a tax credit to married couples to offset this penalty somewhat. President Clinton vetoed that bill.

In 1999, Congress again approved a measure to provide married couples with some relief. Last year's bill would have set the standard deduction for couples at twice the deduction allowed for singles. It would also have set the lowest income-tax bracket for married couples at twice that allowed for single taxpayers. President Clinton vetoed that measure last September.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, the total tax burden borne by American taxpayers dipped slightly in 1998. That is the good news. The bad news is that Americans still spent more on federal taxes than on any of the other major items in their household budgets. For the median-income, two-earner family, federal taxes still amounted to 39 percent of the family budget—more than what they spent on food, housing, and medical care combined. One of the reasons why they paid so much is the continuation of the marriage penalty that exists in the Nation's tax code.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, nearly half of all married taxpayers—about 21 million couples—filing a joint return paid a higher tax than they would have if each spouse had been allowed to file as a single taxpayer.

The marriage penalty hits the working poor particularly hard. Two-earner families making less than $20,000 often must devote a full eight percent of their income to pay the marriage penalty. Eight percent is an extraordinary amount for couples that count on every dollar to make ends meet.

Let me stop here and give an example of the marriage penalty at work. In this example, the penalty comes about because workers filing as single taxpayers get a higher standard deduction, and because income-tax bracket thresholds for married couples are lower than the threshold for singles. Consider a married couple in which each spouse earns about $30,000 a year. They would have paid $7,655 in federal income taxes last year. By comparison, two individuals earning the same amount, but filing single returns, would have paid only $6,892 between the two of them. That is a marriage penalty of $763.

The average penalty—average penalty—paid by couples is even higher than that—about $1,400 a year, according to the Congressional Budget Office. Think what families could do with an extra $1,400. They could pay for three or four months of day care if they choose to send a child outside the home—or make it easier for one parent to stay at home to take care of the children, if that is what they decide is best for them. They could make four or five payments on their car or minivan. They could pay their utility bill for nine months.

The bill before us is the most comprehensive effort yet to eliminate the marriage penalty. It would expand the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly; widen the tax brackets for such couples; and increase the income phase-outs for the earned income credit.

Unlike President Clinton's so-called relief bill, the plan Chairman ROTH brings to us today does not neglect married couples who choose to have one parent stay at home to raise the children. It gives them relief, and, in so doing, it lets them know we value the choice they have made to stay home and raise a family.

Unlike the Clinton plan, which would preserve the penalty for many couples, our plan would eliminate the marriage penalty in its entirety. Sure, that means the revenue loss associated with this legislation is greater than the President proposed, but the smaller cost of providing relief under the Clinton plan is also indicative of just how little it would do to solve the problem. We should not be stingy when attempting to ensure fairness in the tax code.

Passage of this legislation would continue the good progress we have made this year in making the tax code fairer. First, we passed the measure to repeal the Social Security earnings limitation, a tax that has unfairly penalized seniors for more than 60 years, simply because they wanted to earn some extra income to supplement their monthly retirement checks. That measure is now law.

Last week, we voted to eliminate the death tax, which unfairly taxes people simply because they die. We voted to substitute a capital-gains tax so that inherited assets are taxed at the appropriate time—when they are sold, and when income is actually realized.

Hopefully, the marriage-penalty repeal bill, like the death-tax repeal, will pass with a strong, bipartisan majority, and President Clinton will rethink his opposition and sign it when it reaches his desk.

We can debate the merits of any number of changes in the tax code: whether a flat tax is preferable to a sales tax; whether tax rates should be reduced across the board; or whether we should make the tax code more conducive to savings and investment. There are legitimate points to be made on both sides.

But when it comes to fairness, we need to do what is right. The marriage penalty, like the earnings limit and the death tax, is wrong, it is unfair, and it is time to put it to rest. I urge support for the marriage-penalty repeal bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider legislation to address the anomaly in the tax code known as the marriage penalty. The Senate will consider this legislation in light of recent budget projections that show a windfall in federal budget surpluses over the next ten years, and under expedited rules that will almost guarantee passage of some form of marriage penalty relief.

First, I am, as are many other Senators, concerned about the so-called marriage penalty. I can think of no reason why a married couple should have a higher tax liability simply because they have chosen to make a lifelong commitment together through the sacred bond of marriage. I doubt that any Senator would refute the assertion that the promotion of marriage and family stability benefits the nation at large. Indeed, the marriage bond as recognized in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, as well as in the legal codes of the world's most advanced societies, is a cornerstone on which societies build their morals and values. The Bible tells us in 1 Corinthians 7 to ''. . . let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.'' The institution of marriage was prized in the Bible, and likewise, by the ancient world in Rome, and more particularly, in Greece. ''There is nothing nobler or more admirable than when two people who see

eye to eye keep house as man and wife, confounding their enemies and delighting their friends,'' wrote Homer in The Odyssey (9th Century BC).

Our federal government has no official policy on marriage with respect to taxing or subsidizing the institution. Still, what can only be referred to as a quirk in the tax code causes some married couples to pay higher taxes than they would if they were single. I have always believed that the federal income tax code should, at the very least, be marriage neutral. Unfortunately, marriage neutrality has proven to be an elusive goal. The reason is that marriage neutrality is incompatible with a progressive tax system that allows for joint tax returns. When two single taxpayers are married, their incomes increase and can, in some cases, push the couple into a higher tax bracket than when they filed as separate singles. The opposite can also happen, where married couples find themselves in a lower tax bracket than when they were single.

Both the Republican and Democratic proposals before the Senate today attempt to balance the competing interests of progressive taxation, joint tax returns, and marriage neutrality in the best way possible. The Republican proposal, for example, reduces the marginal tax rates for married couples so that recently married couples would not be bumped up into a higher tax bracket. This would effectively eliminate the marriage penalty relating to marginal tax rates. The trade-off is that marriage bonuses, which occur when a married couple pay less in taxes than they would if they filed as two single taxpayers, would be increased.

While some Senators would argue that the Republican proposal is a tax giveaway to households that already receive favorable tax treatment because of marriage, marriage bonuses provide increased assistance for families who make the difficult choice to forgo a second income or career and for one parent to stay at home with their children. Families in this situation ought to be extended tax incentives just the same as those families with a limited income and a child in the child care system. Raising children to be responsible, caring, law-abiding adults is one of the most important tasks that any of us will ever undertake. As we can see daily from the steady stream of frightening newspaper headlines on schoolyard shootings and gang activities, it is also one of the hardest. The fabric of our society, the warp of family closeness and the woof of community, is torn and frayed. If a family makes the increasingly difficult choice to allow one parent to stay at home and focus on child rearing, then, frankly, I think we ought to make it easier for them to do so. We certainly should not make it harder, or more financially punitive! It is too important for the continued strength of our society. I am pleased that this bill takes this important step of recognizing the role of the stay-at-home parent by providing these families with a small amount of relief to assist with the costs of raising a child.

The Democratic proposal also attempts to balance the goals of joint tax entities and progressive taxation with marriage neutrality. This proposal would allow married couples to calculate their income tax as either a married couple or as two singles, depending on which method would be less costly. The effect of this approach would be the elimination for eligible couples of all sixty-five marriage penalty provisions in the tax code, while maintaining the existing marriage bonuses.

Both proposals provide marriage penalty relief to families of all income levels. In the Republican proposal, lower-income families who receive the earned income tax credit would benefit from marriage penalty relief, while the elimination of the marriage penalty caused by the standard deduction would benefit middle-income households. The Democratic proposal, however, is more targeted to lower- and middle-income households because the marriage penalty relief is phased out for couples with an income above $150,000 per year.

But, make no mistake, both proposals, even in the glow of recent surplus projections, would be extremely expensive. The Republican proposal would cost $248 billion over ten years, and $39 billion per year thereafter. The Democratic proposal is slightly less expensive because of the income cap, but would still cost $54.2 billion over five years. My concern is not so much the cost of these proposals, because I think that the cost would be justified by the marriage incentives provided in each, but that marriage penalty relief could open the floodgates to other, more massive tax cuts. Most Senators are aware that the Office of Management and Budget announced during the week of June 26 that projected budget surpluses would exceed estimates made just four months ago by $1.3 trillion, and the Congressional Budget Office is close to releasing its projections that are likely to predict similar results. These new projections raise the estimate of surpluses that will be collected by the government over the next ten years (excluding Social Security) to $1.9 trillion, and, consequently, have fanned the furor for massive tax cuts.

These surplus projections can have an intoxicating effect, so much so that massive tax cuts seem suddenly affordable. What is forgotten is the fact that these surplus projections are highly volatile, and subject to dramatic change. Just since last year, these ten-year surplus projections have increased by almost $2 trillion. Some of that increase stemmed from an increase in tax revenues from the strong economy, but most resulted from simple changes in expectations about how well the economy would perform five and ten years out into the future. These expectations could easily change in the next few years so that, just as quickly as these surpluses appeared, they could disappear.

I think that it is unfortunate that higher-than-expected surpluses have paved the way for the enactment of massive tax cuts. The repeal of the estate tax, for example, which was recently passed by this body, if enacted into law, would cost $105 billion over ten years, and then $50 billion per year thereafter. No hearings were held on this proposal in the Senate. Little consideration was given to an alternative plan that would have been less costly and would have more expeditiously addressed the plight of farmers and small businesses by eliminating most from estate tax rolls. Little, if any, consideration was given to the negative effect that repealing the estate tax would have on charitable contributions, which are deductible from the gross value of an estate under current law. Yet, this body repealed the estate tax under the guise that it was necessary to protect small family farmers and businesses, when much less costly proposals might have done the job just as well.

Let us disabuse ourselves of the idea that all tax cuts are good policy because they are politically popular. They are not. It is easy to vote for tax cuts. It does not require courage. And, in the end, the American people will not thank us for acting in a fiscally irresponsible manner. As I have said on many occasions, while budget projections look rosy now, the future is fraught with peril as the baby-boomers exit the economy, and the Social Security and Medicare programs become unable, as presently structured, to pay full benefits to recipients. The Social Security and Medicare Board of Trustees projected last March that Social Security payroll taxes by themselves would not be enough to cover benefit payments by 2015, and that the Social Security trust fund would be insolvent by 2037. Likewise, the trustees projected that the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund would be insolvent by 2025.

While I support eliminating any marriage penalties that may exist in the tax code, my preference would be to delay enactment of these costly proposals until the long term solvency of Social Security and Medicare have been addressed. However, in order to meet the political deadline of the upcoming Party conventions, the Senate is acting on this legislation today, which is unfortunate.

I support marriage penalty relief, and I believe that both the Republican and Democratic proposals would provide substantial relief. However, I object to the fashion in which these proposals are being considered. As I said before, these proposals are extremely expensive. They should be debated in a way that would allow for many amendments and ample debate time. Unfortunately, they were brought up under

reconciliation protections to avoid such restrictions. While the intent of the legislation may be worthwhile, I object to legislation being pushed through in this manner. The fast-track reconciliation procedures that were enacted in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 were never intended to be used as a method to enact massive tax cuts that could not be passed without a thorough debate and amendment process. I know, because I helped to write the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and it was never my contemplation that the reconciliation process would be used in this way and for these purposes—never! I would not have supported it. I would have voted against it.

In fact, I would have left some loopholes in the process that would have saved us from this spectacle every year, where tax legislation with wide-ranging ramifications on domestic and defense spending priorities that should be debated at great length and amended many times is rushed through this Chamber in order to fulfill a political party's agenda. Reconciliation has become a bear trap that cuts off senators from debate and ensures that legislation will be voted upon regardless of whether there has been ample debate. Reconciliation typically allows for only twenty hours of debate, equally divided between the two leaders, which can be yielded back by the leaders under a nondebatable motion. This year, the reconciliation bill will be voted upon after only two hours and twenty-two minutes of debate. Less than two and one-half hours on a measure that would cost $248 billion over ten years. We owe the American people the assurance that their representatives are enacting legislation that will substantively address the marriage penalty problem in the most cost-efficient method possible.

I spoke in April on marriage penalty relief and the majority party's insistence on pushing this particular legislation through the Senate. While I supported marriage penalty relief then, I still opposed cloture to end debate on the underlying bill to allow senators to offer amendments, debate those amendments, and then vote on those amendments. Incidentally, this legislation was withdrawn from the floor after the minority party insisted on these rights, which is why this marriage penalty relief bill is now being considered in this fashion, under reconciliation protection. I made remarks in April on the marriage penalty relief bill, and made reference to James Madison's ideas on popular government, and the irony of how pushing through marriage penalty relief based on the notion that it is politically popular represented Madison's most profound worries about the character of republican politics. A fear of impulsive and dangerous influence that runaway public opinion could exert over legislation lay at the core of his thinking in 1787 and 1788. Indeed, Madison searched for the proper mechanics for the safe expression of public opinion to prevent popular majorities from pursuing their purposes through means that wore away the bonds that might otherwise restrain them. I think it is also fair to say that Madison would have opposed legislating in this fashion, and the enactment of tax legislation under reconciliation instructions because it removes the bonds that ordinarily would prevent the majority party from pushing through legislation which happens to be the hot political issue of the moment. The Senate will learn one day the detrimental cost of legislating in this fashion.

Nonetheless, as I have said before, I will support both marriage penalty relief proposals in order to eliminate what can only be described as an unintended and unfair consequence of the income tax code. However, I do so with a certain degree of reluctance out of concern that my support would, in any way, be considered an endorsement of this style of legislating or that it would indicate my willingness to forsake fiscal responsibility relating to Social Security and Medicare in order to finance massive tax cuts.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that votes occur in relation to the following amendments in the following sequence, beginning immediately after the adoption of the Interior appropriations bill, with 2 minutes prior to each vote for explanation: Burns No. 3872, Hollings No. 3875, Lott No. 3881, final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that following passage, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with those conferees being ROTH, LOTT, and MOYNIHAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Therefore, there will be no further votes, as already has been announced, this evening. Up to 11 votes will occur in a stacked sequence beginning at 9:45 a.m. on Tuesday.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the Interior appropriations bill and I be recognized to call up the managers' package of amendments which is at the desk, the amendments be reported and agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the Senate then turn to H.R. 4516, the legislative appropriations bill, for Senator BOXER to offer her amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—Continued

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3778; 3779, AS MODIFIED; 3784, AS MODIFIED; 3786, AS MODIFIED; 3787, AS MODIFIED; 3788; 3789; 3891; 3892; 3893; 3894; 3895; 3896; 3897; 3898; 3899; 3900; 3901; 3902; 3903; 3904; 3905; 3906; 3907; AND 3908

The amendments, en bloc, were agreed to as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3778

(Purpose: To designate funds for the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota Development Corporation for the purpose of employment assistance)

On page 138, line 1, insert ''; and of which not to exceed $108,000 shall be for payment to the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota Development Corporation for the purpose of providing employment assistance to Indian clients of the Corporation, including employment counseling, follow-up services, housing services, community services, day care services, and subsistence to help Indian clients become fully employed members of society'' before the colon.

AMENDMENT NO. 3779 AS MODIFIED

On page 168, line 13, insert the following before the colon: '', of which $1,000,000 shall be for the acquisition of lands on the Pisgah National Forest and not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be for Forest Holdings''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3784 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To provide for the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve)

On page 165, after line 18, add the following:

For an additional amount to cover necessary expenses for implementation of the Valles Caldera Preservation Act, $990,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available to the Secretary for the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve: *Provided*, That any remaining balances be provided to the Valles Caldera Trust upon its assumption of the management of the Preserve: *Provided further*, That the amount available in this bill to the Office of the Solicitor within the Department of the Interior shall not exceed $39,206,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3786 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To direct monies from the federal subsistence account to the State of Alaska to provide effective dual management under the federal subsistence fisheries program)

On page 170, line 3 insert before the period the following: '', *Provided*, That $750,000 shall be transferred to the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game as a direct payment for administrative and policy coordination and an additional $250,000 shall be transferred to United Fishermen of Alaska as a direct payment''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3787 AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To authorize the accrual of interest on escrow accounts established under section 1411 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and relating to re-withdrawn lands)

At the end of Title I, insert the following new section:

SEC. (a) All proceeds of Oil and Gas Lease sale 991, held by the Bureau of Land Management on May 5, 1999, or subsequent lease sales in the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska within the area subject to withdrawal for Kuukpik Corporation's selection under section 22(j)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, Public Law

92–203 (85 Stat. 688), shall be held in an escrow account administered under the terms of section 1411 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Public Law 96–487 (94 Stat. 2371), without regard to whether a withdrawal for selection has been made, and paid to Arctic Slope Regional Corporation and the State of Alaska in the amount of their entitlement under law when determined, together with interest at the rate provided in the aforementioned section 1411, from the date of receipt of the proceeds by the United States to the date of payment. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) This section shall be effective as of May 5, 1999.

AMENDMENT NO. 3788

(Purpose: To provide a monies to the City of Craig, Alaska in lieu of municipal land entitlements authorized under the Alaska Statehood Act)

On page 168, line 18 insert before the period the following: ''; *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated and available, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer as a direct payment to the City of Craig at least $5,000,000 but not to exceed $10,000,000 in lieu of any claims or municipal entitlement to land within the outside boundaries of the Tongass National Forest pursuant to section 6(a) of Public Law 85-508, the Alaska Statehood Act, as amended; Provided further, That should the directive in the preceding proviso conflict with any provision of existing law the preceding proviso shall prevail and take precedence''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3789

(Purpose: To provide for the relief of Harvey R. Redmond)

At the end of Title I insert the following new section:

''SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior shall covey to Harvey R. Redmond of Girdwood, Alaska, at no cost, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to United States Survey No. 12192, Alaska, consisting of 49.96 acres located in the vicinity of T. 9N., R., 3E., Seward Meridian, Alaska.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3891

On page 125, line 25, strike ''58,209,000,'' and insert the following: ''63,249,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be for the Lewes Maritime Historic Park''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3892

(Purpose: To provide funding to carry out exhibitions at and acquire interior furnishings for the Rosa Parks Library and Museum, Alabama, with an offset)

On page 125, line 25, before ''of which'' insert the following: ''of which $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out exhibitions at and acquire interior furnishings for the Rosa Parks Library and Museum, Alabama, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3893

(Purpose: To provide funding for acquisition of land around the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, Alabama, with an offset)

On page 122, line 9, before the period, insert the following: '', of which $1,000,000 shall be used for acquisition of land around the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, Alabama, and of which not more than $6,500,000 shall be used for acquisition management''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3894

(Purpose: To set aside funding for the development of a preservation plan for Cane River National Heritage Area, Louisiana)

On page 125, line 25, after ''$58,209,000,'' insert ''of which not less than $500,000 shall be used to develop a preservation plan for the Cane River National Heritage Area, Louisiana, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3895

(Purpose: To set aside funding for the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training for the development of a model for heritage education through distance learning)

On page 126, line 2, before the period at the end, insert '', and of which $250,000 shall be available to the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training for the development of a model for heritage education through distance learning''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3896

On page 165, at the end of line 25 before the colon: ''of which not less than $2,4000,000 shall be made available for fuels reduction activities at Sequoia National Monument''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3897

On page 215, line 24, strike ''or'' and insert ''and'', and on page 216, line 1, strike ''at'' and insert ''of''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3898

(Purpose: To create a curriculum for the instruction of Federal Land Managers in Alaska on the contents and legislative history of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act)

At the end of Title III, add the following:

''SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title I of this Act, the Secretary shall provide $300,000 in the form of a grant to the Alaska Pacific University's Institute of the North for the development of a curriculum on the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). At a minimum this ANILCA curriculum should contain components which explain the law, its legislative history, the subsequent amendments, and the principal case studies on issues that have risen during 20 years of implementation of the Act; examine challenges faced by conservation system managers in implementing the Act; and link ANILCA to other significant land and resource laws governing Alaska's lands and resources. In addition, within the funds provided, Alaska Pacific University's Institute of the North shall gather the oral histories of key Members of Congress in 1980 and before to demonstrate the intent of Congress in fashioning ANILCA, as well as members of President Carter's and Alaska Governor Hammond's Administrations, Congressional staff and stakeholders who were involved in the creation of the Act.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3899

(Purpose: To set aside additional funding for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission)

On page 125, line 25, after ''$58,209,000'', insert '', of which not less than $730,000 shall be available for use by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3900

At the end of Title I, add the following:

''SEC. . CLARIFICATION OF TERMS OF CONVEYANCE TO NYE COUNTY, NEVADA.

Section 132 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (113 Stat. 1535, 1501A–165), is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the County, subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest in and to the parcels of public land described in paragraph (2).

''(B) PRICE.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be made at a price determined to be appropriate for the conveyance of land for educational facilities under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3901

On page 164, line 23 of the bill, immediately preceding the ':'' insert ''and of which not less than an additional $500,000 shall be available for law enforcement purposes on the Pisgah and Nantahala national forests.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3902

On page 130, add the following after line 24:

''For an additional amount for ''Surveys, Investigations, and Research'', $1,800,000, to remain available until expended, to repair or replace stream monitoring equipment and associated facilities damaged by natural disasters; *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3903

(Purpose: To provide that funding shall be available to complete an updated study of the New York-New Jersey highlands under this Forest Stewardship Act of 1990)

On page 164, line 14, before the period at the end insert '', of which not less than $750,000 shall be available to complete an updated study of the New York-New Jersey highlands under section 1244(b) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 3547)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3904

On page 125, line 11, strike ''$1,443,795,000,'' and insert the following: ''$1,443,995,000, of which $200,000 shall be available for the conduct of a wilderness suitability study at Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisconsin, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3905

(Purpose: To set aside funding for the design and consideration of educational and informational displays for the Missouri Recreation Rivers Research and Education Center, Nebraska)

On page 126, line 22, before the period at the end, insert '': *Provided further*, That not less than $2,350,000 shall be used for construction at Ponca State Park, Nebraska, including $1,500,000 to be used for the design and construction of educational and informational displays for the Missouri Recreation Rivers Research and Education Center, Nebraska''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3906

On page 159, strike lines 13 through 19 and insert the following:

''SEC. 119. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin unless a plan for such a refuge is consistent with a partnership agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps of Engineers entered into on April 16, 1999 and is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations thirty (30) days prior to the establishment of the refuge.''

AMENDMENT NO. 3907

(Purpose: To help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and the airspace over that land)

On page 225, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . BACKCOUNTRY LANDING STRIP ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to take any action to close permanently an aircraft landing strip described in subsection (b).

(b) AIRCRAFT LANDING STRIPS.—An aircraft landing strip referred to in subsection (a) is a landing strip on Federal land administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that is commonly known and has been or is consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities.

(c) PERMANENT CLOSURE.—For the purposes of subsection (a), an aircraft landing strip shall be considered to be closed permanently if the intended duration of the closure is more than 180 days in any calendar year.

AMENDMENT NO. 3908

On page 130, line 4, strike ''$847,596,000'' and insert ''$846,596,000'';

On page 165, line 25, strike ''$618,500,000'' and insert ''$613,500,000'';

On page 164, line 19, strike ''$1,233,824,000'' and insert ''$1,231,824,000''.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4516, an act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

The text of H.R. 4516 is amended with the text of S. 2603, as follows:

On page 2 after ''Title 1 Congressional Operations'' insert page 2, line 6 of S. 2603 through page 13, line 14

On page 8, line 8 of H.R. 4516, strike through line 12, page 23

Insert line 15, page 13 of S. 2603 through line 11, page 23

In H.R. 4516, strike line 17, page 23 through line 6, page 45

Insert line 12 page 23 of S. 2603 through line 17, page 76.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 3909

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I will take but 2 minutes of the Senate's time, given that it is so late this evening.

I thank the managers of the legislative appropriations bill for accepting this amendment. I think the Chair would be interested in it as well, given the fact that he is the chairman of the Environment Committee on which I proudly serve.

This amendment merely says that we would limit the use of dangerous pesticide spraying here at the Capitol and on the Capitol Grounds where we have so many children and so many families visiting us every year. My amendment prohibits the routine use of highly toxic pesticides. Those are the ones that contain known or probable carcinogens. They are acute nerve toxins and others that contain highly toxic chemicals.

We do permit the spraying of such highly toxic chemicals in the rare case of an emergency. If there were a sudden emergency, if there were an outbreak where we needed to go to those highly toxic pesticides, under my amendment we would be allowed to do that. But for routine spraying, we would go to the mildest forms of these pesticides, the ones which are classified by the EPA as having the greatest risk to public health.

I could cite studies that show how vulnerable children are to these various compounds. Children are not little adults. They are changing; their bodies are changing. They react very badly to these toxic chemicals.

Seven to ten million people visit the Capitol and surrounding buildings every year. A million take guided tours of our historic buildings. We don't know how many of those are children, but just by looking at the crowds, quite a number are. I know in my office alone—and I am sure the Chair has thousands of youngsters visiting in his office—we studied it, and we have visits by over 33,000 school-age children every year. I think by adopting this amendment, we are setting a valuable example here at the Capitol that I hope all the State capitols will follow. We will begin to see that we can in fact control these pests in a way that is much more friendly to our children.

In closing, there is a wonderful organization in California named after a beautiful little child who died of environmental causes several years ago. Her parents founded this organization. It is called CHEC, the Children's Health Environmental Coalition. They are the ones, years ago, who got me interested in this area. What we are trying to do on every bill that we can is to set this example and say we won't be using this highly toxic form of controlling pests. Tomorrow I will have a debate with one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I am trying to offer a similar amendment to the Interior bill, but we may get into a bit of a debate then.

Tonight is the night for me to say thank you to you, Mr. President, for your indulgence, and to the managers who are here late this evening handling this. I will yield back my time, and I expect we will have a voice vote and I would like to be present for that, if we could do that.

I yield back my time and ask that we have a voice vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3909) was agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3909

(Purpose: limit funds for pesticide use)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

''None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventative application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as determined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to U.S. Capitol buildings or grounds maintained or administered by the Architect of the U.S. Capitol.''

PESTICIDES AMENDMENT

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to thank the managers of the Legislative Branch Appropriations bill for agreeing to my amendment to limit the use of toxic pesticides on U.S. Capitol buildings and grounds. My amendment prohibits the preventive use of pesticides containing a known or probable carcinogen, a class I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate or organocholorine class as identified by the Environmental Protection Agency. Such pesticides could be used, however, in the case of an emergency.

Every year, approximately 7 to 10 million people visit the Capitol, many of them children. The National Academy of Sciences has found that children are particularly vulnerable to the harmful effects of toxic pesticides, that current Environmental Protection Agency pesticide standards are not protective of children and that up to 25% percent of childhood learning disabilities may be attributable to a combination of exposure to toxic chemicals like pesticides and genetic factors. My amendment will help protect young visitors to Washington from the harmful effects of toxic pesticides by limiting the use of such pesticides at the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. President, I thank the managers for their support and I hope that they will work to ensure that this amendment is preserved in conference. May I inquire of the distinguished Ranking Member of the Subcommittee if she will support the amendment in conference with the House?

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank my colleague from California for her question. I assure her that I will work in conference to retain the Senator's amendment on pesticide use at the U.S. Capitol.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. ROTH. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The provisions of the unanimous consent agreement are executed.

The bill (H.R. 4516), as amended, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 4516) entitled ''An Act making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.'', do pass with the following amendments:

(1) Page 2, after line 5, insert:

SENATE

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES

For expense allowances of the Vice President, $10,000; the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, $10,000; Majority Leader of the Senate,

$10,000; Minority Leader of the Senate, $10,000; Majority Whip of the Senate, $5,000; Minority Whip of the Senate, $5,000; and Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Conference Committees, $3,000 for each Chairman; and Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Policy Committees, $3,000 for each Chairman; in all, $62,000.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For representation allowances of the Majority and Minority Leaders of the Senate, $15,000 for each such Leader; in all, $30,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

For compensation of officers, employees, and others as authorized by law, including agency contributions, $92,321,000, which shall be paid from this appropriation without regard to the below limitations, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

For the Office of the Vice President, $1,785,000.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

For the Office of the President Pro Tempore, $453,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders, $2,742,000.

OFFICES OF THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY WHIPS

For Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips, $1,722,000.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For salaries of the Committee on Appropriations, $6,917,000.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

For the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the Chairman of each such committee, $1,152,000 for each such committee; in all, $2,304,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE MAJORITY AND THE CONFERENCE OF THE MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority, $590,000.

POLICY COMMITTEES

For salaries of the Majority Policy Committee and the Minority Policy Committee, $1,171,000 for each such committee; in all, $2,342,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHAPLAIN

For Office of the Chaplain, $288,000.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For Office of the Secretary, $14,738,000.

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

For Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $34,811,000.

OFFICES OF THE SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY

For Offices of the Secretary for the Majority and the Secretary for the Minority, $1,292,000.

AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS AND RELATED EXPENSES

For agency contributions for employee benefits, as authorized by law, and related expenses, $22,337,000.

OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

For salaries and expenses of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, $4,046,000.

OFFICE OF SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Senate Legal Counsel, $1,069,000.

EXPENSE ALLOWANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE, SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE, AND SECRETARIES FOR THE MAJORITY AND MINORITY OF THE SENATE

For expense allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, $3,000; Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, $3,000; Secretary for the Majority of the Senate, $3,000; Secretary for the Minority of the Senate, $3,000; in all, $12,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate, or conducted pursuant to section 134(a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, section 112 of Public Law 96–304 and Senate Resolution 281, agreed to March 11, 1980, $73,000,000.

EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE CAUCUS ON INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL

For expenses of the United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, $370,000.

SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate, $2,077,000.

SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE

For expenses of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, $71,261,000, of which $2,500,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2003.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For miscellaneous items, $8,655,000.

SENATORS' OFFICIAL PERSONNEL AND OFFICE EXPENSE ACCOUNT

For Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account, $253,203,000.

OFFICIAL MAIL COSTS

For expenses necessary for official mail costs of the Senate, $300,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SECTION 1. SEMIANNUAL REPORT. (a) IN GENERAL.—Section 105(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1965 (2 U.S.C. 104a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) Notwithstanding the requirements of paragraph (1) relating to the level of detail of statement and itemization, each report by the Secretary of the Senate required under such paragraph shall be compiled at a summary level for each office of the Senate authorized to obligate appropriated funds.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to the reporting of expenditures relating to personnel compensation, travel and transportation of persons, other contractual services, and acquisition of assets.

''(C) In carrying out this paragraph the Secretary of the Senate shall apply the Standard Federal Object Classification of Expenses as the Secretary determines appropriate.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) FIRST REPORT AFTER ENACTMENT.—The Secretary of the Senate may elect to compile and submit the report for the semiannual period during which the date of enactment of this section occurs, as if the amendment made by this section had not been enacted.

SEC. 2. SENATE EMPLOYEE PAY ADJUSTMENTS. Section 4 of the Federal Pay Comparability Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 60a–1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''(or section 5304 or 5304a of such title, as applied to employees employed in the pay locality of the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore, Maryland consolidated metropolitan statistical area)'' after ''employees under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code,''; and

(B) by inserting ''(and, as the case may be, section 5304 or 5304a of such title, as applied to employees employed in the pay locality of the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore, Maryland consolidated metropolitan statistical area)'' after ''the President under such section 5303'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) Any percentage used in any statute specifically providing for an adjustment in rates of pay in lieu of an adjustment made under section 5303 of title 5, United States Code, and, as the case may be, section 5304 or 5304a of such title for any calendar year shall be treated as the percentage used in an adjustment made under such section 5303, 5304, or 5304a, as applicable, for purposes of subsection (a).''.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 6(c) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999 (2 U.S.C. 121b–1(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and agency contributions'' in paragraph (2)(A), and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Agency contributions for employees of Senate Hair Care Services shall be paid from the appropriations account for 'SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES'.''

(b) This section shall apply to pay periods beginning on or after October 1, 2000.

SEC. 4. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the Senate Health and Fitness Facility Revolving Fund (''the revolving fund'').

(b) The Architect of the Capitol shall deposit in the revolving fund—

(1) any amounts received as dues or other assessments for use of the Senate Health and Fitness Facility, and

(2) any amounts received from the operation of the Senate waste recycling program.

(c) Subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, amounts in the revolving fund shall be available to the Architect of the Capitol, without fiscal year limitation, for payment of costs of the Senate Health and Fitness Facility.

(d) The Architect of the Capitol shall withdraw from the revolving fund and deposit in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts all moneys in the revolving fund that the Architect determines are in excess of the current and reasonably foreseeable needs of the Senate Health and Fitness Facility.

(e) Subject to the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Architect of the Capitol may issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 5. For each fiscal year (commencing with the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001), there is authorized an expense allowance for the Chairmen of the Majority and Minority Policy Committees which shall not exceed $3,000 each fiscal year for each such Chairman; and amounts from such allowance shall be paid to either of such Chairmen only as reimbursement for actual expenses incurred by him and upon certification and documentation of such expenses, and amounts so paid shall not be reported as income and shall not be allowed as a deduction under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 6. (a) The head of the employing office of an employee of the Senate may, upon termination of employment of the employee, authorize payment of a lump sum for the accrued annual leave of that employee if—

(1) the head of the employing office—

(A) has approved a written leave policy authorizing employees to accrue leave and establishing the conditions upon which accrued leave may be paid; and

(B) submits written certification to the Financial Clerk of the Senate of the number of days of annual leave accrued by the employee for which payment is to be made under the written leave policy of the employing office; and

(2) there are sufficient funds to cover the lump sum payment.

(b)(1) A lump sum payment under this section shall not exceed the lesser of—

(A) twice the monthly rate of pay of the employee; or

(B) the product of the daily rate of pay of the employee and the number of days of accrued annual leave of the employee.

(2) The Secretary of the Senate shall determine the rates of pay of an employee under paragraph (1) (A) and (B) on the basis of the annual rate of pay of the employee in effect on the date of termination of employment.

(c) Any payment under this section shall be paid from the appropriation account or fund used to pay the employee.

(d) If an individual who received a lump sum payment under this section is reemployed as an employee of the Senate before the end of the period covered by the lump sum payment, the individual shall refund an amount equal to the applicable pay covering the period between the date of reemployment and the expiration of the lump sum period. Such amount shall be deposited to the appropriation account or fund used to pay the lump sum payment.

(e) The Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

(f) In this section, the term—

(1) ''employee of the Senate'' means any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, except that the term does not include a member of the Capitol Police or a civilian employee of the Capitol Police; and

(2) ''head of the employing office'' means any person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an individual whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

SEC. 7. (a) Agency contributions for employees whose salaries are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate from the appropriations account ''JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE'' under the heading ''JOINT ITEMS'' shall be paid from the Senate appropriations account for ''SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES''.

(b) This section shall apply to pay periods beginning on or after October 1, 2000.

SEC. 8. Section 316(b) of Public Law 101–302 (40 U.S.C. 188b–6(b)) is amended by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''may''.

(2) Page 8, strike out all after line 7, over to and including line 12 on page 23, and insert:

JOINT ITEMS

For Joint Committees, as follows:

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 2001

For all construction expenses, salaries, and other expenses associated with conducting the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States, January 20, 2001, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee authorized by Senate Concurrent Resolution 89, agreed to March 2, 2000 (One Hundred Sixth Congress), and Senate Concurrent Resolution 90, agreed to March 2, 2000 (One Hundred Sixth Congress), $1,000,000 to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and to remain available until September 30, 2001. Funds made available under this heading shall be available for payment, on a direct or reimbursable basis, whether incurred on, before, or after, October 1, 2000: Provided, That the compensation of any employee of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate who has been designated to perform service for the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies shall continue to be paid by the Committee on Rules and Administration, but the account from which such staff member is paid may be reimbursed for the services of the staff member (including agency contributions when appropriate) out of funds made available under this heading.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Economic Committee, $3,315,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Taxation, $6,686,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

For other joint items, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

For medical supplies, equipment, and contingent expenses of the emergency rooms, and for the Attending Physician and his assistants, including: (1) an allowance of $1,500 per month to the Attending Physician; (2) an allowance of $500 per month each to three medical officers while on duty in the Office of the Attending Physician; (3) an allowance of $500 per month to one assistant and $400 per month each not to exceed 11 assistants on the basis heretofore provided for such assistants; and (4) $1,159,904 for reimbursement to the Department of the Navy for expenses incurred for staff and equipment assigned to the Office of the Attending Physician, which shall be advanced and credited to the applicable appropriation or appropriations from which such salaries, allowances, and other expenses are payable and shall be available for all the purposes thereof, $1,835,000, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

CAPITOL POLICE

SALARIES

For the Capitol Police Board for salaries of officers, members, and employees of the Capitol Police, including overtime, hazardous duty pay differential, clothing allowance of not more than $600 each for members required to wear civilian attire, and Government contributions for health, retirement, Social Security, and other applicable employee benefits, $102,700,000, of which $51,350,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House, and $51,350,000 is provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: Provided, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, upon approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For the Capitol Police Board for necessary expenses of the Capitol Police, including motor vehicles, communications and other equipment, security equipment and installation, uniforms, weapons, supplies, materials, training, medical services, forensic services, stenographic services, personal and professional services, the employee assistance program, not more than $2,000 for the awards program, postage, telephone service, travel advances, relocation of instructor and liaison personnel for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, and $85 per month for extra services performed for the Capitol Police Board by an employee of the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate or the House of Representatives designated by the Chairman of the Board, $6,884,000, to be disbursed by the Capitol Police Board or their delegee: Provided, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the cost of basic training for the Capitol Police at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center for fiscal year 2001 shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury from funds available to the Department of the Treasury.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2001 for the Capitol Police Board for the Capitol Police may be transferred between the headings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' upon the approval of—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives under the heading ''SALARIES'';

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, in the case of amounts transferred from the appropriation provided to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate under the heading ''SALARIES''; and

(3) the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, in the case of other transfers.

SEC. 102. APPOINTMENT OF CERTIFYING OFFICERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE. The Capitol Police Board shall appoint certifying officers to certify all vouchers for payment from Capitol Police appropriations and funds.

SEC. 103. CERTIFYING OFFICERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE; ACCOUNTABILITY; RELIEF BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL. Each officer or employee of the Capitol Police, who has been duly authorized in writing by the Capitol Police Board to certify vouchers for payment from appropriations and funds, shall (1) be held responsible for the existence and correctness of the facts recited in the certificate or otherwise stated on the voucher or its supporting papers and for the legality of the proposed payment under the appropriation or fund involved; (2) be held responsible and accountable for the correctness of the computations of certified vouchers; and (3) be held accountable for and required to make good to the United States the amount of any illegal, improper, or incorrect payment resulting from any false, inaccurate, or misleading certificate made by him, as well as for any payment prohibited by law or which did not represent a legal obligation under the appropriation or fund involved: Provided, That the Comptroller General of the United States may, at his discretion, relieve such certifying officer or employee of liability for any payment otherwise proper whenever he finds (1) that the certification was based on official records and that such certifying officer or employee did not know, and by reasonable diligence and inquiry could not have ascertained, the actual facts, or (2) that the obligation was incurred in good faith, that the payment was not contrary to any statutory provision specifically prohibiting payments of the character involved, and the United States has received value for such payment.

SEC. 104. ENFORCEMENT OF LIABILITY OF CERTIFYING OFFICERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE. The liability of these certifying officers or employees shall be enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as now provided by law with respect to enforcement of the liability of disbursing and other accountable officers; and they shall have the right to apply for and obtain a decision by the Comptroller General on any question of law involved in a payment on any vouchers presented to them for certification.

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE AND SPECIAL SERVICES OFFICE

For salaries and expenses of the Capitol Guide Service and Special Services Office, $2,371,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate: Provided, That no part of such amount may be used to employ more than 43 individuals: Provided further, That the Capitol Guide Board is authorized, during emergencies, to employ not more than two additional individuals for not more than 120 days each, and not more than 10 additional individuals for not more than 6 months each, for the Capitol Guide Service.

STATEMENTS OF APPROPRIATIONS

For the preparation, under the direction of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, of the statements for the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, showing appropriations made, indefinite appropriations, and contracts authorized, together with a chronological history of the regular appropriations bills as required by law, $30,000, to be paid to the persons designated by the chairmen of such committees to supervise the work.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Compliance, as authorized by section 305 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1385), $2,066,000.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344), including not more than $2,500 to be expended on the certification of the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with official representation and reception expenses, $27,113,000: Provided, That no part of such amount may be used for the purchase or hire of a passenger motor vehicle.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 105. Beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and hereafter, the Congressional Budget Office may use available funds to enter into contracts for the procurement of severable services for a period that begins in one fiscal year and ends in the next fiscal year and may enter into multi-year contracts for the acquisition of property and services, to the same extent as executive agencies under the authority of section 303L and 304B, respectively, of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act (41 U.S.C. 253l and 254c).

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

CAPITOL BUILDINGS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries for the Architect of the Capitol, the Assistant Architect of the Capitol, and other personal services, at rates of pay provided by law; for surveys and studies in connection with activities under the care of the Architect of the Capitol; for all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol and electrical substations of the Senate and House office buildings under the jurisdiction of the Architect of the Capitol, including furnishings and office equipment, including not more than $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses, to be expended as the Architect of the Capitol may approve; for purchase or exchange, maintenance and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; and not to exceed $20,000 for attendance, when specifically authorized by the Architect of the Capitol, at meetings or conventions in connection with subjects related to work under the Architect of the Capitol, $44,191,000, of which $4,255,000 shall remain available until expended.

CAPITOL GROUNDS

For all necessary expenses for care and improvement of grounds surrounding the Capitol, the Senate and House office buildings, and the Capitol Power Plant, $5,512,000, of which $225,000 shall remain available until expended.

SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of Senate office buildings; and furniture and furnishings to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, $63,974,000, of which $21,669,000 shall remain available until expended.

(3) Page 23, strike out all after line 16, over to and including line 6 on page 45, and insert:

CAPITOL POWER PLANT

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Capitol Power Plant; lighting, heating, power (including the purchase of electrical energy) and water and sewer services for the Capitol, Senate and House office buildings, Library of Congress buildings, and the grounds about the same, Botanic Garden, Senate garage, and air conditioning refrigeration not supplied from plants in any of such buildings; heating the Government Printing Office and Washington City Post Office, and heating and chilled water for air conditioning for the Supreme Court Building, the Union Station complex, the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building and the Folger Shakespeare Library, expenses for which shall be advanced or reimbursed upon request of the Architect of the Capitol and amounts so received shall be deposited into the Treasury to the credit of this appropriation, $39,569,000, of which $523,000 shall remain available until expended: Provided, That not more than $4,400,000 of the funds credited or to be reimbursed to this appropriation as herein provided shall be available for obligation during fiscal year 2001.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 166) and to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, $73,374,000: Provided, That no part of such amount may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor (except the Digest of Public General Bills), to be issued by the Library of Congress unless such publication has obtained prior approval of either the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

For authorized printing and binding for the Congress and the distribution of Congressional information in any format; printing and binding for the Architect of the Capitol; expenses necessary for preparing the semimonthly and session index to the Congressional Record, as authorized by law (44 U.S.C. 902); printing and binding of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed to Members of Congress; and printing, binding, and distribution of Government publications authorized by law to be distributed without charge to the recipient, $73,297,000: Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for paper copies of the permanent edition of the Congressional Record for individual Representatives, Resident Commissioners or Delegates authorized under 44 U.S.C. 906: Provided further, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the appropriations for similar purposes for preceding fiscal years: Provided further, That notwithstanding the 2-year limitation under section 718 of title 44, United States Code, none of the funds appropriated or made available under this Act or any other Act for printing and binding and related services provided to Congress under chapter 7 of title 44, United States Code, may be expended to print a document, report, or publication after the 27-month period beginning on the date that such document, report, or publication is authorized by Congress to be printed, unless Congress reauthorizes such printing in accordance with section 718 of title 44, United States Code.

This title may be cited as the ''Congressional Operations Appropriations Act, 2001''.

TITLE II—OTHER AGENCIES

BOTANIC GARDEN

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the maintenance, care and operation of the Botanic Garden and the nurseries, buildings, grounds, and collections; and purchase and exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of a passenger motor vehicle; all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library, $3,653,000, of which $150,000 shall remain available until expended.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Library of Congress not otherwise provided for, including development and maintenance of the Union Catalogs; custody and custodial care of the Library buildings; special clothing; cleaning, laundering and repair of uniforms; preservation of motion pictures in the custody of the Library; operation and maintenance of the American Folklife Center in the Library; preparation and distribution of catalog records and other publications of the Library; hire or purchase of one passenger motor vehicle; and expenses of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board not properly chargeable to the income of any trust fund held by the Board, $267,330,000, of which not more than $6,500,000 shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2001, and shall remain available until expended, under the Act of June 28, 1902 (chapter 1301; 32 Stat. 480; 2 U.S.C. 150) and not more than $350,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2001 and shall remain available until expended for the development and maintenance of an international legal information database and activities related thereto: Provided, That the Library of Congress may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under the Act of June 28, 1902, in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: Provided further, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than the $6,850,000: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, $10,398,600 is to remain available until expended for acquisition of books, periodicals, newspapers, and all other materials including subscriptions for bibliographic services for the Library, including $40,000 to be available solely for the purchase, when specifically approved by the Librarian, of special and unique materials for additions to the collections: Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, $2,506,000 is to remain available until expended for the acquisition and partial support for implementation of an Integrated Library System (ILS): Provided further, That of the total amount appropriated, $10,000,000 is to remain available until expended for salaries and expenses to carry out the Russian Leadership Program enacted on May 21, 1999 (113 STAT. 93 et seq.).

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Copyright Office, $38,332,000, of which not more than $21,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be derived from collections credited to this appropriation during fiscal year 2001 under 17 U.S.C. 708(d): Provided, That the Copyright Office may not obligate or expend any funds derived from collections under 17 U.S.C. 708(d), in excess of the amount authorized for obligation or expenditure in appropriations Acts: Provided further, That not more than $5,783,000 shall be derived from collections during fiscal year 2001 under 17 U.S.C. 111(d)(2), 119(b)(2), 802(h), and 1005: Provided further, That the total amount available for obligation shall be reduced by the amount by which collections are less than $26,783,000: Provided further, That not more than $100,000 of the amount appropriated is available for the maintenance of an ''International Copyright Institute'' in the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress for the purpose of training nationals of developing countries in intellectual property laws and policies: Provided further, That not more than $4,250 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for activities of the International Copyright Institute and for copyright delegations, visitors, and seminars.

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses to carry out the Act of March 3, 1931 (chapter 400; 46 Stat. 1487; 2 U.S.C. 135a), $48,711,000, of which $14,154,000 shall remain available until expended.

FURNITURE AND FURNISHINGS

For necessary expenses for the purchase, installation, maintenance, and repair of furniture, furnishings, office and library equipment, $4,892,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this Act available to the Library of Congress shall be available, in an amount of not more than $202,300, of which $60,500 is for the Congressional Research Service, when specifically authorized by the Librarian of Congress, for attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation is made.

SEC. 202. Appropriated funds received by the Library of Congress from other Federal agencies to cover general and administrative overhead costs generated by performing reimbursable work for other agencies under the authority of sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, United States Code, shall not be used to employ more than 65 employees and may be expended or obligated—

(1) in the case of a reimbursement, only to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts; or

(2) in the case of an advance payment, only—

(A) to pay for such general or administrative overhead costs as are attributable to the work performed for such agency; or

(B) to such extent or in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, with respect to any purpose not allowable under subparagraph (A).

SEC. 203. Of the amounts appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $5,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the incentive awards program.

SEC. 204. Of the amount appropriated to the Library of Congress in this Act, not more than $12,000 may be expended, on the certification of the Librarian of Congress, in connection with official representation and reception expenses for the Overseas Field Offices.

SEC. 205. (a) For fiscal year 2001, the obligational authority of the Library of Congress for the activities described in subsection (b) may not exceed $92,845,000.

(b) The activities referred to in subsection (a) are reimbursable and revolving fund activities that are funded from sources other than appropriations to the Library in appropriations Acts for the legislative branch.

SEC. 206. Section 1 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize acquisition of certain real property for the Library of Congress, and for other purposes'', approved December 15, 1997 (2 U.S.C. 141 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) TRANSFER PAYMENT BY ARCHITECT.—Notwithstanding the limitation on reimbursement or transfer of funds under subsection (a) of this section, the Architect of the Capitol may, not later than 90 days after acquisition of the property under this section, transfer funds to the entity from which the property was acquired by the Architect of the Capitol. Such transfers may not exceed a total of $16,500,000.''.

SEC. 207. The Librarian of Congress may convert to permanent positions 84 indefinite, time-limited positions in the National Digital Library Program authorized in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996 for the Library of Congress under the heading, ''Salaries and Expenses'' (Public Law 104–53). Notwithstanding any other provision of law regarding qualifications and methods of appointment of employees of the Library of Congress, the Librarian may fill these permanent positions through the non-competitive conversion of the incumbents in the ''indefinite-not-to-exceed'' positions to ''permanent'' positions.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

STRUCTURAL AND MECHANICAL CARE

For all necessary expenses for the mechanical and structural maintenance, care and operation of the Library buildings and grounds, $16,347,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until expended.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Office of Superintendent of Documents necessary to provide for the cataloging and indexing of Government publications and their distribution to the public, Members of Congress, other Government agencies, and designated depository and international exchange libraries as authorized by law, $30,255,000: Provided, That travel expenses, including travel expenses of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, shall not exceed $175,000: Provided further, That amounts of not more than $2,000,000 from current year appropriations are authorized for producing and disseminating Congressional serial sets and other related publications for 1999 and 2000 to depository and other designated libraries.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE REVOLVING FUND

The Government Printing Office is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds 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 programs and purposes set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for the Government Printing Office revolving fund: Provided, That not more than $2,500 may be expended on the certification of the Public Printer in connection with official representation and reception expenses: Provided further, That the revolving fund shall be available for the hire or purchase of not more than 12 passenger motor vehicles: Provided further, That expenditures in connection with travel expenses of the advisory councils to the Public Printer shall be deemed necessary to carry out the provisions of title 44, United States Code: Provided further, That the revolving fund shall be available for temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title: Provided further, That the revolving fund and the funds provided under the headings ''OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS'' and ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' together may not be available for the full-time equivalent employment of more than 3,285 workyears (or such other number of workyears as the Public Printer may request, subject to the approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives): Provided further, That activities financed through the revolving fund may provide information in any format: Provided further, That the revolving fund shall not be used to administer any flexible or compressed work schedule which applies to any manager or supervisor in a position the grade or level of which is equal to or higher than GS–15: Provided further, That expenses for attendance at meetings shall not exceed $75,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 208. (a) Section 1708 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1708. Prices for sales copies of Government information products; resale by dealers; sales agents

''(a) Sales prices for Government information products will be established by the Public Printer to cover the costs of production, dissemination, and other appropriate costs associated with this service, including the offering of sales discounts and any other costs associated with the Sales Program.

''(b) The Superintendent of Documents may prescribe terms and conditions under which he authorizes the resale of Government information products by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government information products under regulations agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government.''.

(b) The table of sections for chapter 17, of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1708 and inserting the following:

''1718. Prices for sales copies of Government information products; resale by dealers; sales agents.''.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including not more than $7,000 to be expended on the certification of the Comptroller General of the United States in connection with official representation and reception expenses; temporary or intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates for individuals not more than the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; hire of one passenger motor vehicle; advance payments in foreign countries in accordance with section 3324 of title 31, United States Code; benefits comparable to those payable under sections 901(5), 901(6), and 901(8) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4081(5), 4081(6), and 4081(8)); and under regulations prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States, rental of living quarters in foreign countries, $384,867,000: Provided, That not more than $1,900,000 of reimbursements received incident to the operation of the General Accounting Office building shall be available for use in fiscal year 2001: Provided further, That notwithstanding section 9105 of title 31, United States Code, hereafter amounts reimbursed to the Comptroller General pursuant to that section shall be deposited to the appropriation of the General Accounting Office then available and remain available until expended, and not more than $1,100,000 of such funds shall be available for use in fiscal year 2001: Provided further, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the National Intergovernmental Audit Forum or a Regional Intergovernmental Audit Forum shall be available to finance an appropriate share of either Forum's costs as determined by the respective Forum, including necessary travel expenses of non-Federal participants. Payments hereunder to the Forum may be credited as reimbursements to any appropriation from which costs involved are initially financed: Provided further, That this appropriation and appropriations for administrative expenses of any other department or agency which is a member of the American Consortium on International Public Administration (ACIPA) shall be available to finance an appropriate share of ACIPA costs as determined by the ACIPA, including any expenses attributable to membership of ACIPA in the International Institute of Administrative Sciences.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 209. SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS. (a) Subchapter III of chapter 7 of subtitle I of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 732 the following:

"§ 732a. Critical positions

''The Comptroller General may establish senior-level positions to meet critical scientific, technical or professional needs of the Office from the positions authorized under sections 731(d), (e)(1), (e)(2), and 732(c)(4) of this title. An individual serving in such a position shall—

''(1) be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service established under section 733 of this title, with respect to rates of basic pay, performance awards, ranks, carry over of annual leave, benefits, performance appraisals, removal or suspension, and reduction in force;

''(2) have the same rights of appeal to the General Accounting Office Personnel Appeals Board that are provided to the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service;

''(3) be exempt from the same provisions of law made inapplicable to the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service under section 733(d) of this title, except for section 732(e) of this title;

''(4) be entitled to receive a discontinued service retirement under chapter 83 or 84 of title 5 as if a member of the General Accounting Office Senior Executive Service; and

''(5) be subject to reassignment by the Comptroller General to any Senior Executive Service position created under section 733 of this title as the Comptroller General determines necessary and appropriate.''.

(b) The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 732 the following:

''732a. Critical positions.''.

SEC. 210. REASSIGNMENT TO SENIOR LEVEL POSITIONS. Section 733(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (6);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) the Comptroller General may reassign a member of the Senior Executive Service to any senior-level position created under section 732a of this title as the Comptroller determines necessary and appropriate; and''.

SEC. 211. EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS. Section 731(e) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''not more than 3 years'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''3-year renewable terms''; and

(2) by striking ''level V'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''level IV''.

SEC. 212. VOLUNTARY EARLY RETIREMENT AUTHORITY. Section 732 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i)(1) An officer or employee of the General Accounting Office who is separated from the service under conditions described in paragraph (2) of this subsection after completing 25 years of service or after becoming 50 years of age and completing 20 years of service is entitled to an annuity in accordance with the provisions of chapter 83 or 84 of title 5, as applicable.

''(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection applies to an officer or employee who—

''(A) has been employed continuously by the General Accounting Office for more than 30 days before the date on which the Comptroller General makes the determination required under subparagraph (D);

''(B) is serving under an appointment that is not limited by time;

''(C) has not received a decision notice of involuntary separation for misconduct or unacceptable performance that is pending decision; and

''(D) is separated from the service voluntarily during a period in which the Comptroller General offers the officer or employee an early retirement for the purpose of realigning the agency workforce in order to meet mission needs, correcting skill imbalances, or reducing high-grade, managerial, or supervisory positions.

''(3) For purposes of chapters 83 and 84 of title 5 (including for purposes of computation of an annuity under such chapters), an officer or employee entitled to an annuity under this subsection shall be treated as an employee entitled to an annuity under section 8336(d) or 8414(b) of such title, as applicable.

''(4) The Comptroller General shall promulgate regulations to implement paragraph (1) that provide for offers of early retirement to any individual employee or groups of employees based on skills, knowledge, performance, or other similar factors or combination of such factors determined by the Comptroller General.

''(5) As used in this subsection, the terms 'employee' and 'annuity' shall have the same meaning as defined in chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, as applicable. The term 'officer' shall have the same meaning as 'employee.'

''(6) The Comptroller General may not utilize the authority granted under this subsection to grant voluntary early retirements to more than 10 percent of the workforce of the General Accounting Office in any fiscal year.''.

SEC. 213. SEPARATION PAY. Section 732 of title 31, United States Code, as amended by section 212 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) The Comptroller General may offer separation pay to an officer or employee under this subsection subject to such limitations or conditions as the Comptroller General may require for purposes of realigning the workforce in order to meet mission needs, correcting skill imbalances, or reducing high-grade, managerial, or supervisory positions. Such separation pay—

''(1) shall be paid, at the option of the officer or employee, in a lump sum or equal installment payments;

''(2) shall be equal to the lesser of—

''(A) an amount equal to the amount the officer or employee would be entitled to receive under section 5595(c) of title 5 if the officer or employee were entitled to payment under such section; or

''(B) $25,000;

''(3) shall not be a basis for payment, and shall not be included in the computation, of any other type of Government benefit;

''(4) shall not be taken into account for purposes of determining the amount of any severance pay to which an individual may be entitled under section 5595 of title 5 based on any other separation;

''(5) shall only be paid to an officer or employee serving under an appointment without time limitation, who has been currently employed for a continuous period of at least 12 months, but does not include—

''(A) a reemployed annuitant under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, chapter 84 of title 5, or another retirement system for employees of the Government; or

''(B) an officer or employee having a disability on the basis of which such officer or employee is or would be eligible for disability retirement under any of the retirement systems referred to in subparagraph (A);

''(6) shall terminate, upon reemployment in the Federal Government, during receipt of installment payments;

''(7) shall be repaid in its entirety upon reemployment in the Federal Government or working for any agency of the Government through personal services contract within 5 years after the date of the separation on which payment of the separation pay is based, except that—

''(A) if the employment is with an Executive agency, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may, at the request of the head of the agency, waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position;

''(B) if the employment is with an entity in the legislative branch, the head of the entity or the appointing official may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position;

''(C) if the employment is with the judicial branch, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts may waive the repayment if the individual involved possesses unique abilities and is the only qualified applicant available for the position; or

''(D) if the employment is without compensation, the appointing official may waive the repayment;

''(8) shall be paid under regulations providing that offers of separation pay shall be based on skills, knowledge, performance, or other similar factors or combination of such factors determined by the Comptroller General;

''(9) shall be paid upon the condition that the General Accounting Office remit to the Office of Personnel Management for deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund an amount equal to 45 percent of the final annual basic pay for each employee covered under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5 to whom separation pay has been paid under this section and—

''(A) such remittance shall be in addition to any other payments which the General Accounting Office is required to make under subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5; and

''(B) for purposes of this paragraph the term 'final basic pay' with respect to an employee means the total amount of basic pay which would be payable for a year of service by such employee, computed using the employee's final rate of basic pay, and, if last serving on other than a full-time basis, with appropriate adjustment therefore;

''(10) shall not be paid to more than 5 percent of the workforce of the General Accounting Office in any fiscal year; and

''(11) shall be paid to employees under this section for a period of 5 years following the enactment of this section unless Congress renews the authority for an additional period of time.''.

SEC. 214. REDUCTION IN FORCE. Section 732(h) of title 31, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(h)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 5, the Comptroller General shall prescribe regulations for the release of officers and employees of the General Accounting Office in a reduction in force which is carried out for downsizing, realigning, or correcting skill imbalances. The regulations shall give effect to military preference and may take into account such other factors as skills, knowledge, and performance in such a manner and to such an extent as the Comptroller General determines necessary and appropriate.

''(2) Except as provided under paragraph (3), an employee may not be released, due to a reduction in force, unless such employee is given written notice at least 60 days before such employee is so released. Such notice shall include—

''(A) the personnel action to be taken with respect to the employee involved;

''(B) the effective date of the action;

''(C) a description of the procedures applicable in identifying employees for release;

''(D) the employee's ranking relative to other competing employees, and how that ranking was determined; and

''(E) a description of any appeal or other rights which may be available.

''(3) The Comptroller General may, in writing, shorten the period of advance notice required under paragraph (2) with respect to a particular reduction in force, if necessary because of circumstances not reasonably foreseeable, except that such period may not be less than 30 days.''.

SEC. 215. ANNUAL REPORT. Section 719 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) appropriate legislative changes to sections 732(h), (i), and (j) of this title.''; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C) by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) a description of the actions taken under sections 732 (h), (i), and (j) of this title, including information on the number of employees who received voluntary early retirements and separation pay under sections 732(i) and (j) and who were released under a reduction in force action under section 732(h), and an assessment of the effectiveness and usefulness of these human capital initiatives in achieving the agency's mission, meeting its performance goals, and fulfilling its strategic plan.''.

SEC. 216. FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT. (a) Not later than 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report concerning the implementation and effectiveness of sections 209 through 214 of this Act.

(b) The report under this section shall include—

(1) a summary of the portions of the annual reports required under sections 719(a)(3) and (b)(1)(D) of title 31, United States Code;

(2) recommendations for continuation of or legislative changes to sections 732(h), (i), and (j) of title 31, United States Code; and

(3) any assessments or recommendations of the General Accounting Office Personnel Appeals Board and interested employee groups or associations within the General Accounting Office.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used for the maintenance or care of private vehicles, except for emergency assistance and cleaning as may be provided under regulations relating to parking facilities for the House of Representatives issued by the Committee on House Administration and for the Senate issued by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SEC. 302. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond fiscal year 2001 unless expressly so provided in this Act.

SEC. 303. Whenever in this Act any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for or the rate of compensation or designation of any office or position appropriated for is different from that specifically established by such Act, the rate of compensation and the designation in this Act shall be the permanent law with respect thereto: Provided, That the provisions in this Act for the various items of official expenses of Members, officers, and committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and clerk hire for Senators and Members of the House of Representatives shall be the permanent law with respect thereto.

SEC. 304. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 305. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(b) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

(c) If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 306. Such sums as may be necessary are appropriated to the account described in subsection (a) of section 415 of Public Law 104–1 to pay awards and settlements as authorized under such subsection.

SEC. 307. Amounts available for administrative expenses of any legislative branch entity which participates in the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) established by charter on March 26, 1996, shall be available to finance an appropriate share of LBFMC costs as determined by the LBFMC, except that the total LBFMC costs to be shared among all participating legislative branch entities (in such allocations among the entities as the entities may determine) may not exceed $252,000.

SEC. 308. Section 316 of Public Law 101–302 is amended in the first sentence of subsection (a) by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2001''.

SEC. 309. RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP PROGRAM. Section 3011 of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31; 113 Stat. 93) is amended—

(1) by striking ''fiscal years 1999 and 2000'' in subsections (a)(1), (b)(4)(B), (d)(3), and (h)(1)(A) and inserting ''fiscal years 2000 and 2001''; and

(2) by striking ''2001'' in subsection (a)(2), (e)(1), and (h)(1)(B) and inserting ''2002''.

SEC. 310. CAPITOL SECURITY CONSOLIDATION. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Capitol Security Consolidation Act of 2000''.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Act of August 4, 1950'' means the Act entitled ''An Act relating to the policing of the buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress'', approved August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167 et seq.);

(2) the term ''GPO police employee''—

(A) means an employee of the Government Printing Office designated to serve as a special policeman under section 317 of title 44, United States Code (as in effect immediately before the effective date of this section); and

(B) does not include any civilian employee performing support functions;

(3) the term ''function'' means any duty, obligation, power, authority, responsibility, right, privilege, activity, or program; and

(4) the term ''LOC police employee''—

(A) means an employee of the Library of Congress designated as police under the first section of the Act of August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167) (as in effect immediately before the effective date of this section); and

(B) does not include any civilian employee performing support functions.

(c) TRANSFER OF PERSONNEL AND FUNCTIONS.—There are transferred to the United States Capitol Police—

(1) each LOC police employee and each GPO police employee;

(2) any—

(A) functions performed under section 317 of title 44, United States Code, and the first section and section 9 of the Act August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167) (as in effect immediately before the effective date of this section); and

(B) related functions designated in the applicable memorandum of understanding under subsection (h); and

(3) any civilian employee of the Library of Congress or the Government Printing Office who—

(A) performs security support functions; and

(B) is designated for transfer by the Chief of the Capitol Police in the applicable memorandum of understanding under subsection (h).

(d) MEMBERS OF CAPITOL POLICE.—Subject to subsection (e), each LOC police employee and GPO police employee transferred under subsection (c) shall be a member of the Capitol Police.

(e) QUALIFICATION DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) shall not apply to any individual who the Chief of the Capitol Police determines does not meet the qualifications required to be a member of the Capitol Police.

(2) AGE LIMITATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the Chief of the Capitol Police may waive the application to any individual of the maximum age limitation of 37 years for hiring a member of the Capitol Police.

(3) TRAINING.—During the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Capitol Police Board may waive any regulation, standard, guideline, or other limitation prescribed by the Capitol Police Board relating to the training of a member of the Capitol Police with respect to any LOC police employee or GPO police employee transferred under this section.

(4) APPLICATION FOR QUALIFICATION DETERMINATION.—Not later than October 1, 2000, any LOC police employee or GPO police employee who is transferred under this section may file an application for a qualification determination under this subsection with the Chief of the Capitol Police.

(f) TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

(1) TRANSFER AND ALLOCATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, and other funds employed, used, held, arising from, available to, or to be made available in connection with the functions transferred by this section shall be transferred to the appropriations accounts for the Capitol Police under the subheadings ''SALARIES'' and ''GENERAL EXPENSES'' under the heading ''CAPITOL POLICE'' under the heading ''CAPITOL POLICE BOARD'', as applicable. Funds for salaries shall be provided in equal amounts to the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, to be disbursed by the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives. Unexpended funds transferred under this section shall be used only for the purposes for which the funds were originally authorized and appropriated.

(2) REORGANIZATION.—The Capitol Police Board is authorized to allocate or reallocate any function transferred under this section among members of the Capitol Police, and to establish, consolidate, alter, or discontinue such organizational entities in the Capitol Police as may be necessary or appropriate.

(3) INTERIM ASSIGNMENTS.—During the period beginning on October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2001, each LOC police employee or GPO police employee may perform any function transferred under subsection (c)(2), as applicable, under the direction of the Chief of the Capitol Police. Any such employee performing such functions who is not a member of the Capitol Police at the close of September 30, 2001, shall be separated from service at that time.

(4) HIGH RANKING LOC AND GPO POLICE OFFICERS.—The Capitol Police Board may reduce the rank of any LOC police employee or GPO police employee who holds the rank of lieutenant (or the equivalent of such rank) or higher immediately before the effective date of this section.

(5) NONREDUCTION IN PAY.—Except as provided under paragraph (3), the transfer of any employee under this section shall not cause that employee to be separated or reduced in pay before October 1, 2002.

(6) REFERENCES.—Reference in any other Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or

delegation of authority, or any document of or relating to the Librarian of Congress, the Public Printer, the Library of Congress, or the Government Printing Office with regard to functions transferred under this section, shall be deemed to refer to the Capitol Police Board.

(g) LOC AND GPO POLICE JURISDICTION.—

(1) LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—

(A) DESIGNATION OF LOC POLICE EMPLOYEES.—The first section of the Act of August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167) is repealed.

(B) JURISDICTION OF LOC POLICE EMPLOYEES.—Section 9 of the Act of August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167h) is amended by striking ''The police provided'' through ''Provided, That the'' and inserting ''The''.

(C) REGULATIONS.—Section 7(a) of the Act of August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167f(a)) is amended by striking ''the Librarian of Congress'' and inserting ''the Capitol Police Board, in consultation with the Librarian of Congress,''.

(2) GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 317 of title 44, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 317. Protection of persons and property

''The Capitol Police shall protect persons and property in premises and adjacent areas occupied by or under the control of the Government Printing Office, in accordance with the Capitol Security Consolidation Act of 2000.''.

(B) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 3 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 317 and inserting the following:

''317. Protection of persons and property.''.

(h) MEMORANDA OF UNDERSTANDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 1, 2000, the Chief of the Capitol Police shall enter into—

(A) a memorandum of understanding with the Librarian of Congress; and

(B) a memorandum of understanding with the Public Printer of the Government Printing Office

(2) CONTENT.—Each memorandum under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) provide for the performance of law enforcement functions relating to the Library of Congress or the Government Printing Office, as the case may be, by members of the Capitol Police;

(B) ensure that such members are under the direction of the Chief of the Capitol Police;

(C) designate the related functions transferred under subsection (c)(2);

(D)(i) provide for the interim assignment under subsection (f)(3) of any LOC police employee or GPO police employee, as the case may be;

(ii) coordinate the functions performed by such employees on interim assignments with members of the Capitol Police and civilian employees; and

(iii) ensure that such employees on interim assignments are under the direction of the Capitol Police;

(E) provide for—

(i) the designation of civilian employees of the Library of Congress or the Government Printing Office, as the case may be, for transfer under subsection (c)(3); and

(ii) the assignment of functions of such employees as civilian employees of the Capitol Police;

(F) provide for the coordination of any security-related functions performed by civilian employees of the Library of Congress or the Government Printing Office, as the case may be, with—

(i) law enforcement functions performed by members of the Capitol Police; and

(ii) any support functions performed by civilian employees of the Capitol Police;

(G) provide for procedures for determining rank and pay and providing necessary training for individuals transferred under this section;

(H) maintain or improve the public safety of the Library of Congress or the Government Printing Office, as the case may be; and

(I) provide for the efficient implementation of the transfer of employees and functions under this section.

(3) LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REGULATIONS.—The memorandum of understanding between the Chief of the Capitol Police and the Librarian of Congress shall provide for the enforcement of, and any modifications to, regulations prescribed under section 7 of the Act of August 4, 1950 (2 U.S.C. 167f).

(i) CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 9 of the Act entitled ''An Act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes'', approved July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 212a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''The Librarian of Congress and the Public Printer of the Government Printing Office shall be nonvoting ex officio members of the Capitol Police Board.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect with respect to the Librarian of Congress and the Public Printer of the Government Printing Office on the date on which the applicable officer signs the memorandum of understanding described under subsection (h), respectively.

(j) RETIREMENT BENEFITS.—

(1) SERVICE DEEMED TO BE SERVICE AS CAPITOL POLICE.—Any period of service performed by an individual as a LOC police employee or a GPO police employee (including any period of service performed by that individual on interim assignment under subsection (f)(3)) shall be deemed to be service performed as a member of the Capitol Police for purposes of chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, if—

(A) the individual becomes a member of the Capitol Police under this section;

(B) not later than 90 days after the date of the qualification determination under subsection (e), the individual makes an election to be covered under this paragraph; and

(C) the individual makes the payment under paragraph (2).

(2) EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTIONS.—An individual who makes an election under paragraph (1)(A) to be covered under that paragraph shall pay an amount determined by the Office of Personnel Management equal to—

(A) the difference between—

(i) the amount deducted and withheld from basic pay under chapters 83 and 84 of title 5, United States Code, for the period of service described under paragraph (1); and

(ii) the amount that would have been deducted and withheld during that period, if service during that period had been performed as a member of the Capitol Police; and

(B) interest as prescribed under section 8334(e) of title 5, United States Code, based on the amount determined under subparagraph (A).

(3) AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Capitol Police shall pay an amount for applicable agency contributions based on payments made under paragraph (2).

(4) DEPOSIT OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under paragraphs (2) and (3) shall be deposited in the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund.

(5) AGE LIMITATION.—During the period beginning on October 1, 2000, through September 30, 2002, sections 8335(d) and 8425(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any individual who becomes a member of the Capitol Police under this section (including an individual who makes an election under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection to be covered under that paragraph).

(6) REGULATIONS.—After consultation with the Capitol Police Board, the Office of Personnel Management shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection, including regulations relating to employee contributions under paragraph (2) that are similar to regulations under section 8334 of title 5, United States Code.

(k) LEAVE.—Any annual or sick leave to the credit of an individual transferred under this section may be transferred to the credit of that individual as a member of the Capitol Police as determined by the Capitol Police Board.

(l) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 2000.

(2) DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Subsections (e) and (h) shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 311. (a)(1) Any State may request the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress to approve the replacement of a statue the State has provided for display in Statuary Hall in the Capitol of the United States under section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187).

(2) A request shall be considered under paragraph (1) only if—

(A) the request has been approved by a resolution adopted by the legislature of the State and the request has been approved by the Governor of the State, and

(B) the statue to be replaced has been displayed in the Capitol of the United States for at least 25 years as of the time the request is made.

(b) If the Joint Committee on the Library of Congress approves a request under subsection (a), the Architect of the Capitol shall enter into an agreement with the State to carry out the replacement in accordance with the request and any conditions the Joint Committee may require for its approval. Such agreement shall provide that—

(1) the new statue shall be subject to the same conditions and restrictions as apply to any statue provided by a State under section 1814 of the Revised Statutes (40 U.S.C. 187), and

(2) the State shall pay any costs related to the replacement, including costs in connection with the design, construction, transportation, and placement of the new statue, the removal and transportation of the statue being replaced, and any unveiling ceremony.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to permit a State to have more than 2 statues on display in the Capitol of the United States.

(d)(1) The Joint Committee on the Library of Congress may approve the transfer to a State of the ownership of any statue being replaced under this section if the State includes a request for the approval of such transfer at the same time a request is made under subsection (a).

(2) If any statue is removed from the Capitol of the United States as part of a transfer of ownership under paragraph (1), then it may not be returned to the Capitol for display unless such display is specifically authorized by Federal law.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

SEC. 312. (a) Section 201 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1993 (40 U.S.C. 216c note) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$14,500,000''.

(b) Section 201 of such Act is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before ''Pursuant'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(b) The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to solicit, receive, accept, and hold amounts under section 307E(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (40 U.S.C. 216c(a)(2)) in excess of the $14,500,000 authorized under subsection (a), but such amounts (and any interest thereon) shall not be expended by the Architect without approval in appropriation Acts as required under section 307E(b)(3) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 216c(b)(3)).''.

SEC. 313. CENTER FOR RUSSIAN LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT. (a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the legislative branch of the Government a center to be known as the ''Center for Russian Leadership Development'' (the ''Center'').

(2) BOARD OF TRUSTEES.—The Center shall be subject to the supervision and direction of a

Board of Trustees which shall be composed of 9 members as follows:

(A) 2 members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 1 of whom shall be designated by the Majority Leader of the House of Representatives and 1 of whom shall be designated by the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives.

(B) 2 members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, 1 of whom shall be designated by the Majority Leader of the Senate and 1 of whom shall be designated by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(C) The Librarian of Congress.

(D) 4 private individuals with interests in improving United States and Russian relations, designated by the Librarian of Congress.

Each member appointed under this paragraph shall serve for a term of 3 years. Any vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment and the individual so appointed shall serve for the remainder of the term. Members of the Board shall serve without pay, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

(b) PURPOSE AND AUTHORITY OF THE CENTER.—

(1) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center is to establish, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (2), a program to enable emerging political leaders of Russia at all levels of government to gain significant, firsthand exposure to the American free market economic system and the operation of American democratic institutions through visits to governments and communities at comparable levels in the United States.

(2) GRANT PROGRAM.—Subject to the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (4), the Center shall establish a program under which the Center annually awards grants to government or community organizations in the United States that seek to establish programs under which those organizations will host Russian nationals who are emerging political leaders at any level of government.

(3) RESTRICTIONS.—

(A) DURATION.—The period of stay in the United States for any individual supported with grant funds under the program shall not exceed 30 days.

(B) LIMITATION.—The number of individuals supported with grant funds under the program shall not exceed 3,000 in any fiscal year.

(C) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds under the program shall be used to pay—

(i) the costs and expenses incurred by each program participant in traveling between Russia and the United States and in traveling within the United States;

(ii) the costs of providing lodging in the United States to each program participant, whether in public accommodations or in private homes; and

(iii) such additional administrative expenses incurred by organizations in carrying out the program as the Center may prescribe.

(4) APPLICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each organization in the United States desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Center at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Center may reasonably require.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) describe the activities for which assistance under this section is sought;

(ii) include the number of program participants to be supported;

(iii) describe the qualifications of the individuals who will be participating in the program; and

(iv) provide such additional assurances as the Center determines to be essential to ensure compliance with the requirements of this section.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the ''Russian Leadership Development Center Trust Fund'' (the ''Fund'') which shall consist of amounts which may be appropriated, credited, or transferred to it under this section.

(2) DONATIONS.—Any money or other property donated, bequeathed, or devised to the Center under the authority of this section shall be credited to the Fund.

(3) FUND MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 116 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 1105 (b), (c), and (d)), and the provisions of section 117(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1106(b)), shall apply to the Fund.

(B) EXPENDITURES.—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay to the Center from amounts in the Fund such sums as the Board of Trustees of the Center determines are necessary and appropriate to enable the Center to carry out the provisions of this section.

(d) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Board shall appoint an Executive Director who shall be the chief executive officer of the Center and who shall carry out the functions of the Center subject to the supervision and direction of the Board of Trustees. The Executive Director of the Center shall be compensated at the annual rate specified by the Board, but in no event shall such rate exceed level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The provisions of section 119 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1989 (2 U.S.C. 1108) shall apply to the Center.

(2) SUPPORT PROVIDED BY LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.—The Library of Congress may disburse funds appropriated to the Center, compute and disburse the basic pay for all personnel of the Center, provide administrative, legal, financial management, and other appropriate services to the Center, and collect from the Fund the full costs of providing services under this paragraph, as provided under an agreement for services ordered under sections 1535 and 1536 of title 31, United States Code.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(g) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—Any amounts appropriated for use in the program established under section 3011 of the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106–31; 113 Stat. 93) shall be transferred to the Fund and shall remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(h) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSFER.—Subsection (g) shall only apply to amounts which remain unexpended on and after the date the Board of Trustees of the Center certifies to the Librarian of Congress that grants are ready to be made under the program established under this section.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF SENATE COMMENDING CAPITOL POLICE. (a) The Senate finds that—

(1) the United States Capitol is the people's house, and, as such, it has always been and will remain open to the public;

(2) millions of people visit the Capitol each year to observe and study the workings of the democratic process;

(3) the Capitol is the most recognizable symbol of liberty and democracy throughout the world and those who guard the Capitol guard our freedom;

(4) on July 24, 1998, Officer Jacob Chestnut and Detective John Michael Gibson of the United States Capitol Police sacrificed their lives to protect the lives of hundreds of tourists, Members of Congress, and staff;

(5) the officers of the United States Capitol Police serve their country with commitment, heroism, and great patriotism;

(6) the employees of the United States working in the United States Capitol are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the Capitol building and the Congress;

(7) the operation of the Capitol and the legislative process are dependent on the professionalism and hard work of those who work here, including the United States Capitol Police, congressional staff, and the staff of the Congressional Research Office, the General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Government Printing Office, and the Architect of the Capitol; and

(8) the House of Representatives should restore the cuts in funding for the United States Capitol Police, congressional staff, and congressional support organizations.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Capitol Police and all legislative employees are to be commended for their commitment, professionalism, and great patriotism; and

(2) the conferees on the legislative branch appropriations legislation should maintain the Senate position on funding for the United States Capitol Police and all legislative branch employees.

(4) Page 45, after line 6, insert:

SEC. 315. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventative application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as determined by the United States Environmental Protection Agency to United States Capitol buildings or grounds maintained or administered by the Architect of the United States Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate insists on its amendments, requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints Mr. BENNETT, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. COCHRAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, as conferees on the part of the Senate.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VICTIMS OF GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it has been more than a year since the Columbine tragedy, but still this Republican Congress refuses to act on sensible gun legislation.

Since Columbine, thousands of Americans have been killed by gunfire. Until we act, Democrats in the Senate will read some of the names of those who lost their lives to gun violence in the past year, and we will continue to do so every day that the Senate is session.

In the name of those who died, we will continue this fight. Following are the names of some of the people who were killed by gunfire one year ago today.

July 17: Reggie Allen, 20, Miami-Dade County, FL; Brady Ball, 25, New Orleans, LA; Lynn Beck, 16, Dallas, TX;

Sherron Britt, 31, St. Louis, MO; Khary Daley, 24, Boston, MA; Willie Ennett, 23, Detroit, MI; Monroe Gibson, 23, New Orleans, LA; Hemenorio Gonzalez, 45, San Antonio, TX; Wilbert Hooten, 64, Chicago, IL; Fernando Marquez, 32, Chicago, IL; Jim Rest, 58, Minneapolis, MN; Terrence Roberts, Detroit, MI; Paul Trapp, 50, Detroit, MI; Sam Wright, 35, Detroit, MI; Unidentified male, 77, Nashville, TN.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD'S RAIL MERGER MORATORIUM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to commend the Surface Transportation Board for issuing its rail merger moratorium, which has just been upheld by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. We on the Commerce Committee have been watching the railroad industry closely these last several years and we believe time is needed to reevaluate where the industry has been and where it should be going. To have moved forward with a new round of mergers now would have been shortsighted and not in the public interest. I am pleased that the Board had the courage to call a time-out on rail mergers to reexamine its rail merger policy before proceeding further at this important crossroads for the rail sector. I am also gratified that the Court shared my view, and the view of many of us in the Senate, that the Board has the authority to do what needs to be done.

WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, today I rise on behalf of the men and women of this country who value hunting and fishing as an important part of their lives. I am one of them, and I know I am not alone in the Senate. Many of my colleagues have joined me as members of the Sportsmen's Caucus, and I am pleased that we enjoy such strong support. In my home state of Montana, hunting and fishing are incredibly important. These are some of the activities we engage in to enjoy our beautiful outdoors. Hunting and fishing give us the chance to spend time with our families, and to take part in the traditions that generations of Montanans have enjoyed.

It is this strong tradition that brings me here today. There has been a grave injustice dealt to America's sportsmen. I am referring to the abuse of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson funds by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. These are funds from the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs which impose an excise tax on the equipment hunters and fishermen buy. Then the tax monies from the sporting goods are used for things like wildlife habitat and hunter safety programs. These programs were started in 1937, with the strong support of both the sportsmen who pay the tax and the states who administer the projects.

As years went by, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service which manages the programs, started straying further and further from the original intent of Pittman-Robertson funds. After an oversight investigation by House Committee on Resources, chaired by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, it was found that the Fish and Wildlife Service was using Pittman-Robertson for purposes far outside the intent of the law. Funds were used for everything from foreign travel to grants for anti-hunting groups and programs that work against the interests of hunters. This is just plain wrong, and goes against everything the program was originally intended to accomplish.

In response to the abuse uncovered by his Committee, Mr. YOUNG introduced legislation to fix the problems. Part of the legislation caps the administrative expenses for the program and sets in stone what is an authorized administrative expense. This is a step in the right direction, because it will restore the integrity to this program. His bill, H.R. 3671, passed the House on April 5th with an overwhelming vote of 423–2.

I am proud to be included as a cosponsor of the Senate version of this bill, S. 2609. My colleagues from Idaho, Mr. CRAIG and Mr. CRAPO, have modeled it after H.R. 3671 and included provisions for valuable programs like hunter safety, as well as a multi-state conservation grant program. This bill ensures that the money sportsmen pay for wildlife conservation and hunter safety is actually used for those purposes and restores the accountability that has been missing for too long. It is time we made this right, and earned back the trust of the people we are here to serve.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, July 14, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,666,749,557,909.16 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-six billion, seven hundred forty-nine million, five hundred fifty-seven thousand, nine hundred nine dollars and sixteen cents).

One year ago, July 14, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,624,307,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred twenty-four billion, three hundred seven million).

Five years ago, July 14, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,933,039,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred thirty-three billion, thirty-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, July 14, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $531,818,000,000 (Five hundred thirty-one billion, eight hundred eighteen million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,134,931,557,909.16 (Five trillion, one hundred thirty-four billion, nine hundred thirty-one million, five hundred fifty-seven thousand, nine hundred nine dollars and sixteen cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HEALTHY CULTURE INITIATIVE

• Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the ground-breaking and encouraging work being performed by the Healthy Culture Initiative, a non-profit group with which I am honored to be associated. The Healthy Culture Initiative (HCI) is an organization committed to strengthening and improving the health of America's culture by recognizing and replicating the many innovative, local initiatives aimed at solving community challenges.

The Healthy Culture Initiative recognizes that there are many challenges we face as a nation—over the last thirty years, we have seen huge increases in family breakdown, out-of-wedlock births, single parent families, teen suicide, drug abuse, violence, and civic disengagement. But for every problem in America, there is already a solution—a solution that is in place in neighborhoods across America. Indeed, many of the most effective solutions to the complex social problems of crime, drug abuse, family breakdown, teen suicide, illegitimacy, and poverty arise from the committed efforts of a small group of individuals working within their own community.

The Healthy Culture Initiative seeks to recognize these exciting efforts, and encourage their replication. HCI has four primary objectives:

First, through a series of Success Summits to be held in cities across America, the Healthy Culture Initiative will recognize, and help replicate, community-based solutions to pressing social challenges.

Second, the Healthy Culture Initiative will jump-start important civic dialogue about ways that ordinary people, working alone or in small groups, can help strengthen families, schools, neighborhoods, and ultimately, our Nation.

Third, HCI will measure the success of new initiatives. In conjunction with the Gallup organization, the Healthy Culture Initiative will work to quantify the actual results of each new initiative launched, so that resources and attention can be concentrated on the most effective efforts.

And finally, HCI will develop a network of information resources, including web links and educational materials, to assist community activists in initiating new programs in their neighborhoods.

I can personally attest to the exciting work undertaken by the Healthy Culture Initiative, in that I and Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, currently serve as honorary co-chairs. I am excited by the caliber and quality of individuals who are leading this initiative—including Don Clifton, President and CEO of the Gallup Corporation; Charles Krulak, former Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, Executive Director Cindy Cobb; Don Eberly, CEO of the

National Fatherhood Initiative, Curt Smith of the Hudson Institute, Jay Speigel of the Reserve Officers Association, and many others.

The plans of the Healthy Culture Initiative are ambitious and wide-ranging. It is my hope that by celebrating the many exciting success stories taking place in our communities across America, we can encourage their replication—and build a healthier culture, and a stronger America.●

225TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. ARMY

● Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 225th Anniversary of the United States Army and ask unanimous consent that an article written by the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Eric K. Shinseki, which pays due tribute to the U.S. Army and its contributions to our freedoms be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Copyright 2000 The Baltimore Sun Company, The Baltimore Sun, Thurs., June 15, 2000]

THE ARMY AT 225: A NEW PATRIOTISM

(By Eric K. Shinseki)

WASHINGTON—In two weeks, Mel Gibson's latest movie, ''The Patriot,'' opens nationwide. Set during the American Revolution, it is the story of a colonist who becomes a militia leader when the sweep of war and the advance of the British endanger his farm and family.

Whether by design or mere coincidence, the release of ''The Patriot'' comes at a particularly fitting time in our nation's history because this month marks the 225th anniversary of the birth of our Army.

The birth of our Nation and the birth of our Army are inseparably linked.

A year before we formally declared our independence, we had already begun fighting for it at Lexington and Concord and the Battle of Bunker Hill, the bloodiest single engagement of the Revolution. On that small piece of ground, over the course of one day, the British lost a staggering 1,054 regulars. The colonists lost about 440.

After Bunker Hill, the British would never again underestimate the tenacity and fighting spirit of the American soldier. These early engagements surprised the British, who saw themselves as professionally trained soldiers and the militiamen as little more than a disorganized rabble.

But let us not forget that we surprised ourselves as well. Despite our dogged determination to confront the foe, we were unproven and uncertain of our abilities. Who could have imagined that our ill-equipped and untrained colonial militia would fare as well as it did? Our success in those early battles was significant.

The victories strengthened national pride, engendered new confidence and bolstered the will to fight. When word spread down the coast that New England farmers had successfully stood up to the well-equipped and well-trained British regulars, colonists everywhere were filled with newfound courage and patriotic fervor. Frustration turned to motivation, and from that point on, the cry for independence simply would not be quelled.

On June 14, 1775, Congress took the first formal step in the march toward independence by voting to establish what was then the Continental Army.

In those days, the term patriot more closely equated to insurgent. A patriot was a revolutionary who promoted the independence of his people from the country or union of countries that controlled them.

From the British perspective, patriots were criminals; to them, the term was an epithet carrying the negative connotation of disloyalty. Thus, in 1775, when George Washington dubbed the original rag-tag band of fighters ''the patriot army,'' he was making a profoundly political and deliberately inflammatory statement; this newborn army would win independence for America.

Over time, the word ''patriot'' evolved to a more heroic meaning—a person who loves his country and who defends and promotes its interests. It is especially applied to soldiers who fight for love of country. Thanks to the success of the American Revolution, the connotation of that simple term changed from one of disloyalty to one of allegiance.

Since the end of the Revolution, American soldiers, imbued with the spirit of the original patriots, have pledged their allegiance to this nation through their sacrifices in uniform. In doing so, hundreds of thousands of them have given their last full measure of devotion in ultimate demonstration of love for country.

Today, thousands of soldiers serve around the globe to maintain our freedom and to provide the promise of a better life to others for whom liberty is but a dream. They are the finest men and women the nation has to offer—active, guard and reserve soldiers doing the heavy lifting so we can enjoy the comforts and freedoms of our way of life.

They are unknown to most of us, but they sacrifice daily in places like Kosovo, Saudi Arabia, Bosnia, East Timor, Kuwait, Korea and Macedonia in order to promote democracy and to preserve peace and stability.

These men and women are our patriots. They are prepared to defend our country, and they are also the best ambassadors for democracy we could have, carrying the same torch of liberty that was lit 225 years ago. In the remotest corners of the globe, American soldiers command respect because they symbolize the traits of our forefathers; a passion for liberty and a willingness to fight to protect freedom.

As we reflect on the Army's 225th birthday, let us remember that with our Army was born a nation; with that nation was born democracy; and with democracy was born the hope that peace and liberty could someday be attained by all oppressed peoples of the world.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the presiding officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 8:22 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hayes, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3544. An act to authorize a gold medal to be presented on behalf of the Congress to Pope John Paul II in recognition of his many and enduring contributions to peace and religious understanding, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3591. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

H.R. 4391. An act to amend title 4 of the Untied States Code to establish souring requirements for State and local taxation of mobile telecommunication services.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3323. An act to designate the Federal building located at 158–15 Liberty Avenue in Jamaica, Queens, New York, as the ''Floyd H. Flake Federal Building.''

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–551. A resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of Wisconsin relative to the Washington Juneteenth 2000 National Holiday Observance; ordered to lie on the table.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 29

Whereas, more than 130 years old, Juneteenth, National Freedom Day is the oldest and only African-American holiday observance in the United States, which is also known as ''Emancipation Day,'' ''Emancipation Celebration,'' ''Freedom Day,'' ''Jun-Jun'' and ''Juneteenth''; and

Whereas, Juneteenth National Freedom Day commemorates the survival, due to God-given strength and determination, of African-Americans, who were first brought to this country stacked in the bottom of slave ships in a month-long journey across the Atlantic Ocean, known as the ''Middle Passage''; and

Whereas, approximately 11,500,000 African-Americans survived the voyage to the New World (the number that died is likely greater), only to be subjected to whipping, castration, branding, rape, tearing apart of families and forced submission to slavery for more than 200 years after arrival in the United States; and

Whereas, Juneteenth commemorates the day on which freedom was proclaimed to all slaves in the South by Union General Granger, on June 19, 1865, in Galveston, Texas, more than 2.5 years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Abraham Lincoln; and

Whereas, for the first time, in over 130 years of the annual celebration, Juneteenth has finally been ''officially recognized'' as Juneteenth Independence Day in America by the President and Congress of the United States; and

Whereas, this reality is particularly underscored by the fact that it was in the 1st Session of the 105th Congress, via the bipartisan cooperation of former Congresswoman Barbara Rose-Collins (D-Michigan, former Senator Carol Mosley-Braun (D-Illinois), Congressman J.C. WATTS (R-Oklahoma), former

House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Georgia), Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R-Mississippi) and Senate Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE (D-South Dakota), that Senate Joint Resolution 11 and House Joint Resolution 56 were successfully shepherded through both houses of Congress, in a successful effort to officially recognize Juneteenth as the Independence Day observance of Americans of African descent in 1997; and

Whereas, Americans of all colors, creeds, cultures, religions and countries-of-origin share in a common love of, and respect for, ''freedom,'' as well as a determination to protect their right to freedom through democratic institutions, by which the ''tenets-of-freedom'' are guaranteed and protected; and

Whereas, the ''19th of June'' or Juneteenth Independence Day, along with the ''4th of July,'' completes the ''cycle of freedom'' for America's Independence Day observances; and

Whereas, ''Until All are Free, None are Free'' is an oft-repeated maxim that can be used to highlight the significance of the end of the era of slavery in the United States; and

Whereas, the National Juneteenth Observance Foundation is sponsoring the premier celebration, concert, worship services and campaign to commemorate America's 2nd Independence Day observance, the ''19th of June,'' as one which completes the cycle of America's 18th century Independence Movement, initiated with the ''4th of July,'' 1776, ''Declaration of Independence'' and to recognize this country's movement towards a ''One America,'' advanced by a sincere dialogue of the realization of what Juneteenth historically means to all Americans, promoting racial healing, restoration and justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly, That the members of the Wisconsin assembly support this historic recognition and encourage participation of our members, families and communities in the ''officially recognized'' Washington Juneteenth 2000 National Holiday Observance, on the National Mall, Lincoln Memorial and U.S. capital grounds, scheduled for Saturday, June 17, 2000, from 8 a.m. until 5 p.m., which will be followed by a Sunday evening Juneteenth Fathers' Day Benefit Concert honoring African-American Fathers, and a Monday, June 19, 2000, noon rally in support of National Juneteenth Independence Day holiday legislation and a series of evening Juneteenth prayer and praise worship services in churches and houses of worship throughout the Washington, D.C., area and the country; and, be it further

Resolved, That the assembly chief clerk shall provide a copy of this resolution to the president and secretary of the U.S. senate, to the speaker and clerk of the U.S. house of representatives and to each member of the congressional delegation from this state attesting the adoption of this resolution by the 1999 assembly of the state of Wisconsin.

POM–552. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey relative to flood areas and flood victims; to the Committee on Banking, House, and Urban Affairs.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 200

Whereas, Tremendous damage was caused in the State of New Jersey by the high winds, waves, storm surge, severe flooding and fires associated with Hurricane Floyd; and

Whereas, Up to 13 inches of rain fell in portions of the State, causing rivers and other inland waterways to flood streets, homes and businesses, and high winds downed many trees and damaged many structures; and

Whereas, The President of the United States declared certain counties in this State, including Bergen, Essex, Hunterdon, Mercer, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Union, to be federal disaster areas, and this federal disaster declaration allows for the federal funding of disaster relief to public entities, businesses and individuals, as well as funding for mitigation against future similar disasters; and

Whereas, The damages in the State resulting from Hurricane Floyd and its associated flooding are estimated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency to be approximately $500,000,000 and this estimate is rising as more assessments are conducted and verified; and

Whereas, The total number of houses, apartments and businesses destroyed, damaged or affected by Hurricane Floyd and its associated flooding exceeds 70,000; and

Whereas, United States Senator Frank Lautenberg and United States Representative Marge Roukema have proposed federal legislation to help small businesses and farmers recover from the damage inflicted by Hurricane Floyd and its associated flooding, which legislation would make available, through the Federal Emergency Management Agency, one-time grants to small businesses and farmers in amounts up to $50,000 or at least 50 percent of the cost to replace non-insured contents and inventory or to carry out repairs, provided that the grant is not used to relocate the business outside of the community and provided that the grant recipient purchases and maintains flood insurance coverage; and

Whereas, Individuals and businesses have suffered extraordinary hardships, and it is in the public interest to assist individuals and businesses recovering from the devastating effects of Hurricane Floyd in the most expeditious manner possible; and

Whereas, It is in the best interest of the residents of the State to urge the President, the Congress of the United States, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to take all available steps to provide financial assistance in the most expeditious manner possible to New Jersey's flood areas and flood victims; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House urges the President and the Federal Emergency management Agency to provide financial assistance in the most expeditious manner possible to provide relief to New Jersey's flood areas and flood victims. This House also urges the President and the Federal Emergency Management Agency to not deduct any State monies provided for flood relief from the calculation of federal monies allocated to New Jersey to recover from the devastating effects of Hurricane Floyd and its aftermath.

2. This House urges the Congress of the United States to act swiftly on legislation proposed by United States Senator Frank Lautenberg and United States Representative Marge Roukema to help small business and farmers recover from the damage inflicted by Hurricane Floyd and its associated flooding.

3. A duly authorized copy of this resolution, signed by the Speaker of the General Assembly and attested by the Clerk thereof, shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and each member of Congress elected from the State of New Jersey.

POM–553. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to consumer credit reporting agencies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 310

Whereas, the Fair Credit Reporting Act established a statutory framework for protecting the rights of consumers to fair disclosure of credit information; and

Whereas, the Fair Credit Reporting Act permits credit reporting agencies to report information related to a consumer's credit history; and

Whereas, credit reporting agencies provide an overall rating of the consumer's credit risk on the consumer's credit report; and

Whereas, credit reporting agencies consider the number of inquiries into a consumer's credit report when determining the overall rating; and

Whereas, the number of inquiries requesting a consumer's credit report is not substantially related to a consumer's credit risk and is often outside the consumer's control; and

Whereas, creditors rely on the information reported by credit reporting agencies to evaluate the credit risk of a consumer; and

Whereas, many consumers are denied credit based on a credit reporting agency's rating of that consumer: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring; That the Congress of the United States be urged to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit credit reporting agencies from using information related to the number of inquires in a consumer's credit report to determine the consumer's overall rating; and, be it

Resolved further, That the General Assembly of Virginia most fervently urge and encourage each state legislative body of the United States of America to enact this resolution, or one similar in context and form, as a show of solidarity in petitioning the federal government for greater protection for consumers in obtaining credit; and, be it

Resolved finally, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Secretary of the United States Department of Labor, each member of the Virginia Congressional Delegation, and to the Chairman of the Council of State Governments, requesting that he distribute copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of each house of each state legislative body in the United States of America in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia in this matter.

POM–554. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to community goals and outcomes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Whereas, the Hawaii State Legislature has recognized the importance of measuring progress towards shared outcomes through the establishment of the Hawaii Performance Partnerships Board by Act 160, Session Laws of Hawaii 1999, and the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution No. 38 by the Legislature in 1998; and

Whereas, a memorandum of agreement has been executed between the federal, state, county, community, and business sectors to encourage and facilitate cooperation to redesign and test an outcomes-oriented approach to intergovernmental service delivery; and

Whereas, the federal government, through the efforts of the National Partnership for Reinventing Government, has empowered federal agencies to provide incentives, such as decreased state matching funds, waived

regulations, or additional federal funds to state agencies in partnership with community-based organizations that measure progress towards shared outcomes through initiatives such as Boost4Kids; and

Whereas, Hawaii's aloha spirit connects its people in a unique manner, by guiding our decisions and actions; and

Whereas, Hawaii's communities have joined together to create outcomes and goals to improve the well-being of Hawaii's people in several different efforts, such as Ke Ala Hoku, Education Goals 2000, Healthy 2010, Hawaii Family Touchstones; and

Whereas, the acceptance of a common set of desired outcomes, compatible with statutory mandates, will enable state, county, and community agencies to focus on achieving positive results that exemplify Hawaii's uniqueness; and

Whereas, achieving results require creation of accountability systems that cross agency boundaries to measure the combined efforts of many partners, both public and private; and

Whereas, the Hawaii Performance Partnerships Board has considered the achievements of many of Hawaii's people in creating outcomes and goals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2000, the House of Representatives concurring, That the following key community outcomes are hereby endorsed by the Legislature as state policy:

(1) A safe, nurturing social environment;

(2) A healthy, natural environment;

(3) A thriving, diverse, sustainable economy;

(4) Educated people; and

(5) Civic vitality;

Be it further resolved, That public and private agencies committed to improving the well-being of Hawaii's peoples be encouraged to utilize these outcomes as a basis for policy and program development, planning, and for budgeting; and be it further

Resolved, that all public and private agencies are encouraged to form partnerships and measure progress towards the outcomes most appropriate to their individual missions; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Agriculture, the United States Secretary of Education, the United States Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Hawaii Performance Partnerships Board, the Mayor of the County of Maui, the Mayor of the City and County of Honolulu, the Mayor of the County of Kauai, the Mayor of the County of Hawaii, Aloha United Way, the Hawaii Community Foundation, HMSA Foundation/Hawaii Medical Service Association, The Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, all state departments, Partnering for Outcomes, State Procurement Office, Good Beginnings Alliance, Interdepartmental Council, Hawaii Primary Care Association, and Covering Kids.

POM–555. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Mayfield Heights, Ohio relative to a United Nations Convention, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

POM–556. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to East Timorese refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 54

Whereas, In 1975, after the former Portuguese colony of East Timor gained its independence, Indonesian forces invaded East Timor and occupied the country despite the call of the United Nations Security Council for Indonesia to withdraw its forces; and

Whereas, In 1976 the Indonesian government admitted that 60,000 East Timorese had been killed since the invasion and President Suharto signed legislation declaring East Timor as Indonesia's 27th province; and

Whereas, In the 1970's and 1980's tens of thousands of East Timorese died of starvations, military bombardment, and executions as thousands of other suffered malnutrition, sterilization, relocation in settlement camps, and arrest and torture at the hands of the Indonesian forces; and

Whereas, Despite continued military attacks on East Timorese civilians during 1999 and fears of widespread violence against voters, a heavy turnout at the polls on August 30, 1999, provided almost an 80 percent vote for the independence of East Timor from Indonesia; and

Whereas, Within hours of the announcement of the election results on September 4, 1999, a systematic campaign of terror was launched against the East Timorese by the Indonesian armed forces and their allied militias during which three-quarters of the population was displaced. In a coordinated manner, the Indonesian military and militias forced hundreds of thousands of East Timorese at gunpoint to board trucks, boats, and airplanes for transportation to West Timor and other parts of Indonesia; and

Whereas, By the end of 1999, United Nations agencies reported that over 125,000 East Timorese had returned home; however, more than 100,000 East Timorese remain unable to return home, many months after the announcement of the referendum results and despite repeated pledges by the Indonesian government to remedy the situation. Thousands of East Timorese taken to other areas of Indonesia remain unaccounted for now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly. That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to employ diplomatic and other resources to persuade the Indonesian government to expedite the return of all East Timorese refugees in Indonesia who wish to return home; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

POM–557. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 102

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard is strategically located in the Pacific Ocean and the Naval Base is in the best interest of the National Security; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard is the largest industrial employer in the State of Hawaii; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard employed 6,900 employees in 1989, and has since experienced a 58% reduction of the workforce, and currently employs 3,200 employees; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard was the Homeport for 41 Navy ships and submarines in 1989, and currently is the Homeport for 31 navy ships and submarines; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard provided Navy contract work for 65 to 75 percent of the private ship repair industry in Hawaii; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard spends in excess of $350 million in material purchases, contracts with local businesses, and payroll costs; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard provides for trade and skills training for the youth of Hawaii through the Apprentice program in partnership with the University of Hawaii; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard resolves a quality of life issue for the military by accomplishing the ship repair overhauls and repairs in Hawaii and the Homeport of the Navy ships; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard has the capacity to accomplish more Navy work in Pearl Harbor with the skilled workforce and the availability of the Homeport ships; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard needs to be ''right sized'' for its current and future workload to allow Pearl Harbor and the Navy to maintain and overhaul ships in Hawaii; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard would require the hiring of 700 to 800 permanent civilian employees over the next two years to obtain the necessary skilled personnel to execute the Navy work; and

Whereas, Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard has an application list of 1,000 qualified local applicants seeking employment at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2000, the House of Representatives concurring, That this body hereby urges the United States Navy to increase the workload and employment in Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard to utilize the full capacity of the Hawaiian ship repair industry; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Navy is requested to brief the Legislature and community business leaders on the future work load plans for Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Hawaii Congressional Delegation, the Governor, and the United States Navy through the chain of command to the Chief of Naval Operations, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Defense.

POM–558. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii relative to toxic waste; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 124

Whereas, the United States and the people of Hawaii have had long historical, cultural, and economic ties with the people of the Philippines as part of the Pacific-Asia community; and

Whereas, Filipinos all over the world, including the Filipino-American community in Hawaii and the United States and their friends, commemorated the centennial of the birth of the Republic of the Philippines (June 12, 1898), a culmination of the Filipino peoples' struggle for freedom and independence against Spanish colonial rule; and

Whereas, in December 1992, United States military forces withdrew from Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base, thus ending almost a century of United States military presence in the Philippines; and

Whereas, reports from the United States General Accounting Office, United States Department of Defense, the World Health Organization, United States experts, environmental baseline surveys conducted by American firms, and recent media reports, including those conducted by the Boston Globe and CNN, identified serious contamination at forty-six sites at both Clark and Subic bases; and

Whereas, many of the chemicals identified, such as polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) Aldrin, Dieldrin, Benzene, and Heptachlor,

are part of the family chemicals known as persistent organic pollutants (POPs) because of their persistence in the environment and association with health problems like cancer, reproductive failure, and behavior disorders; and

Whereas, a ''Health for All'' survey conducted by internationally-recognized health expert Doctor Rosalie Bertell on behalf of the Canadian Institute for the Concern for Public Health and released in November 1998, found conspicuously high and disparate levels of kidney, urinary, nervous, and female system health problems among 716 families surveyed in the Clark Air Base area alone; and

Whereas, on January 27, 1999, the Philippines House of Representatives Committee on Ecology released a report holding the United States responsible for toxic wastes left behind in the former United States military bases at Clark and Subic, which threaten to make these areas economically devastated, largely uninhabitable, and unusable; and

Whereas, the Filipino-American community, including the National Federation of Filipino American Associations (NFFAA) and various church groups, such as the Church Coalition for Human Rights in the Philippines and the 20th General Synod of the United Church of Christ (United States), have expressed grave concern for the United States government's lack of response and responsibility over its legacy of toxic wastes in the Philippines; and

Whereas, The Filipino Coalition for Solidarity, Inc., a civil rights group based in Hawaii, is spearheading the information campaign in Hawaii regarding this issue: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 2000, That the Legislature expresses its strong concern for the serious environmental problems caused by toxic wastes left behind by the United States and the grave threat these wastes pose to public health in the communities adjoining its former bases in Clark and Subic; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature calls on the United Sates government to assist the Philippines, which has neither the funds nor the technical capacity to conduct an environmental clean up, as it has already done in cleaning up toxic contamination in overseas United States military bases in Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom, and in other countries; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation, the Governor of Hawaii, the President of the Philippines, the President of the Philippines Senate, and the Speaker of the Philippines Senate, and the Speaker of the Philippines House of Representatives.

POM–559. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to the United States Army Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 207

Whereas, the Department of the Army has been granted approval by Congress to establish a national United States Army Museum; and

Whereas, several sites are being considered by Congress for the location of this museum, including Fort Belvoir in Fairfax County; and

Whereas, Fort Belvoir is located near Mount Vernon, the residence of George Washington, the first President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief; and

Whereas, locating the United States Army Museum in Virginia would enhance Virginia's tourism and economic development efforts; and

Whereas, locating the United States Army-Museum at Fort Belvoir is a logical choice due to its proximity to Washington, D.C., the Pentagon, and Arlington Cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States be urged to establish the national United States Army Museum at Fort Belvoir, Virginia; and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the House of Delegate transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia in this matter.

POM–560. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to commercial marketing; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 50

Whereas, The death penalty was originally instituted in California in 1851 under the Criminal Practices Act and reinstated in 1978; and

Whereas, Due to the heinous nature of crimes that are punishable by the death penalty, only 5 percent of murderers reside on death row; and

Whereas, The international retail corporation, the United Colors of Benetton, has glamorized death row inmates through photos and interviews, in order to sell Benetton products; and

Whereas, Such ''shock marketing'' perversely profiles criminals who have committed grossly inhuman acts of murder; and

Whereas, The 26 criminals profiled by Benetton have murdered at least 45 innocent victims; and

Whereas, The advertisement campaign is causing unnecessary pain and distress to the family and friends of the murder victims; and

Whereas, This marketing constitutes a flippant ''style statement'' in what has been, and should remain, a serious issue for responsible public debate; and

Whereas, A good corporate citizen must maintain a good standard of ethics and respect the bounds of responsible discourse concerning matters of policy dealing with the lives of citizens and the values of law-abiding citizens; and

Whereas, The glamorization of death row inmates in Benetton's marketing campaign does not appear to be consistent with being a good corporate citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California Jointly. That Benetton's glorification of criminals for profit is both inappropriate and insensitive to the families of the victims; and be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Assembly and Senate of the State of California encourage all citizens in California to express to the United Colors of Benetton, in whatever manner they deem most effective, their opinion of the inappropriate and insensitive death row marketing campaign and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the President of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the President of the California Chamber of Commerce, the Chairman of the New York Stock Exchange, and the Chairman of the Board of the United Colors of Benetton.

POM–561. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado relative to the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 00–031

Whereas, According to its comprehensive plan and its duly adopted zoning regulations, the Board of County Commissioners of Jefferson County, Colorado denied an application by Lake Cedar Group, LLC, to rezone land on Lookout Mountain from residential and agricultural zoning to planned development zoning in order to allow construction of an 854-foot telecommunications supertower and a 26,000 square foot support building; and

Whereas, Such decision was a quasi-adjudicative decision based on factual evidence presented to the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners and application of applicable legal standards and as such can be appealed judicially to Jefferson County District Court, which court is fully empowered to grant full and appropriate relief to the appellant if appropriate under the facts of the case; and

Whereas, Lake Cedar Group filed an appeal of Jefferson County's decision in Jefferson County District Court, which appeal is now pending the filing of briefs by the parties; and

Whereas, Despite the pending judicial appeal, and after Jefferson County spent several months preparing the voluminous record of proceedings for the Jefferson County District Court action, Lake Cedar Group, without notifying the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners or any other interested party, filed a petition with the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) requesting the FCC to ''preempt'' Jefferson County's decision and to declare Jefferson County's decision ''prohibited and unenforceable''; and

Whereas, By Public Notice dated April 10, 2000, the FCC seeks public comment on Lake Cedar Group's petition; and

Whereas, In the United States, control over individual land use decisions is firmly vested in local governments, through statutory delegation from state governments; and

Whereas, The FCC is barred by the 10th Amendment to the United States Constitution from attempting to preempt decisions made by local governments on individual land use applications because the United States Congress has not directed or authorized the FCC to preempt such local decisions; and

Whereas, The FCC lacks not only the authority, but also the expertise and any adopted standards to second-guess and invalidate local government land use decisions; and

Whereas, Any attempt by the FCC to preempt local government land use decision-making in this manner would represent an illegal, unauthorized, and unjustified attack on state- and local-government land use authority; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the Sixty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the House of Representatives concurring herein:

That the General Assembly of the State of Colorado hereby encourages the FCC not to preempt local government land use decision-making and state judicial processes, thus overriding local and state government authority; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Joint Resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; each member of Colorado's Congressional delegation; each member of the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Commerce; the Governor of Colorado; and the Commissioners of the Federal Communications Commission.

POM–562. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana relative to Internet taxation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Whereas, the Internet is a collection of computer networks that enables people to communicate electronically with people in other states and nations around the world and millions of organizations and consumers are taking advantage of this technological innovation to transact electronic interstate commerce; and

Whereas, business-to-consumer sales transacted through the Internet have increased the interstate commerce of items which have traditionally been sold in intrastate commerce, increasing competition between traditional ''main street'' family businesses and interstate mail order and electronic commerce businesses; and

Whereas, under current federal court decisions, some Internet vendors and other remote sellers cannot be legally compelled to collect sales and use taxes from consumers in other states; and

Whereas, the difficulties in requiring sales and use tax collections from remote sellers place local ''main street'' merchants at an unfair competitive disadvantage and the Internet and Internet vendors should not receive preferential tax treatment at the expense of such merchants; and

Whereas, state sales and use tax collections comprise a substantial percentage of state revenues; and

Whereas, states have the primary responsibility for the delivery of education, public safety, transportation, and health and human services; and

Whereas, the projected growth of electronic commerce transactions will have a substantial negative impact on state sales and use tax collections; and

Whereas, the federal Internet Tax Freedom Act has temporarily limited the states' ability to design new taxing schemes to keep up with today's rapidly transforming technology-drive economy; and

Whereas, prior to the end of the moratorium period imposed by the Internet Tax Freedom Act, the United States Congress will be charged with the responsibility to decide the future course of taxation of the Internet, possibly to the detriment of state and local governments and traditional ''main street'' merchants: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Legislature does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to consider the needs of state and local governments and local ''main street'' retailers when determining a course of action regarding Internet taxation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–563. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana relative to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 23

Whereas, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1972 as amended (16 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) was enacted to protect and manage migratory birds in the United States and includes the regulation of taking, possessing, transporting, shipping, exporting, and importing of migratory birds; and

Whereas, the enforcement of those laws and regulations is essential to the goal of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, enforcement which, in the state of Louisiana, is the responsibility of the enforcement division of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; and

Whereas, the hunting of migratory birds is a widespread recreational and tourist activity in the state of Louisiana with an economic impact in the state in excess of $131 million, including an annual harvest of over 3.5 million birds by more than 128,000 hunters participating in over 1.7 million hunting trips; and

Whereas, with that level of activity in the state of Louisiana, the enforcement division of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries is confronted with the monumental task of enforcement of the provisions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, violations of which are estimated to have an annual negative impact on the state's economy of nearly $8.2 million; and

Whereas, the enforcement division of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries has performed this responsibility through the years and, in fact, has issued more than eighty-nine percent of the citations issued for violations of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, all without the benefit of federal monetary support for its efforts: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Louisiana Legislature does hereby memorialize the U.S. Congress to authorize and appropriate sufficient funds to the enforcement division of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to enable the enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and to enable efforts for conservation and protection of the migratory birds required by that Act; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–564. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to highway rest stops; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 103

Whereas, it is a well-established fact that driver fatigue is a major factor contributing to highway accidents; and

Whereas, federal law prescribes limits on the number of continuous hours truckers may drive and the length of time they must rest before driving again; and

Whereas, one of the most convenient places where long-haul truckers could break their trip and get the rest they need to operate safely is rest stops along interstate highways; and

Whereas, this option is not realistically open to truckers, because the Commonwealth limits vehicle stays at these rest stops to no more than two hours; and

Whereas, the cost of motel rooms and the inability of many motel parking lots to accommodate large tractor-trailer combinations make use of motels an impractical option for truckers seeking to get their required rest as prescribed by federal law; and

Whereas, construction of additional interstate highway rest stops and expansion of existing facilities would enable truckers to comply with federal hours-of-service requirements safely and inexpensively, resulting in fewer highway accidents and improved safety for the motoring public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Congress of the United States be urged to provide federal funding for expansion of certain highway rest stops and for construction of additional interstate highway rest stops and, be it

Resolved further, That the Clerk of the House of Delegates transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the sense of the General Assembly of Virginia in this matter.

POM–565. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California relative to hemophilia relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 55

Whereas, The Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act of 1998 (P.L. 105–369) was enacted by Congress to provide for compassionate payments to individuals with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, who contracted the human immunodeficiency virus due to contaminated blood products; and

Whereas, In its review of the events surrounding the HIV infection of thousands of people with blood-clotting disorders, such as hemophilia, a 1995 study, entitled ''HIV and the Blood Supply,'' of the Institute of Medicine found a failure of leadership and an inadequate institutional decisionmaking process in the system responsible for ensuring blood safety, concluding that a failure of leadership led to less than effective donor screening, weak regulatory actions, and insufficient communication to patients about the risk of AIDS; and

Whereas, It is important for both the federal and state government to halt immediately the funding of a product or program if they become aware of a risk of infection when using the product and have not informed the public; and

Whereas, This legislation, named after a teenage hemophiliac who died from AIDS, was enacted to provide financial relief to the families of hemophiliacs who were devastated by the federal government's policy failure in its handling of the AIDS epidemic; and

Whereas, Although the relief bill has been enacted into law, Congress has been reluctant to fund it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to fully fund the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund, enacted into law under the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act of 1998, so that there is no delay between the authorization and the timely appropriation of this relief; and be it further

Resolved, That the President and the Congress of the United States are respectfully urged to withhold the appropriation of funds to programs that have not clearly disclosed to the consumer the risks of infection for a product the program manufactures or distributes; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House

of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

S. 2487: A bill to authorize appropriations for Fiscal year 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation (Rept. No. 106–345).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire :

S. 2878. A bill to commemorate the centennial of the establishment of the first national wildlife refuge in the United States on March 14, 1903, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 2879. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs and activities to address diabetes in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 2880. A bill to provide construction assistance for a project for a water transmission line from the Missouri River to the city of Williston, North Dakota; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon:

S. 2881. A bill to update an existing Bureau of Reclamation program by amending the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956, to establish a partnership program in the Bureau of Reclamation for small reclamation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2882. A bill to authorize Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies to augment water supplies for the Klamath Project, Oregon and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. INHOFE):

S.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution to disapprove a final rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency concerning water pollution; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. Res. 337. A resolution relative to the death of the Honorable John O. Pastore, formerly a Senator from the State of Rhode Island; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. CRAPO, Mr, WARNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2878: A bill to commemorate the centennial of the establishment of the first national wildlife refuge in the United States on March 14, 1903, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environmental and Public Works.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I am proud to come before the Senate today to introduce the ''National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commemoration Act of 2000''. This landmark bill commemorates the centennial of the first national wildlife refuge in the United States, established on March 14, 1903, by a great man and conservationist, President Theodore Roosevelt. By setting aside land at Indian River Lagoon on Pelican Island, Florida as a haven for birds, President Roosevelt began a conservation legacy known as the National Wildlife Refuge System.

Today, the National Wildlife Refuge System has evolved into the most comprehensive system of lands devoted to wildlife protection and management in the world—spanning nearly 93 million acres across the United States and its territories. By placing special emphasis on conservation, our nation's network of refuges ensures the continued protection of our wildlife resources, including threatened and endangered species, and land areas with significant wildlife-oriented recreational, historical and cultural value.

Currently, there are more than 500 refuges in the United States and its territories, providing important habitat for 700 bird species, 220 mammal species, 250 species of amphibians and reptiles, and over 200 fish species. The Refuge System also hosts some of our country's premiere fisheries, and serves a vital role in the protection of threatened and endangered species by preserving their critical habitats.

Approximately 98 percent of the Refuge System land is open to the public. Each year, the System attracts more than 34 million visitors to participate in a variety of recreational activities that include observing and photographing wildlife, fishing, hunting and taking part in system-sponsored educational programs. By providing the public with an opportunity to participate in these activities, refuges promote a sense of appreciation for the natural wonders of this nation and emphasize our important role as stewards of these lands.

The bill that I introduce today marks a milestone in the history of conservation and celebrates 100-years of the National Wildlife Refuge System on March 14, 2003. The bill commemorates the Refuge System by creating a Commission that will oversee the Centennial anniversary and promote public awareness and understanding of the importance of refuges to our nation. Additionally, the bill directs the Fish and Wildlife Service to prepare a long-term plan for the Refuge System that will enable the Service to look ahead and determine the future needs and priorities of the system network.

This bill celebrates the legacy of our national refuge lands, and recognizes the tireless efforts of numerous dedicated individuals from both the private and public sectors who have worked to preserve this invaluable national heritage. I encourage my colleagues to show your support for the National Wildlife Refuge System by co-sponsoring this legislation. I ask unanimous consent to print the text of the bill in the appropriate place in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2878

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commemoration Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) President Theodore Roosevelt began an American wildlife conservation legacy by establishing the first national wildlife refuge at Indian River Lagoon on Pelican Island, Florida, on March 14, 1903;

(2) the National Wildlife Refuge System is comprised of more than 93,000,000 acres of Federal land managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in more than 520 individual refuges and thousands of Waterfowl Production Areas located in all 50 States and the territories of the United States;

(3) the System is the only network of Federal land that—

(A) is dedicated singularly to wildlife conservation; and

(B) has wildlife-dependent recreation and environmental education as priority public uses;

(4) the System serves a vital role in the conservation of millions of migratory birds, hundreds of endangered and threatened species, some of the premier fisheries of the United States, marine mammals, and the habitats on which those species depend;

(5)(A) each year the System provides millions of Americans with opportunities to participate in wildlife-dependent recreation, including hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation; and

(B) through those activities, Americans develop an appreciation for the natural wonders and wildlife heritage of the United States;

(6) the occasion of the centennial of the beginning of the System, in 2003, presents a historic opportunity to enhance natural resource stewardship and expand compatible public enjoyment of the national wildlife refuges of the United States; and

(7) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service—

(A) recognizes that the System has a backlog of unmet critical operations and maintenance needs;

(B) has worked to prioritize those needs; and

(C) has made efforts to control the extent of the backlog.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commission established by section 4.

(2) SYSTEM.—The term ''System'' means the National Wildlife Refuge System established by the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd et seq.).

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the ''National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commission''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(1) The Secretary of the Interior.

(2) The Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(3) The Executive Director of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation established by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (16 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.).

(4) Up to 10 individuals, recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and appointed by the President, who—

(A) are not officers or employees of the Federal Government; and

(B) shall be broadly representative of the diverse beneficiaries of the System and have outstanding knowledge or appreciation of wildlife, fisheries, natural resource management, or wildlife-dependent recreation.

(5) The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives, who shall be nonvoting members.

(c) TERM; VACANCIES.—

(1) TERM.—A member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(2) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Commission—

(A) shall not affect the powers of the Commission; and

(B) shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made.

(d) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold the initial meeting of the Commission.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairperson.

(f) CHAIRPERSON.—The Secretary of the Interior shall serve as Chairperson of the Commission.

SEC. 5. DUTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

(1) develop and carry out, in cooperation with Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental entities (including public and private associations and educational institutions), a plan to commemorate, on March 14, 2003, the centennial of the beginning of the System;

(2) provide, in cooperation with the entities, host services for conferences on the System and assist in the activities of the conferences;

(3) make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior concerning the long-term plan for the System required under section 9; and

(4) make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior concerning measures that can be taken to enhance natural resources stewardship and expand compatible public enjoyment of the System.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than December 31 of the first calendar year that begins after the date on which the Commission holds its initial meeting, and December 31 of each calendar year thereafter through 2003, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the activities and plans of the Commission.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2004, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a final report on the activities of the Commission, including an accounting of all funds received and expended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. POWERS.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Commission may hold such meetings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out this Act.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from a Federal agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this Act.

(2) PROVISION OF INFORMATION.—On request of the Chairperson of the Commission, the head of the agency shall provide the information to the Commission.

(c) FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES.—Subject to subsection (e)(2), the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, shall provide to the Commission financial and administrative services (including services relating to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement).

(d) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as other agencies of the Federal Government.

(e) GIFTS.—

(1) ACCEPTANCE.—The Commission may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property to carry out this Act.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS.—The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation shall administer, on behalf of the Commission, any gifts of funds received under paragraph (1) in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Foundation.

(f) APPLICABLE LAW.—Federal laws (including regulations) governing procurement by Federal agencies shall not apply to the Commission, except for laws (including regulations) concerning working conditions, wage rates, and civil rights.

SEC. 7. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation for the services of the member to the Commission.

(b) STAFF.—

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR.—The Chief of the National Wildlife Refuge System of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall serve as the Executive Director of the Commission.

(2) OTHER PERSONNEL.—The Chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws (including regulations), appoint and terminate such personnel as are necessary to enable the Commission to perform the duties of the Commission.

(3) COMPENSATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the personnel appointed under paragraph (2) without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates.

(B) MAXIMUM RATE OF PAY.—The rate of pay for the personnel appointed under paragraph (2) shall not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(c) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member, the Executive Director, and other personnel of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for an employee of an agency under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the home or regular place of business of the individual in the performance of the duties of the Commission.

SEC. 8. TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.

(a) DATE.—The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits the report of the Commission under section 5(b)(2).

(b) DISPOSITION OF COMMISSION PROPERTY.—

(1) MEMORABILIA.—On termination of the Commission and after consultation with the Archivist of the United States and the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Executive Director may—

(A) deposit all books, manuscripts, miscellaneous printed matter, memorabilia, relics, and other similar materials of the Commission relating to the centennial of the beginning of the System in a Federal, State, or local library or museum; or

(B) make other disposition of such materials.

(2) OTHER PROPERTY.—The Executive Director may—

(A) use property that is acquired by the Commission and remains on termination of the Commission (other than property described in paragraph (1)) for the purposes of the System; or

(B) dispose of such property as excess or surplus property.

SEC. 9. LONG-TERM PLAN FOR SYSTEM.

After taking into consideration the recommendations of the Commission under section 5(a)(3), the Secretary of the Interior shall develop a long-term plan for the System to address—

(1) the priority staffing and operational needs as determined through—

(A) the refuge operating needs system; and

(B) comprehensive conservation plans for refuges required under section 4(e) of the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 668dd(e));

(2) the priority maintenance and construction needs as identified in the maintenance management system, the 5-year deferred maintenance list, and the 5-year construction list, developed by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(3) any transition costs as identified by the Secretary of the Interior in conducting analyses of newly acquired refuge lands.

SEC. 10. DESIGNATION OF YEAR OF THE WILDLIFE REFUGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress designates 2003 as the ''Year of the Wildlife Refuge''.

(b) PROCLAMATION.—Congress requests the President to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to celebrate the Year of the Wildlife Refuge with appropriate ceremonies and programs.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the activities of the Commission under this Act—

(1) $100,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(2) $250,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Chairman SMITH and

others to introduce the ''National Wildlife Refuge System Centennial Commemoration Act of 2000.''

First established by that great conservation leader, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1903, the National Wildlife Refuge System has grown today to be the premier system of reserves for the conservation of wildlife habitat and biological diversity in the world.

There are more than 500 refuges today, supporting over 1500 vertebrate species and thousands of species of plants. Open to the public, these refuges are the focal point of thousands of visitors each year that participate in wildlife viewing, photography, hunting, fishing or biking. They are places where families go to introduce youngsters to nature and to teach them the meaning of stewardship.

In some cases, refuges provide the last habitats for endangered species. In all cases, the nearly 93 million acres in the National Wildlife Refuge system provide special places for wildlife, fish, plants and people. These lands provide a buffer against ever-increasing development and are reserved for future generations to enjoy and learn from.

In Montana, we have seven National Wildlife Refuges including the 2,800 acre Lee Metcalf Refuge, the 15,500 acre Bowdoin National Wildlife Refuge in the Central Flyway, and the National Bison Range, originally set aside to protect the last of the great bison herds.

Mr. President, the bill that we are introducing today will celebrate the last 100 years of the National Wildlife Refuge System on Mary 14, 2003. In addition, the bill establishes a commission to look ahead and plan for the future, including a review of the backlog of maintenance needs at our refuges. It is my hope that this bill will increase public awareness and understanding of these national treasures.

I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BUNNING, and Mr. CRAIG)

S. 2879. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish programs and activities to address diabetes in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

PEDIATRIC DIABETES RESEARCH AND PREVENTION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today, on behalf of myself, Senator BREAUX, and Senator ABRAHAM, I am pleased to introduce the Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act. Both Senator BREAUX and Senator ABRAHAM have been leaders in the fight against diabetes.

Our legislation will help us reduce the tremendous toll that diabetes takes on our Nation's children and young people. Diabetes is a devastating, lifelong condition that affects people of every age, race, and nationality.

Sixteen million Americans suffer from diabetes, and about 800,000 new cases are diagnosed each year. It is one of our nation's most costly diseases in both human and economic terms. Diabetes is the leading cause of kidney failure, blindness in adults, and amputations not related to injury. It is a major risk factor for heart disease and stroke and shortens life expectancy up to 15 years. Moreover, diabetes costs our nation more than $105 billion a year in health-related expenditures. More than one out of every ten health care dollars and about one out of four Medicare dollars are spent on people with diabetes.

Unfortunately, there is no method to prevent or cure diabetes, and available treatments have only limited success in controlling its devastating consequences. The burden of diabetes is particularly heavy for children and young adults with type I, or insulin dependent diabetes, also known as juvenile diabetes. In type I diabetes, the immune system attacks the insulin-producing beta cell in the pancreas and destroys them. As a consequence, the pancreas produces little or no insulin. Juvenile diabetes is the second most common chronic disease affecting children. Moreover, it is one that they never outgrow.

As the founder of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I have met many children with diabetes who face a daily struggle to keep their blood glucose levels under control: kids like nine-year-old Nathan Reynolds, an active young boy from North Yarmouth who was Maine's delegate to the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation's Children's Congress last year. Nathan was diagnosed with diabetes in December of 1997, which forced him to change both his life and his family's life. He has learned how to take his blood—something his four-year-old brother reminds him to do before every meal—check his blood sugar level, and give himself an insulin shot on his own, sometimes with the help of his parents or his school nurse. Nathan told me that his greatest wish was that, just once, he could take a ''day off'' from his diabetes.

The sad fact is that children like Nathan with diabetes can never take a day off from their disease. There is no holiday from dealing with their diabetes. They face a lifetime of multiple daily finger pricks to check their blood sugar levels and daily insulin shots. Moreover, insulin is not a cure for diabetes, and it does not prevent the onset of serious complications. As a consequence, children like Nathan also face the possibility of lifelong disabling complications, such as kidney failure and blindness.

Reducing the health and human burden of diabetes as well as its enormous economic impact depends upon identifying the factors responsible for the disease and developing new methods for prevention, better treatment, and ultimately a cure. The Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act, which I am introducing today, will do just that.

One of the most important actions we can take is to establish a type I diabetes monitoring system. Currently, there is no way to track the incidence of type I diabetes across the country. As a consequence, the estimates for the number of people with type I diabetes from the American Diabetes Association, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health vary enormously—from 123,000 to over 1.5 million, a 13-fold variation.

According to noted epidemiologist Alex Languimer, ''Good monitoring does not necessarily ensure the making of right decisions, but it does reduce the risk of wrong ones.'' One of the best ways to define the prevalence and incidence of a disease, as well as to characterize and study populations, is to establish a registry specific to that disease. The bill I am introducing today directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS), acting through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), to create a National Registry on Juvenile Diabetes so that we can develop a national database on type I diabetes, including information about incidence and prevalence. The Secretary would also be directed to establish an advisory board of epidemiologists, clinicians, ethicists, patients and others to help guide this effort.

Obesity and inadequate physical activity—both major problems in the United States today—are important risk factors for type 2, or non-insulin dependent diabetes. Unfortunately, obesity is a significant and growing problem among children in the United States, which has led to a disturbing increase in the incidence of type 2 diabetes among young people. This is particularly alarming since type 2 diabetes has long been considered an ''adult'' disease. Nearly all of the documented cases of type 2 diabetes in young people have occurred in obese children, who are also at increased risk for the complications associated with the disease. Moreover, these complications will likely develop at an earlier age than if these children had developed type 2 diabetes as adults.

The Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act will direct the Secretary of HHS to implement a national public health effort to address type 2 diabetes among children, including: 1) enhanced surveillance systems and expanded research to better assess the prevalence of type 2 diabetes in young people and determine the extent to which type 2 diabetes is incorrectly diagnosed as type 1 diabetes among children; 2) assistance to States to establish coordinated school health programs and physical activity and nutrition demonstration projects to control

weight and to increase physical activity among school children; and 3) development and improvement of laboratory methods to assist in diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of diabetes.

In addition, the Collins, Breaux, Abraham legislation calls for long-term studies of persons with type 1 diabetes at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) where these individuals will be followed for 10 years or more. These long-term studies will examine disease manifestations, medical histories, environmental factors, development of complications, and other factors. This long-term analysis of type 1 diabetes will provide an invaluable basis for the identification of potential environmental triggers thought to precipitate the disease. It will also provide for the delineation of clinical characteristics or lab measures associated with the complications of diabetes as well as help to identify a potential study population for clinical trials.

Type 1 diabetes is considered an autoimmune disease, which results when the body's system for fighting infection turns against a part of the body. A variety of promising new approaches to treatment and prevention of autoimmune responses are currently under development. For the most part, however, these studies are conducted in adult populations. Moreover, at present, there is an insufficient infrastructure to conduct the clinical trials necessary to take advantage of new therapeutic approaches.

The Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act directs the Secretary of HHS, acting through the Director of the NIH, to support regional clinical centers for the cure of type 1 diabetes and through these centers, provides for: (1) a population of children appropriate for study; (2) well-trained clinical scientists able to conduct such trials; (3) appropriate clinical settings to house these studies; and (4) appropriate statistical capability, data, safety and other monitoring capacity.

And finally, the legislation directs the Secretary of HHS to provide for a national effort to develop a vaccine for type 1 diabetes. Animal studies suggest great promise for the development of a new vaccine to prevent type 1 diabetes in humans. The Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act provides for a combination of increased efforts in research and development of candidate vaccines, coupled with an enhanced ability to conduct large clinical trials in children.

The Pediatric Diabetes Research and Prevention Act will help us to better understand and ultimately conquer this disease which has had such a devastating impact on millions of American children and their families. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Ms. COLLINS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine, and I want to recognize her leadership in this area.

In the last couple of years, I have begun to focus my attention on childhood type 1 diabetes. What the Senator from Maine is offering today is clearly moving us well in advance.

I ask the Senator to allow me to be a sponsor of her legislation.

The Senator's effort struck a particularly loud chord with me, because it was exactly one year ago today that the Senate and I lost a friend and colleague, Ken Foss, related to his diabetes.

This Senate and this Congress should focus on diabetes, as we have cancer and other health areas in our country, to move more quickly toward a cure.

The Senator is so right in recognizing we have already moved a long way and there is a great deal known. My rather limited reading suggests that the great push forward might well break us into those areas of remedy, at least for type 1, and there is a great deal of work going on. My congratulations to the Senator for her leadership in that area. I stand to help in any way I can.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the kind, supportive words from my colleague. I am very honored to add him as a cosponsor of my bill.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself and Mr. DORGAN):

S. 2880. A bill to provide construction assistance for a project for a water transmission line from the Missouri River to the city of Williston, North Dakota; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE WATER PROJECT IN WILLISTON, NORTH DAKOTA

THE WILLISTON WATER TRANSMISSION LINE

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to authorize the Army Corps of Engineers to construct a new water transmission line from the Missouri River to the city of Williston. This project is very important to the reliability of the water supply for the residents of Williston and is needed to mitigate long-term consequences from construction of the Garrison Dam.

The construction of the Garrison Dam and creation of Lake Sakakawea by the Corps forced the city of Williston to relocate its water intake and treatment plant to its present location approximately five miles upstream of the city. As a requirement of the new location, a large-diameter transmission line was constructed to convey the entire city's water supply from the treatment plant to the city.

All of the water for the city's residents and businesses must flow through this single transmission line. As a result, the existing transmission line is the only link between the water treatment plant and the city's water distribution system.

The existing transmission line has been in service for nearly 40 years with limited maintenance to date in part because the line runs through an area near the river that has become supersaturated due to the rising water table behind the dam. As the transmission line continues to age, it has become susceptible to failures, as demonstrated in April 1998.

On April 8, 1998, maintenance crews discovered a major leak in the transmission line near the water treatment plant. City officials immediately alerted residents of the problem and imposed water restrictions to essential water uses only. Through an emergency declaration, the National Guard was enlisted to install an overland pipeline to help provide temporary water for the city. The high water table from Lake Sakakawea made repairs difficult with extensive pumping and dewatering procedures needed to locate and fix the broken pipeline. It took more than two weeks to make the necessary repairs. If the failure had occurred during the winter, repairs and temporary water service would have been almost impossible to provide. This experience supports the need for Williston to have a second transmission line from the water treatment plant to the city's water distribution system.

The bill I am introducing today will authorize the Corps to construct a new transmission line. The city has identified a new route for the line that provides improved access, avoids unstable site conditions, provides potential service for future industrial sites, while minimizing the length and cost of the new transmission line.

Mr. President, I believe the Federal government has a responsibility to assist communities mitigate the adverse consequences resulting from the construction of the Garrison Dam and creation of Lake Sakakawea. The Corps of Engineers built the Garrison Dam which resulted in the need for this project, and in my view the Corps should be responsible for addressing the unintended consequences of building that dam. This bill will help the Federal government live up to its responsibility and ensure that the residents of Williston have a reliable water supply. I urge my colleagues to review this legislation quickly so we can pass it this year, before there is another disruption to the city's water supply.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2882. A bill to authorize Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies to augment water supplies for the Klamath Project, Oregon and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE KLAMATH BASIN WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation, cosponsored by my colleague Mr. WYDEN, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Department of

the Interior, to conduct feasibility studies in the Klamath basin.

The Klamath Project in Oregon and California is one of the earliest federal reclamation projects. The Secretary of the Interior authorized development of the project on May 15, 1905, under provisions of the Reclamation Act of 1902. The project irrigates over 200,000 acres of farmland in south-central Oregon and north-central California. The two main sources of water supply for the project are Upper Klamath Lake and the Klamath River, as well as Clear Lake Reservoir, Gerber Reservoir, and Lost River, which are located in a closed basin. The total drainage area is approximately 5,700 square miles. The Klamath River is subject to an interstate compact between the States of Oregon and California.

There are also several wildlife refuges in the basin that are an important part of the western flyway. There are listed suckers in Upper Klamath Lake that require the lake to be maintained at certain levels throughout the summer. There are also salmon in the Klamath River for which federal agencies are seeking additional flow. It is my understanding that there will be significant additional flow requirements next year.

The Upper Basin has not been adjudicated by the State of Oregon, which is trying to use an alternative process to formal adjudication. The tribes in the basin are also seeking a resolution of their water rights claims.

In recent years, there has been growing concern about meeting the competing needs of various water uses in the Basin, including the needs of the farmers, the fish, the tribes and the wildlife refuges. There is a consensus in the basin about the need to increase overall water supplies in order to meet these growing needs and enhance the environment.

The bill I am introducing today is an effort to build on this consensus. I have discussed the concepts in this bill with a number of the stakeholders in the Upper Basin, and I am committed to a legislative process that will consider the views of the various interest groups in the basin. I know that there will be other issues that stakeholders will want considered, and I will endeavor to do so.

I believe it is vitally important, however, that we take the first step to enable the Department of the Interior to study ways to improve both the water quality and the water quantity in the Upper Klamath basin. There is significant private irrigation in the Upper Basin as well, and I am committed to a process that includes these water users as well.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GRAMM, and Mr. INHOFE):

S.J. Res. 50. A joint resolution to disapprove a final rule promulgated by the Environmental Protection Agency concerning water pollution; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

DISAPPROVING A FINAL RULE PROMULGATED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY CONCERNING WATER POLLUTION

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a joint resolution, co-sponsored by Senators BOB SMITH, HUTCHINSON, CRAIG, SHELBY, COVERDELL, ENZI, GRAMM, and INHOFE, revoking the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rule on Total Maximum Daily Loads under the Clean Water Act.

I strongly support the EPA's goal of cleaning up our nation's water bodies but disagree with its approach. We must accelerate cleanup of our rivers, lakes, and streams; unfortunately, the EPA's rule will not accomplish that goal. In fact, the EPA's hastily completed rule will divert billions of dollars from programs that are working to an unreasonable, prohibitively-expensive, and technically-unworkable program.

Since the EPA's draft TMDL rule was first published in August 1999, many stakeholders including states, industry, environmental organizations, the public, and Congress have all raised serious concerns. The EPA received over 34,000 public comments, most overwhelmingly in opposition to the rule. Twenty public forums were conducted; again, sentiments ran overwhelmingly in opposition to the EPA's rule. Twelve congressional hearings were held, revealing that the proposal is unreasonable and unworkable. The National Governors' Association denounced the rule as an inflexible, unfunded mandate that will eliminate opportunities to reduce overall pollution. In a May 19 letter, six environmental groups urged the EPA to ''withdraw the current version of the proposed rule, which is so fundamentally flawed that it would weaken the existing TMDL program.''

When it became clear that the EPA was ignoring concerns and proceeding to fast-track its rule, even in the fact of such serious opposition, Congress, rightly, exercised its oversight responsibility by including specific language in the Fiscal Year 2001 Military Construction Supplemental Appropriations bill to prevent finalization of the rule. Similar language was also passed by the House in the FY 2001 VA–HUM-Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. In clear defiance of Congress, the EPA promulgated the rule on July 11, 2000.

The Congressional Review Act, 5 U.S.C. 801–808 provides for expedited congressional review of agency rulemaking; specially, Section 802 provides a legislative procedure by which Congress can disapprove an agency's rule. This congressional review statute was approved in the 104th Congress for situations just such as this to reserve to Congress a mechanism for exercising its agency oversight responsibility.

It is important that we work to develop a program that will enhance, not hinder, our cleanup efforts. Repeatedly, the EPA was urged to repropose a rule that will accomplish our goal of more clean water more quickly; revoking the hurriedly completed rule will allow the EPA to focus its efforts on a program that will actually achieve the goals of the Clean Water Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the EPA's efforts to circumvent Congress and encouraging it to develop an effective proposal in collaboration with the public.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) were added as cosponsors of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose.

S. 555

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 555, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to continue payment of monthly educational assistance benefits to veterans enrolled at educational institutions during periods between terms if the interval between such periods does not exceed eight weeks.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to provide collective bargaining for rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear viscera and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear viscera, and for other purposes.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Washington

(Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1571

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1571, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for permanent eligibility of former members of the Selected Reserve for veterans housing loans.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act to provide to certain nationals of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti an opportunity to apply for adjustment of status under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2061, a bill to establish a crime prevention and computer education initiative.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2217, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Museum of the American Indian of the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children.

S. 2288

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2288, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to repeal provisions relating to the State enforcement of child support obligations and the disbursement of such support and to require the Internal Revenue service to collect and disburse such support through wage withholding and other means.

S. 2358

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2358, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the operation by the National Institutes of Health of an experimental program to stimulate competitive research.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2591

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2591, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax credits for alternative fuel vehicles and retail sale of alternative fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects, and to increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating chances for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and implementation of those Acts, and for other purposes.

S. 2690

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2690, a bill to reduce the risk that innocent persons may be executed, and for other purposes.

S. 2700

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2700, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2703

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2703, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 2709

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2709, to establish a Beef Industry Compensation Trust Fund with the duties imposed on products of countries that fail to comply with certain WTO dispute resolution decisions.

S. 2725

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2725, a bill to provide for a system of sanctuaries for chimpanzees that have been designated as being no longer needed in research conducted or supported by the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

S. 2739

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 2739, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the issuance of a semipostal stamp in order to afford the public a convenient way to contribute to funding for the establishment of the World War II Memorial.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2743, a bill to amend the Public Heath Service Act to develop an infrastructure for creating a national voluntary reporting system to continually reduce medical errors and improve patient safety to ensure that individuals receive high quality health care.

S. 2829

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2829, a bill to provide of an investigation and audit at the Department of Education.

S. 2842

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2842, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery.

S. 2868

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2868, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to children's health.

S.J. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) , the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN),

the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) were added as cosponsors of S.J.Res. 48, a joint resolution calling upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the 25th anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act.

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S.Res. 294, a resolution designating the month of October 2000 as ''Children's Internet Safety Month.''

S. RES. 301

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 301, a resolution designating August 16, 2000, as ''National Airborne Day.''

S. RES. 304

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S.Res. 304, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the development of educational programs on veterans' contributions to the country and the designation of the week that includes Veterans Day as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' for the presentation of such educational programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3457

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3457 intended to be proposed to S. 2536, an original bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3798

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3798 proposed to H .R. 4578, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3811

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3811 proposed to H.R. 4578, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3811 proposed to H.R. 4578, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 3845

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3845 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3848

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3848 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3849

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3849 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3853

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3853 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3855

At the request of Mr. TORRICELLI, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3855 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3860

At the request of Mr. CLELAND, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3860 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3863

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3863 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3874

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3874 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3876

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3876 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

AMENDMENT NO. 3877

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3877 proposed to H.R. 4810, a bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3877 proposed to H.R. 4810, supra.

SENATE RESOLUTION 337—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN O. PASTORE, FORMERLY A SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. DASCHLE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 337

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John O. Pastore, formerly a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, tonight, as we adjourn, we do so in memory of John O. Pastore, who served the people of Rhode Island here in the Senate from 1950 to 1976.

Senator Pastore's life was in many ways a realization of the American dream—characterized by humble beginnings, hard work, opportunity, and accomplishment. His father was an immigrant tailor who passed away when John was a young boy. From that time on, he and his four siblings were reared by their mother, who supported the family as a seamstress.

Senator Pastore earned his law degree from Northeastern University, through evening classes the school offered at the Providence YMCA. The family home was his first law office.

Senator Pastore, was initially elected to office in 1934, when he became a Member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives. He subsequently served as assistant state attorney general, lieutenant governor, and in 1945 became governor when his predecessor resigned for another office. Senator Pastore was then elected to two terms in his own right.

In 1950, he was elected to the U.S. Senate to fill a vacant seat. Two years later, he won the first of four full terms in this institution. He never lost an election.

Many individuals have passed through the doors of this great chamber, and each has left a unique imprint. Senators for years to come will think of John Pastore whenever the ''Pastore rule'', relating to germaneness of debate, is invoked.

Senator Pastore will be remembered in the United States Senate as a servant of the people and a man committed to his beliefs.

Today, the thoughts and prayers of the Senate are with his family and his constituents.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

BRYAN (AND FITZGERALD) AMENDMENT NO. 3883

Mr. BRYAN (for himself and Mr. FITZGERALD) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4578) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 164, line 19, strike ''$1,233,824,000,'' and insert ''$1,203,824,000,''.

On page 164, line 23, strike ''(16 U.S.C. 460*l*6a(i)):'' and insert ''(16 U.S.C. 460*l*6a(i)), of which $220,844,000'' shall be available for forest products:''.

On page 165, beginning on line 6, strike ''*Provided*'' and all that follows through ''accomplishment:'' on lines 11 and 12.

On page 165, line 25, strike ''$618,500,000, to remain available until expended:'' and insert ''$633,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which $419,593,000 shall be available for preparedness and fire use functions:''.

NICKLES AMENDMENT NO. 3884

Mr. NICKLES proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . FUNDING FOR NATIONAL MONUMENTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be used to establish or expand a national monument under the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) after July 17, 2000, except by Act of Congress.

BOXER AMENDMENT NO. 3885

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. REID (for Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventive application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophospate, carbamate, or organo- chlorine class as identified by the Environmental Protection Agency in National Parks in any area where children may be present.

BOND AMENDMENT NO. 3886

Mr. GORTON (for Mr. BOND) proposed an amendment to the amendment proposed by Mrs. BOXER to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. . PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR APPLICATION OF UNAPPROVED PESTICIDES IN CERTAIN AREAS THAT MAY BE USED BY CHILDREN.

(a) DEFINITION OF PESTICIDE.—In this section, the term ''pesticide'' has the meaning given the term in section 2 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 136).

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the application of a pesticide that is not approved for use by the Environmental Protection Agency in any area owned or managed by the Department of the Interior that may be used by children, including any national park.

(c) COORDINATION.—The Secretary of the Interior shall coordinate with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that the methods of pest control used by the Department of the Interior do not lead to unacceptable exposure of children to pesticides.

BINGAMAN AMENDMENT NO. 3887

Mr. REID (for Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 163, after line 23, add the following:

SEC. . (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) in 1990, pursuant to the Indian Self Determination and Education Assistance Act (ISDEA), 25 U.S.C. et seq., a class action lawsuit was filed by Indian tribal contractors and tribal consortia against the United States, the Secretary of the Interior and others seeking redress for failure to fully pay for indirect contract support costs (Ramah Navajo Chapter v. Babbitt, 112 F.3d 1455 (10th Cir. 1997));

(2) the parties negotiated a partial settlement of the claim totaling $76,200,000 which was approved by the court on May 14, 1999;

(3) the partial settlement was paid by the United States on September 14, 1999, in the amount of $82,000,000;

(4) the Judgment Fund, 31 U.S.C. 1304, was established to pay for legal judgments awarded to plaintiffs who have filed suit against the United States;

(5) the Contract Disputes Act of 1978 requires that the Judgment Fund be reimbursed by the responsible agency following the payment of an award from the Fund;

(6) because the potential exists that Indian program funds in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the Indian Health Service (IHS) would be used in Fiscal Year 2001 to reimburse the Judgment Fund, resulting in significant financial and administrative disruptions in the BIA, the IHS, and the Indian tribes who rely on such funds.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services should declare Indian program funds unavailable for purposes of reimbursing the judgment fund; and

(2) if the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services determines that there are no other available funds, the agencies through the Administration should seek an appropriation of funds from Congress to provide for reimbursement of the judgment fund.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

LANDRIEU AMENDMENT NO. 3888

Ms. LANDRIEU proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . EXPANSION OF ADOPTION CREDIT.

(a) SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—

(1) CREDIT AMOUNT.—Paragraph (1) of section 23(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of credit) is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter—

''(A) in the case of a special needs adoption, $10,000, or

''(B) in the case of any other adoption, the amount of the qualified adoption expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer.''.

(2) YEAR CREDIT ALLOWED.—Section 23(a)(2) of such Code (relating to year credit allowed) is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''In the case of a special needs adoption, the credit allowed under paragraph (1) shall be allowed for the taxable year in which the adoption becomes final.''.

(3) DOLLAR LIMITATION.—Section 23(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)(B)'', and

(B) by striking ''($6,000, in the case of a child with special needs)''.

(4) DEFINITION OF SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—Section 23(d) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) SPECIAL NEEDS ADOPTION.—The term 'special needs adoption' means the final adoption of an individual during the taxable year who is an eligible child and who is a child with special needs.''.

(5) DEFINITION OF CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—Section 23(d)(3) of such Code (defining child with special needs) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) CHILD WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.—The term 'child with special needs' means any child if a State has determined that the child's ethnic background, age, membership in a minority or sibling groups, medical condition or physical impairment, or emotional handicap makes some form of adoption assistance necessary.''.

(b) INCREASE IN INCOME LIMITATIONS.—Section 23(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to income limitation) is amended —

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''$75,000'' and inserting ''$63,550 ($105,950 in the case of a joint return)'', and

(B) by striking ''$40,000'' and inserting ''the applicable amount'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable amount, with respect to any taxpayer, for the taxable year shall be an amount equal to the excess of—

''(i) the maximum taxable income amount for the 31 percent bracket under the table contained in section 1 relating to such taxpayer and in effect for the taxable year, over

''(ii) the dollar amount in effect with respect to the taxpayer for the taxable year under subparagraph (A)(i).

''(D) COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after 2001, each dollar amount under subparagraph (A)(i) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2000'

for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(ii) ROUNDING RULES.—If any amount after adjustment under clause (i) is not a multiple of $1,000, such amount shall be rounded to the next lower multiple of $1,000.''.

(c) ADOPTION CREDIT MADE PERMANENT.—Subclauses (A) and (B) of section 23(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining eligible child) are amended to read as follows:

''(A) who has not attained age 18, or

''(B) who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 23(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''(1)'' and inserting ''(1)(B)''.

(2) Section 23(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking ''(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(a)(1)(B)''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

ASHCROFT AMENDMENT NO. 3889

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 164, line 23, strike ''6a(i):'' and insert ''6a(i), of which not less than an additional $500,000 shall be available for use for law enforcement purposes in the national forest that, during fiscal year 2000, had both the greatest number of methamphetamine dumps and the greatest number of methamphetamine laboratory law enforcement actions in the national forest system:

HATCH (AND BINGAMAN) AMENDMENT NO. 3890

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 126, line 2, before the period, insert the following: '', and of which $2,250,000 shall be used to construct and maintain the Four Corners Interpretive Center authorized by Public Law 106–143''.

ROTH AMENDMENT NO. 3891

Mr. ROTH proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 125, line 25, strike ''58,209,000,'' and insert the following: ''63,249,000, of which $1,000,000 shall be for the Lewes Maritime Historic Park,''.

SESSIONS AMENDMENTS NOS 3892–3893

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. SESSIONS) proposed two amendments to the amendments to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3892

On page 125, line 25, before ''of which'' insert the following: ''of which $1,000,000 shall be available to carry out exhibitions at and acquire interior furnishings for the Rosa Parks Library and Museum, Alabama, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3893

On page 122, line 9, before the period, insert the following: '', of which $1,000,000 shall be used for acquisition of land around the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, Alabama and of which not more than $6,500,000 shall be used for acquisition management.''

LANDRIEU (AND BREAUX) AMENDMENTS NOS. 3894–3895

Mr. ROTH (for Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. BREAUX)) proposed two amendments to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra: as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3894

On page 125, line 25, after $58,209,000,'' insert ''of which not less than $500,000 shall be used to develop a preservation plan for the Cane River National Heritage Area, Louisiana, and''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3895

On page 126, line 2, before the period at the end, insert '', and of which $250,000 shall be available to the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training for the development of a model for heritage education through distance learning''.

FEINSTEIN AMENDMENT NO. 3896

Mr. ROTH (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 165, at the end of line 25 colon, insert: ''of which not less than $2,400,000 shall be made available for fuels reduction activities at Sequoia National Monument.

CHAFEE AMENDMENT NO. 3897

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. L. CHAFEE) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 215, line 24, strike ''or'' and insert ''and'', and on page 216, line 1, strike ''at'' and insert ''of''.

MURKOWSKI AMENDMENT NO. 3898

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, surpa; as follows:

''SEC. . Of the funds appropriated in Title I of this Act, The Secretary shall provide $300,000 in the form of a grant to the Alaska Pacific University's Institute of the North for the development of a curriculum on the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). At a minimum this ANILCA curriculum should contain components which explain the law, its legislative history, the subsequent amendments, and the principal case studies on issues that have risen during 20 years of implementation of the Act; examine challenges faced by conservation system managers in implementing the Act; and link ANILCA to other significant land and resource laws governing Alaska's lands and resources. In addition, within the funds provided, Alaska Pacific University's Institute of the North shall gather the oral histories of key Members of Congress in 1980 and before to demonstrate the intent of Congress in fashioning ANILCA, as well as members of President Carter's and Alaska Governor Hammond's Administrations, Congressional staff and stakeholders who were involved in the creation of the Act.''

SNOWE AMENDMENT NO. 3899

Mr. ROTH (for Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 125, line 25, after ''$58,209,000'', insert '', of which not less than $730,000 shall be available for use by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, and''.

REID AMENDMENT NO. 3900

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

''SEC. . CLARIFICATION OF TERMS OF CONVEYANCE TO NYE COUNTY, NEVADA.

''Section 132 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000 (113 Stat. 1535, 1501A–165), is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) CONVEYANCE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall convey to the County, subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest in and to the parcels of public land described in paragraph (2).

''(B) PRICE.—The conveyance under paragraph (1) shall be made at a price determined to be appropriate for the conveyance of land for educational facilities under the Act of June 14, 1926 (commonly known as the ''Recreation and Public Purposes Act'') (43 U.S.C. 869 et seq.).''.

EDWARDS AMENDMENTS NOS. 3901–3902

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. EDWARDS) proposed two amendments to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3901

On page 164, line 23 of the bill, immediately preceding the ':'' insert ''and of which not less than an additional $500,000 shall be available for law enforcement purposes on the Pisgah and Nantahala national forests''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3902

Intended to be proposed by Mr. EDWARDS On page 130, add the following after line 24:

''For an additional amount for ''Surveys, Investigations, and Research'', $1,800,000, to remain available until expended, to repair or replace stream monitoring equipment and associated facilities damaged by natural disasters: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

TORRICELLI AMENDMENT NO. 3903

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 164, line 14, before the period at the end insert '', of which not less than $750,000 shall be available to complete an updated study of the New York-New Jersey highlands under section 1244(b) of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (104 Stat. 3547)''.

FEINGOLD (AND KOHL) AMENDMENT NO. 3904

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. KOHL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 125, line 11, strike ''$1,443,795,000,'' and insert the following: ''$1,443,995,000, of which $200,000 shall be available for the conduct of a wilderness suitability study at Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisconsin, and''.

KERREY (AND HAGEL) AMENDMENT NO. 3905

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. KERREY (for himself and Mr. HAGEL)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 126, line 22, before the period at the end, insert ': *Provided further*, That not

less than $2,350,000 shall be used for construction at Ponca State Park, Nebraska, including $1,500,000 to be used for the design and construction of educational and informational displays for the Missouri Recreation Rivers Research and Education Center, Nebraska''.

DURBIN AMENDMENT NO. 3906

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 159, strike lines 13 through 19 and insert the following:

''SEC. 119. None of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin unless a plan for such a refuge is consistent with a partnership agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corps of Engineers entered into on April 16, 1999 and is submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations thirty (30) days prior to the establishment of the refuge.''

CRAPO AMENDMENT NO. 3907

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. CRAPO) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follows:

On page 225, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

SEC. 3 . BACKCOUNTRY LANDING STRIP ACCESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to take any action to close permanently an aircraft landing strip described in subsection (b).

(b) AIRCRAFT LANDING STRIPS.—An aircraft landing strip referred to in subsection (a) is a landing strip on Federal land administered by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture that is commonly known and has been or is consistently used for aircraft landing and departure activities.

(c) PERMANENT CLOSURE.—For the purposes of subsection (a), an aircraft landing strip shall be considered to be closed permanently if the intended duration of the closure is more than 180 days in any calendar year.

GORTON (AND BYRD) AMENDMENT NO. 3908

Mr. ROTH (for Mr. GORTON (for himself and Mr. BYRD)) proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4578, supra; as follow:

On page 130, line 4, strike ''$847,596,000'' and insert ''$846,596,000'';

On page 165, line 25, strike ''$618,500,000'' and insert ''$613,500,000'';

On page 164, line 19, strike ''$1,233,824,000'' and insert ''$1,231,824,000''.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

BOXER AMENDMENT NO. 3909

Mrs. BOXER proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4516) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

''None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventative application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as determined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to U.S. Capitol buildings or grounds maintained or administered by the Architect of the U.S. Capitol.''

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 27, 2000 in SR–328a at 9:00 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review proposals to establish an international school lunch program.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 26, 2000 in SR–328a at 9:00 a.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review the federal sugar program.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry will meet on July 20, 2000 in SD–106 at 9:00 a.m. The purpose of this meeting will be to examine the implications of high energy prices on U.S. agriculture.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION AND PRICE COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry subcommittee on Production and Price Competitiveness will meet on July 18, 2000 in SR–328a at 2:30 p.m. The purpose of this hearing will be to review proposals to examine the future of U.S. agricultural export programs.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet today, July 17, 2000 from 1:30 p.m.–4:30 p.m. in Dirksen 628 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 337, submitted earlier by Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 337) relative to the death of the Honorable John O. Pastore, formerly a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, tonight, as we adjourn, we do so in memory of John O. Pastore, who served the people of Rhode Island here in the Senate from 1950 to 1976.

Senator Pastore's life was in many ways a realization of the American dream—characterized by humble beginnings, hard work, opportunity, and accomplishment. His father was an immigrant tailor who passed away when John was a young boy. From that time on, he and his four siblings were reared by their mother, who supported the family as a seamstress.

Senator Pastore earned his law degree from Northeastern University, through evening classes the school offered at the Providence YMCA. The family home was his first law office.

Senator Pastore was initially elected to office in 1934, when he became a Member of the Rhode Island House of Representatives. He subsequently served as assistant state attorney general, lieutenant governor, and in 1945 became governor when his predecessor resigned for another office. Senator Pastore was then elected to two terms in his own right.

in 1950, he was elected to the U.S. Senate to fill a vacant seat. Two years later, he won the first of four full terms in this institution. He never lost an election.

Many individuals have passed through the doors of this great chamber, and each has left a unique imprint. Senators for years to come will think of John Pastore whenever the ''Pastore rule'', relating to germaneness of debate, is invoked.

Senator Pastore will be remembered in the United States Senate as a servant of the people and a man committed to his beliefs.

Today, the thoughts and prayers of the Senate are with his family and his constituents.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and a statement of explanation appear at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 337) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 337

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John O. Pastore, formerly a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 18, 2000

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, July 18.

I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of the Interior appropriations bill under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, further, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, upon convening at 9:15 a.m., the Senate will immediately resume debate on the Interior appropriations bill, with Senators FEINGOLD and BINGAMAN in control of 15 minutes each to offer and debate their amendments. Following that debate, at approximately 9:45, the Senate will proceed to rollcall votes on the remaining amendments to the Interior appropriations bill, as well as on final passage. Following the disposition of the Interior appropriations bill, the Senate will begin the final four votes on the reconciliation bill. Therefore, Senators should be prepared to stay in the Chamber for up to 12 votes, with all votes after the first vote limited to 10 minutes each.

For the remainder of the day, it is expected that the Senate will begin consideration of the Agriculture appropriations bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:15 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 9:44 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, July 18, 2000, at 9:15 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 17, 2000:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

NORMAN Y. MINETA, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE WILLIAM M. DALEY.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 18, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 19

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the Fish and Wildlife Services's administration of the Federal Aid Program.
SD–406

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority.
SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

10 a.m.

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on certain legislative proposals and issues relevant to the operations of Inspectors General, including S. 870, to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) to increase the efficiency and accountability of Offices of Inspecter General within Federal departments, and an Administrative proposal to grant statutory law enforcement authority to 23 Inspectors General.
SD–342

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Securities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on adapting a 1930's financial reporting model to the 21st century.
SD–538

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the status of the Biological Opinions of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on the operations of the Federal hydropower system of the Columbia River.
SD–366

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the National Indian Gaming Commission.
SR–485

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the National Science Foundation, focusing on current research activities.
SR–253

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine giving permanent normal trade relations status to Communist China, focusing on human rights, labor, trade and economic implications.
SD–419

JULY 20

9 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine implications of high energy prices on Unites States agriculture.
SD–106

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold oversight hearings on the United States General Accounting Office's investigation of the Cerro Grande Fire in the State of New Mexico, and from Federal agencies on the Cerro Grande Fire and their fire policies in general.
SD–366

Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to consider the Department of Veterans' Affairs adjudication, and pending legislation including S. 1810, to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures, and S. 2544, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects.
SR–418

Armed Services
To hold closed hearings on the situation in Iraq and U.S. military operations in and around Iraq.
S–407, Capitol

Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the General Accounting Office's performance and accountability review.
SR–428A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on purchasing tickets through the Internet, and whether or not it benefits the consumer.
SR–253

10 a.m.

Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 2688, to amend the Native American Languages Act to provide for the support of Native American Language Survival Schools.
SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings on genetic information in the workplace.
SD–430

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the conduct of monetary policy by the Federal Reserve.
SH–216

Foreign Relations
Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee
To hold hearings on issues relating to the governement of Afghanistan, focusing on the conduct of the Taliban (Militia tha rules Afghanistan).
SD–419

2 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2757, to provide for the transfer or other disposition of certain lands at Melrose Air Force Range, New Mexico, and Yakima Training Center, Washington; S. 2691, to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon; S. 2754, to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Utah; S. 2834, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey property to the Greater Yuma Port Authority of Yuma County, Arizona, for use as an international port of entry; H.R. 3023, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Reclamation, to convey property to the Greater Yuma Port Authority of Yuma County, Arizona, for use as an international port of entry; and H.R. 4579, to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah.
SD–366

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles, with Annexes, done at Caracas December 1, 1996, (the ''Convention''), which was signed by the United States, subject to ratification, on December 13, 1996 (Treaty Doc. 105-48); international Plant Protection Convention (IPPC), adopted at the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations at Rome on November 17, 1997 (Treaty Doc. 106-23); food Aid Convention 1999, which was opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from May 1 through June 30, 1999. Convention was signed by the United States June 16, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106-14); convention (No. 176) Concerning Safety and Health in Mines, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 82nd Session in Geneva on June 22, 1995 (Treaty Doc. 106-08); and the nomination of Everett L.

Mosley, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Agency for International Development.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement implementing the October 1999 announcement by the President to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest for increased protection.

SD–366

JULY 25

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the National Missile Defense Program.

SH–216

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on Natural Gas Supply.

SD–366

10 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act.

SR–485

Finance

Taxation and IRS Oversight Subcommittee

To hold hearings on federal income tax issues relating to proposals to encourage the creation of public open spaces in urban areas and the preservation of farm and other rural lands for conservation purposes.

SD–215

JULY 26

9 a.m.

Small Business

Business meeting to markup S. 1594, to amend the Small Business Act and Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

SR–428A

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to review the federal sugar program.

SR–328A

10 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 1801, to provide for the identification, collection, and review for declassification of records and materials that are of extraordinary public interest to the people of the United States.

SD–342

11 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on potential timber sale contract liability incurred by the government as a result of timber sale contract cancellations.

SD–366

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2526, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act.

SR–485

JULY 27

9 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings to review proposals to establish an international school lunch program.

SR–328A

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.

345 Cannon Building

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Legislative Branch Appropriations bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6991–S7082

Measures Introduced: Five bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2878–2882, S.J. Res. 50, and S. Res. 337. **Page S7072**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2487, to authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–345) **Page S7072**

Measures Passed:

Legislative Branch Appropriations: Senate passed H.R. 4516, making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, after incorporating the text of S. 2603, Senate companion measure, and after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto, as follows: **Pages S7057–65**

Boxer Amendment No. 3909, to limit funds for the preventative application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as determined by the Environmental Protection Agency to U.S. Capitol buildings or grounds maintained or administered by the Architect of the U.S. Capitol. **Page S7057**

Senate insisted on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair was authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Bennett, Stevens, Craig, Cochran, Feinstein, Durbin, and Byrd. **Page S7065**

Death of Former Senator Pastore: Senate agreed to S. Res. 337, relative to the death of the Honorable John O. Pastore, formerly a Senator from the State of Rhode Island. **Pages S7081–82**

Interior Appropriations: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 4578, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7007–09, S7014–43, S7055–57**

Adopted:

Roth (for Daschle) Amendment No. 3778, to designate funds for the United Sioux Tribes of South Dakota Development Corporation for the purpose of employment assistance. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Edwards) Modified Amendment No. 3779, to make funds available for the acquisition of lands on the Pisgah National Forest. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Domenici) Modified Amendment No. 3784, to provide for the management of the Valles Caldera National Preserve. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Stevens) Modified Amendment No. 3786, to direct monies from the federal subsistence account to the State of Alaska to provide effective dual management under the federal subsistence fisheries program. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Stevens) Modified Amendment No. 3787, to authorize the accrual of interest on escrow accounts established under section 1411 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act and relating to re-withdrawn lands. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3788, to provide monies to the City of Craig, Alaska in lieu of municipal land entitlements authorized under the Alaska Statehood Act. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3789, to provide for the relief of Harvey R. Redmond. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Ashcroft) Amendment No. 3889, to provide funding for the Department of the Interior to fight methamphetamine production and trafficking in our national forests. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Hatch) Amendment No. 3890, to provide funds for the construction of the Four Corners Interpretive Center.

Roth Amendment No. 3891, to make funds available for the Lewes Maritime Historic Park. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Sessions) Amendment No. 3892, to provide funding to carry out exhibitions at and acquire interior furnishings for the Rosa Parks Library and Museum, Alabama, with an offset. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Sessions) Amendment No. 3893, to provide funding for acquisition of land around the Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge, Alabama, with an offset. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Landrieu/Breaux) Amendment No. 3894, to set aside funding for the development of a preservation plan for Cane River National Heritage Area, Louisiana. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Landrieu/Breaux) Amendment No. 3895, to set aside funding for the National Center for Preservation Technology and Training for the development of a model for heritage education through distance learning. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 3896, to make funds available for fuels reduction activities at Sequoia National Monument. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Chafee) Amendment No. 3897, to make certain technical corrections. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Murkowski) Amendment No. 3898, to create a curriculum for the instruction of Federal Land Managers in Alaska on the contents and legislative history of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Snowe) Amendment No. 3899, to set aside additional funding for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Reid) Amendment No. 3900, to clarify terms of conveyance to Nye County, Nevada. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Edwards) Amendment No. 3901, to make funds available for law enforcement purposes on the Pisgah and Nantahala national forests. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Edwards) Amendment No. 3902, to make funds available for "Surveys, Investigations, and Research" to remain available until expended, to repair or replace stream monitoring equipment and associated facilities damaged by natural disasters. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3903, to provide that funding shall be available to complete an updated study of the New York-New Jersey highlands under the Forest Stewardship Act of 1990. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Feingold/Kohl) Amendment No. 3904, to make funds available for the conduct of a wilderness suitability study at Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisconsin. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Kerrey/Hagel) Amendment No. 3905, to set aside funding for the design and construction of educational and informational displays for the Missouri Recreation Rivers Research and Education Center, Nebraska. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Durbin) Amendment No. 3906, to provide that none of the funds in this Act may be used to establish a new National Wildlife Refuge in the Kankakee River basin unless a plan for such a refuge is consistent with a partnership agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Army Corp of Engineers. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Crapo) Amendment No. 3907, to help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and the airspace over that land. **Pages S7055–57**

Roth (for Gorton/Byrd) Amendment No. 3908, to limit certain funding. **Pages S7055–57**

Withdrawn:

Thomas Amendment No. 3800, to provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the management of conflicting activities and uses. **Pages S7016–24**

Pending:

Reed Amendment No. 3798, to increase funding for weatherization assistance grants, with an offset. **Pages S7014–16**

Bryan/Fitzgerald Amendment No. 3883, to reduce the Forest Service timber sale budget by $30,000,000 and increase the wildland fire management budget by $15,000,000. **Pages S7024–27**

Lieberman Modified Amendment No. 3811, to provide funding for maintenance of a Northeast Home Heating Oil Reserve, with an offset. **Pages S7027–29**

Nickles Amendment No. 3884, to defend the Constitutional system of checks and balances between the Legislative and Executive branches. **Pages S7029–32**

Reid (for Boxer) Amendment No. 3885, to provide that none of the funds appropriated under this Act may be used for the preventive application of a pesticide containing a known or probable carcinogen, a category I or II acute nerve toxin or a pesticide of the organophosphate, carbamate, or organochlorine class as identified by the Environmental Protection Agency in National Parks in any area where children may be present. **Page S7032**

Gorton (for Bond) Amendment No. 3886, to prohibit use of funds for application of unapproved pesticides in certain areas that may be used by children. **Pages S7032–34**

Reid (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 3887, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the protection of Indian program monies from judgment fund claims. **Pages S7034–35**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill and certain amendments to be proposed thereto, on Tuesday, July 18, 2000.

Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act: Senate resumed consideration of H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the text of S. 2839, Senate companion measure, as an amendment, which was subsequently agreed to, and taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7043–55**

Adopted:

Roth (for Bond) Amendment No. 3851 (to Amendment No. 3850), to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals. **Page S7049**

Reid (for Durbin) Amendment No. 3850, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for health insurance costs of self-employed individuals. **Page S7049**

Reid (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3854, to ensure that children enrolled in the Medicaid program at highest risk for lead poisoning are identified and treated. **Page S7050**

Reid (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3855, to amend the Social Security Act to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare coverage of individuals disabled with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. **Page S7050**

Reid (for Cleland) Amendment No. 3859, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude United States savings bond income from gross income if used to pay long-term care expenses. **Page S7050**

Reid (for Cleland) Amendment No. 3860, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the enhanced deduction for corporate donations of computer technology to public libraries and community centers. **Pages S7050–51**

Dorgan Amendment No. 3877, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat payments under the Conservation Reserve Program as rentals from real estate, expand the applicability of section 179 expensing, provide an exclusion for gain from the sale of farmland, and allow a deduction for 100 percent of the health insurance costs of self-employed individuals. **Page S7050**

Landrieu Amendment No. 3888, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the adoption credit to provide assistance to adoptive parents of special needs children. **Pages S7048, S7050**

Rejected:

By 45 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 198), Feingold motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions that the Committee report it back along with legislation that would substantially extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. **Page S7043–44**

By 46 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 200), Moynihan Amendment No. 3863, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7045**

Earlier, Amendment No. 3863 (listed above), was ruled germane.

By 40 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 201), Feingold Amendment No. 3845, to strike the adjustment to the rate brackets and to further adjust the standard deduction. **Page S7046**

Withdrawn:

Reid (for Dodd) Amendment No. 3876, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the unified credit exemption and the qualified family-owned business interest deduction, to increase, expand, and simplify the child and dependent care tax credit, to expand the adoption credit for special needs children, to provide incentives for employer-provided child care. **Pages S7043, S7051**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3868, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to maintain exemption of Alaska from dyeing requirements for exempt diesel fuel and kerosene. **Page S7043**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3869, to amend section 415 of the Internal Revenue Code. **Page S7043**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3870, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a charitable deduction for certain expenses incurred in support of Native Alaskan subsistence whaling. **Page S7043**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3871, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide for equitable treatment of trusts created to preserve the benefits of Alaska Native Settlement Act. **Page S7043**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3872, to clarify the tax treatment of passengers filling empty seats on noncommercial airplanes. **Page S7043**

Roth (for Stevens) Amendment No. 3873, to amend title 26 of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1986 to allow income averaging for fishermen without negative Alternative Minimum Tax treatment, for the creation of risk management accounts for fishermen. **Page S7043**

Brownback Modified Amendment No. 3849, to provide tax relief for farmers. **Page S7044**

Reid (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3856, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to lower the adjusted gross income threshold for deductible disaster casualty losses to 5 percent, to make such deduction an above-the-line deduction, to allow an election to take such deduction for the preceding or

succeeding year, and to eliminate the marriage penalty for individuals suffering casualty losses.

Page S7051

Reid (for Torricelli) Amendment No. 3857, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the marriage penalty for individuals suffering casualty losses. **Page S7051**

Roth (for Grams) Amendment No. 3861, to repeal the increase in tax on Social Security benefits.

Page S7051

Roth (for Abraham) Modified Amendment No. 3862, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the need to repeal the marriage tax penalty and improve coverage of prescription drugs under the Medicare program this year. **Page S7051**

Reid Amendment No. 3866 (to Amendment No. 3861), to express the sense of the Senate that the general fund transfer mechanism included in the Grams Social Security amendment should be used to extend the life of the Medicare trust fund through 2030, to ensure that Medicare remains a strong health insurance program for our nation's seniors and that its payments to health providers remain adequate. **Page S7051**

Roth (for Grams) Amendment No. 3867 (to Amendment No. 3861), to repeal the increase in tax on Social Security benefits. **Page S7051**

Reid (for Wellstone) No. 3879, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the restoration of reductions in payments under the Medicare program caused by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Page S7051

Reid (for Wellstone) No. 3880, to express the sense of the Senate regarding the restoration of reductions in payments under the Medicare program caused by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

Page S7051

Nickles (for Lott) Amendment No. 3882, to provide a substitute. **Page S7051**

Pending:

Burns Amendment No. 3874, to repeal of the modification of the installment method. **Page S7055**

Reid (for Hollings) Amendment No. 3875, to pay down the debt by striking the tax cuts. **Page S7055**

Nickles (for Lott) Amendment No. 3881, to provide a substitute. **Page S7055**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate took the following actions:

Roth Modified motion to waive all points of order under the budget process, arising from the earned-income credit component. Subsequently, Senate failed to sustain the point of order against section 4 of the bill that it violates section 313 of the Congressional Budget Act. **Page S7043**

By 48 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 199), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected Roth motion to waive any point of order made against Amendments numbered 3864 and 3865 (to Amendment No. 3863). **Pages S7044–45**

Senate sustained a point of order against Roth Amendment No. 3864, to strike sunset provision, as being in violation of the Byrd Rule of the Budget Act, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S7045**

Senate sustained a point of order against Roth Amendment No. 3865 (to Amendment No. 3863), to strike sunset provision, as being in violation of the Byrd Rule of the Budget Act, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S7045**

By 30 yeas to 68 nays (Vote No. 202), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Feingold Amendment No. 3846, to provide a nonrefundable credit against tax for costs of COBRA continuation insurance and allow extended COBRA coverage for qualified retirees. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S7046–47

By 45 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 203), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Harkin Amendment No. 3847, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S7047–48

By 51 yeas to 47 nays (Vote No. 204), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Kennedy Amendment No. 3848, to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to permit States to expand coverage under the Medicaid program and SCHIP to parents of enrolled children. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S7048–49**

By 49 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 205), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget

Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Reid (for Durbin) Modified Amendment No. 3852, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow small business employers a credit against income tax for employee health insurance expenses paid or incurred by the employer. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell.

Pages S7049–50

By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 206), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected a motion to waive certain provisions of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to the consideration of Reid (for Robb) Amendment No. 3853, to make the bill effective upon enactment of a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Subsequently, a point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S7050**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Tuesday, July 18, 2000, with votes to occur on pending amendments and final passage. Further, that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and the Chair be authorized to appoint the following conferees on the part of the Senate: Senators Roth, Lott, and Moynihan.

Page S7055

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination:

Norman Y. Mineta, of California, to be Secretary of Commerce. **Page S7082**

Messages From the House: **Page S7067**

Measures Referred: **Page S7067**

Petitions: **Pages S7067–72**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S7072–76**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7076–78**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7079–81**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S7081**

Authority for Committees: **Page S7081**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7066–67**

Text of H.R. 4205, as Previously Passed:

Pages S6871–S6982 (Record of 7–14–00)

Record Votes: Nine record votes were taken today. (Total—206) **Pages S7044–S7050**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 9:44 p.m., until 9:15 a.m. on Tuesday, July 18, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7082.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

END-OF-LIFE CARE

Special Committee on Aging: Committee held hearings to examine certain professional and public education initiatives that are under way to inform Americans about appropriate end-of-life care that may improve care, ease pain, and help families as the nation ages, receiving testimony from Joanne Lynn, Arlington, Virginia, on behalf of the Americans for Better Care of the Dying, and the RAND Center to Improve Care of the Dying; James A. Tulsky, Duke University Department of Medicine Institute on Care at the End of Life, Durham, North Carolina, on behalf of the Durham Veterans Affairs Medical Center; Linda Todd, Hospice of the Siouxland, Sioux City, Iowa, on behalf of the National Hospice and Palliative Care Organization; Richard Rosenquist, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, on behalf of the Iowa City Veterans Affairs Medical Center Pain Management Clinic; Linda Emanuel, Northwestern University, Chicago, Illinois, on behalf of the Education for Physicians on End-of-Life Care Project, Shelly Twiford, Dakota City, Nebraska; and Peggy Gulotta, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 4 public bills, H.R. 4864–4867; and 1 resolution, H. Con. Res. 372, were introduced. **Page H6354**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows.

H.R. 4437, to grant to the United States Postal Service the authority to issue semipostals, amended (H. Rept. 106–734, Pt. 1);

H.R. 2671, to provide for the Yankton Sioux Tribe and the Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska certain benefits of the Missouri River Basin Pick-Sloan project (H. Rept. 106–735);

H.R. 2435, to expand the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include the Wills House, amended (H. Rept. 106–736);

H.R. 3468, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah (H. Rept. 106–737);

H.R. 3817, to redesignate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Peak Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado as the "Jaryd Atadero Legacy Trail", amended (H. Rept. 106–738);

H.R. 2773, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system, amended (H. Rept. 106–739);

H.R. 2833, to establish the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area, amended (H. Rept. 106–740);

H.R. 2919, to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio, amended (H. Rept. 106–741);

H.R. 3236, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Weber Basin Water Conservancy District, Utah, to use Weber Basin Project facilities for the impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes, amended (H. Rept. 106–742);

H.R. 3291, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, amended (H. Rept. 106–743);

H.R. 3657, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of public domain land in the San Bernardino National Forest in the State of California, amended (H. Rept. 106–744);

H.R. 3999, to clarify the process for the adoption of local constitutional self-government for the United States Virgin Islands and Guam, amended (H. Rept. 106–745);

S. 439, to amend the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988 to adjust the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada (H. Rept. 106–746);

S. 1629, to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Oregon (H. Rept. 106–747);

S. 1374, to authorize the development and maintenance of a multi agency campus project in the town of Jackson, Wyoming (H. Rept. 106–748);

S. 1705, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into land exchanges to acquire from the private owner and to convey to the State of Idaho approximately 1,240 acres of land near the City of Rocks National Reserve, Idaho (H. Rept. 106–749);

H.R. 3676, to establish the Santa Rosa and San Jacinth Mountains National Monument in the State of California, amended (H. Rept. 106–750);

H.R. 4115, to authorize appropriations for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, amended (H. Rept. 106–751);

H. Res. 553, providing for consideration of a motion to go to conference on any Senate amendments to H.R. 4810, to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 (H. Rept. 106–752);

H.R. 4843, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for retirement security and pension reform, amended (H. Rept. 106–753); and

Conference report on H.R. 4576, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001 (H. Rept. 106–754). **Pages H6102–H6345, H6353–54**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Biggert to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H6055**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:41 p.m. and reconvened at 2 p.m. **Page H6056**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:41 p.m. and reconvened at 7 p.m. **Page H6085**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Postage Stamps Sold At A Premium: H.R. 4437, amended, to grant to the United States Postal Service the authority to issue semipostals; **Pages H6068–71**

Vicki Coceano Post Office Building in Miramar City, Florida: H.R. 3985, amended, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar

City, Florida, as the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building.'' Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H6071–72**

Inadequate Security Policy and Procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration: H. Res. 534, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate that security policy and security procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration remain inadequate, that the individuals responsible for such policy and procedures must be held accountable for their performance, and that immediate action must be taken to correct security deficiencies x(agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 391 yeas to 5 nays with 2 voting ''present'', Roll No. 401); **Pages H6072–77, H6086**

Rehabilitation of Floodwater Retention Projects: H.R. 728, amended, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws. Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H6077–81**

Congratulating the Republic of Latvia on the 10th Anniversary Reestablishment of its Independence: H. Con. Res. 319, congratulating the Republic of Latvia on the 10th anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence from the rule of the former Soviet Union (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 398 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 402); and **Pages H6081–83, H6087**

Attack on the Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina: H. Res. 531, amended, condemning the 1994 attack on the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina, urging the Argentine Government to punish those responsible (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 402 yeas to one nay, Roll No. 403). **Pages H6083–85, H6087–88**

Suspension Failed—Internet Gambling Prohibition: The House failed to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 3125, amended, to prohibit Internet gambling (With 2/3 required to pass, failed by a yea and nay vote of 245 yeas to 159 nays, Roll No. 404). **Pages H6057–68, H6088**

Order of Business—Disapproving the Extension of Trade Waiver to China: Agreed that it be in order an any time on Tuesday, July 18, or any day thereafter to consider H.J. Res. 103, disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the People's Republic of China, that it be considered as read, that all points of order against it and against its consideration be waived ; that it be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (in opposition) and a Member in support; that pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered to final passage without intervening motion; and that these provisions shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority with respect to China for the remainder of the second session of the 106th Congress. Further it is the intent that the 2 hours of debate be yielded fairly between members of the majority and minority parties on both sides of the issue. **Page H6086**

Late Report—DOD Conference Report: The Committee on Appropriations received permission to have until midnight to file a conference report on H.R. 4576, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. **Page H6089**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H6086, H6087, H6087–88, and H6088. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT—RESOLVE DIFFERENCES WITH SENATE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for consideration of a motion to go to conference on H.R. 4810, Marriage Penalty Tax Elimination Reconciliation Act. The rule provides that the motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Finally, the rule provides that H. Res. 550 is laid on the table.

MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade approved for full Committee action the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2000.

CORRECTIONS ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Trade approved for full Committee action the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2000.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, JULY 18, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Production and Price.

Competitiveness, to hold hearings to examine the future of the United States agricultural export program, 2:30 p.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to mark up H.R. 4733, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001; and H.R. 4690, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 2 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold hearings on S. 2733, to provide for the preservation of assisted housing for low income elderly persons, disabled persons, and other families, 2 p.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the impact of climate change on the United States, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: business meeting to consider pending calendar business, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Taxation and IRS Oversight, to hold hearings on federal income tax issues relating to proposals to lower U.S. dependency on foreign oil used in transportation fuels, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine national security implications of granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations status to communist China, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings on the impact of increases in prescription drug costs, 2 p.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, to mark up a measure making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on ''Medicaid Provider Enrollment: Assessing State Efforts to Prevent Fraud,'' 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, hearing on ''Mercury in Medicine-Are We Taking Unnecessary Risks?'' 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, oversight hearing on ''The U.S. General Accounting Office,'' 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1686, Internet Freedom Act; and H.R. 1685, Internet Growth and Development Act of 1999, Part 2, 9:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, hearing on H.R. 1293, Transportation Employee Fair Taxation Act of 1999; and a hearing and markup of H.R. 4700, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2317, Lower Delaware Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; and H.R. 4828, Steens Mountain Wilderness Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: a measure making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001; H.R. 4118, Russian-American Trust and Cooperation Act of 2000; and H.R. 4843, Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act of 2000, 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, hearing on Reexamining the Scientific Basis for the Linear No-Threshold Model of Low-Dose Radiation, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Financing Commercial Space Ventures, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Ground Transportation, hearing on the Implementation of the Federal Railroad Administration Grade-Crossing Whistle Ban Law, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Benefits, to mark up the following: H.R. 4850, Veterans Benefits Act of 2000; and H.R. 4864, Veterans Claims Assistance Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:15 a.m., Tuesday, July 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 4578, Interior Appropriations, with votes to occur on certain amendments and final passage beginning at 9:45 a.m.; following which, Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 4810, Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act, with votes to occur on certain amendments and final passage. Also, Senate expects to begin consideration of H.R. 4461, Agriculture Appropriations.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, July 18

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

(1) H.R. 3113—Unsolicited Commercial Electronic Mail Act;

(2) H.R. 2634—Drug Addiction Treatment Act;

(3) H.R. 3380—Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act;

(4) H.R. 2961—International Patient Act;

(5) H.R. 4430—Alfred Rascon Post Office Building in Fulton, Maryland;

(6) H.R. 4157—Matthew 'Mack' Robinson Post Office Building in Pasadena, California;

(7) H.R. 4517—Alan B. Shepard, Jr. Post Office Building in Derry, New Hampshire;

(8) H.R. 4554—Joseph F. Smith Post Office Building in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania;

(9) H.R. 4865—Debt Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001; and

(10) H.R. 1264—Right-To-Know National Payroll Act.

Consideration of H.J. Res. 103, disapproving the extension of the trade waiver authority for China (unanimous consent agreement, 2 hours of debate); and

Possible consideration of a motion to go to conference on H.R. 4810, Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Reconciliation (closed rule, 1 hour of debate).

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.